

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

**1018th
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 27 September 1961,
at 3 p.m.



SIXTEENTH SESSION

NEW YORK

Official Records

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Address by Mr. Arturo Frondizi, President of Argentina</i>	129
<i>Speech by Mr. Pazhwak (Afghanistan).</i>	132
<i>Speech by Mr. Martino (Italy).</i>	134
<i>Agenda item 8:</i>	
<i>Adoption of the agenda (continued)</i>	
<i>First report of the General Committee (concluded).</i>	137
<i>Second report of the General Committee.</i>	146
<i>Agenda item 92:</i>	
<i>Admission of new Members to the United Nations</i>	147

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I would ask if the members of the Assembly would be good enough to allow me to invite the President of the Argentine Republic to address the Assembly.

2. I have the honour to welcome Mr. Arturo Frondizi, President of the Argentine Republic, who wishes to make a statement to the Assembly. I take the liberty of expressing the hope that this important statement will throw new light on the various problems which confront us and will facilitate our efforts to promote peace and to ease international tension. I now invite His Excellency the President of the Argentine Republic to address the Assembly.

ADDRESS BY MR. ARTURO FRONDIZI, PRESIDENT OF THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

3. Mr. FRONDIZI, President of the Argentine Republic (translated from Spanish): The people of Argentina, on whose behalf I am addressing this Assembly, wish to support all those who have spoken here in favour of the maintenance of peace and friendship among all the peoples of the world. There is no more urgent and vital undertaking for the men of today—those of all regions of the world, of all beliefs and of all social classes—than that of preserving peace. God created man with the mark of brotherhood, so that he might survive and multiply throughout the ages. War and destruction challenge that divine purpose, especially since another war might extinguish man from the face of the earth. The peoples of the whole world, anxious and afraid, come to this universal forum confident that the breath of creation, the supreme act which gave us life, will inspire the hearts and minds of all the statesmen, and thus forever banish war and

weapons of mass destruction as instruments of international policy.

4. I should like to pay a tribute of respect and admiration to the memory of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, the late Secretary-General of the United Nations. Mr. Hammarskjöld was not only the administrative head of this Organization; he also fulfilled highly responsible functions in international life. By the vigour of his action and the exceptional qualities he displayed in the fulfilment of his task, Mr. Hammarskjöld became in this Organization an official whom it was difficult to replace, and his death in the line of duty constitutes a loss the magnitude of which will be fully realized as time goes by and all that his activities meant for peace becomes clear.

5. The nation which I represent is a young one. It has just celebrated 150 years of independence. Born in the early years of the nineteenth century, it was guided by the liberal ideas of the American and French Revolutions when the world-wide interchange of goods and ideas was breaking up the trading monopolies and political autocracies and was spreading the principles of democracy, freedom and self-determination of peoples.

6. We Argentines subsequently fought for the right to trade freely with Europe, without the discrimination and restrictions which the colonial system had imposed. We fought for our national self-determination, vis-à-vis not only Spain but other European Powers which, disputing the maritime and trading routes with Spain, were putting pressure on the new Republic of the River Plate with the object of incorporating it in their spheres of influence. As our nation grew and became an important producer of food and raw materials, the great industrial nations vied with one another in seeking to gain control of that wealth. The history of our country is a chronicle of the heroic efforts of the Argentine people to overcome its internal dissensions, consolidate its national unity and defend its political and economic independence.

7. From the earliest days of the Republic, we Argentines clearly sensed our inviolable national sovereignty, the ties of ideals and interests which bound us to the sister nations of Latin America, and our obligation to be generous and open-handed members of the world community. We were at one and the same time Argentines, Americans and citizens of the world. The patriot armies which gave us independence marched with the Liberator, San Martín, across the high mountains of the Andes to liberate Chile and Peru—to liberate them, but never to dominate them.

8. Invariably, with exemplary consistency, Argentina's international policy has been based on the three fundamental principles of international life—the legal equality of States, non-intervention in domestic affairs, and the self-determination of peoples. These

considerations determined our delegates' actions in the League of Nations, in the Organization of American States and in the United Nations.

9. We invariably practise a policy of respect for international legal order, and never fail to support and implement the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes by means of arbitration, conciliation and good offices. We have opposed foreign intervention and any kind of pressure, whether political, economic, legal or ideological, by one nation upon another. That is how we acted when an extra-continental Power attempted by force to collect a debt from an American nation, and it was the same when any nation attempted to change the Government or political system of another, or when two sister nations went to war. In this last case we were always ready to offer our good offices.

10. There has not been a single instance in which the Argentine nation has supported aggression, outside interference in the policy of any country, or recourse to armed conflict for the settlement of international disputes. On the other hand, there is abundant evidence of Argentine action taken to defend the self-determination of peoples and universal peace—from the activities of the Argentine delegations at Geneva after the First World War down to those of our representatives in the United Nations. This moral authority encourages us to confirm, before the world, the unequivocal international position of the nation which I here have the honour to represent.

11. This assembly of nations reflects, dramatically, the picture of the contemporary world. The United Nations, which in 1945 brought together the States which had been victorious in the last war, has opened its doors to those which were then the conquered nations, and it now comprises practically 100 States, a third of which are nations having recently acquired independent status. There are represented here all the age-old beliefs of humanity, all the races, cultures and political and social systems; the most powerful nations and the most humble; those that once ruled over vast empires, and the colonies which have now been freed from their former overlords. There is thus being realized the ideal of an international organization excluding none, practising no discrimination or inequality, and bringing together nearly all the sovereign States of the world, represented by their lawful Governments and on a footing of absolute equality. The Argentine Republic will support any effort to make the Organization more universal and its delegations more genuinely representative.

12. For the first time in the history of international relations, a world organization is functioning in which the voice of all peoples is heard. Each of the Governments associated in it can express itself freely, and no nation or group of nations has a predominating or decisive influence over the rest in the important decisions of this body. Despite the natural limitations circumscribing the authority of any international legal body and preventing it from exercising supra-national powers, the United Nations today represents, authentically and democratically, the conscience of mankind. That is why the Argentine Republic will support any efforts to increase the authority and prestige of the United Nations and the independence and responsibility of its principal organs.

13. In this great Assembly is also reflected the most significant and decisive event of the century—that which will give a historic name to our epoch. I

refer to the heroic and majestic awakening of the new nations of Asia and Africa—to the unprecedented fact that millions of human beings, belonging to different peoples and separated by vast deserts and impassable mountains, have joined, within barely twenty years, in a great movement of liberation and of entry into the community of sovereign nations. The Argentines warmly welcome their Asian and African brothers and pledge their whole-hearted co-operation in the arduous but glorious process of promoting freedom and ever-growing prosperity, both for those peoples which have already won their political independence and for those which are still fighting to obtain it.

14. We peoples of America won our political independence a century and a half ago. Yet we know that sovereignty is not a legal formula, but a national will to power and self-determination which does not end, but only begins, with the political act of emancipation. Economic under-development is an enemy of a people's true sovereignty no less menacing than external political factors which restrict or stultify it. No backward country is completely independent. The political strife and the institutional distortions and setbacks which overtake the new democratic republics from the moment when they proclaim their independence are not the casual whims of nature. They are a consequence of the economic and social poverty, of the weakness and anachronism of economic structures, which continue to exist after the political act of emancipation. Highly developed and prosperous peoples are apt to judge severely, and from an academic standpoint, the difficulties, errors and abuses which mark the practice of democracy in the new nations. But democracy is not a fiat transmitted to mankind from above; it is a slow process, completed with suffering and even with bloodshed by peoples that are endeavouring to govern themselves.

15. As an American country, we aim at the permanent consolidation of representative democracy throughout the continent and the complete guarantee of republican liberties, as well as at the fullest possible protection of human rights.

16. The only way of helping peoples to practise democracy and freedom to the full is to collaborate with them in their economic development and social well-being, which are essential to their cultural and political progress. There is no more effective way of delaying and obstructing that progress than by interfering from outside in the domestic vicissitudes of such countries and trying to impose institutions and customs on them, since these cannot be copied or invented but can be created only in the heart and mind of the people concerned. In this exceptional and serious world situation, the international community has no duty more urgent than that of assisting the under-developed countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa.

17. The world which is emerging, the varied and numerous congregation of new peoples—such is the pointer of the scales where the future of mankind is concerned. Our ideals and interests, both immediate and long-range, coincide with the universal desire for concord and lasting peace. We shall therefore use all the weight of our influence in the United Nations to find adequate solutions for such fundamental problems as disarmament, the banning of nuclear tests, the question of peace with Germany, the peaceful solution of colonial problems, and all other questions affecting the peace of the world.

18. The full development of our economies depends upon international financial assistance and the liberalization and expansion of trade between all regions of the world. Only in an atmosphere free from tension and mistrust among the great Powers will it be possible to achieve the ideal of universal and controlled disarmament. The continuation of the disarmament negotiations would of itself indicate and encourage a relaxation of tension. Failure to reach, at least, an urgent agreement on the absolute prohibition of nuclear tests in every form and in every part of the world is quite inexcusable.

19. Disarmament, in its turn, will liberate vast financial and technical resources which the great Powers can use to promote the economic development of the under-developed countries. That contribution cannot be measured solely in terms of money and technical assistance. It involves an active policy of international solidarity which will serve as an example to sustain, throughout the world, the ideals of freedom, justice and respect for human dignity. When the international community succeeds in replacing its present anxieties and tensions by collective action for help to the new emerging world, the ideals of democracy and human freedom will have won the battle throughout the globe.

20. We peoples of Latin America, who by tradition and calling belong to the world governed by the ethical and cultural values of the West, are in virtue of those same principles bound to side with the peoples that are fighting to establish their freedom and to ensure for all their sons a level of living compatible with their moral dignity. In the same way, we have a right to expect that the great Powers will respect our sovereignty and help us to overcome backwardness and poverty.

21. The philosophical and juridical idea of the international community is, in its origins, Western and Christian. During the Middle Ages and until the end of the eighteenth century, it was confined to Christian Europe. But the selfsame notion of Christian brotherhood and of Christianity's world-wide vocation caused that closed, exclusive community to change, little by little, into an association open to every system of values in the modern world. The present international community is a "plural" society, in which different cultures and ethical and legal systems exist side by side. It is based on the principle of the peaceful coexistence of all its members and on mutual respect for ideological and political differences. Hence, when we proclaim our Western and Christian filiation, we are postulating no concept of exclusiveness or of hostility towards other ideas. Nor are we seeking to establish antagonism between blocs or to set one group of nations against another. On the contrary, the Christian concept of life predisposes us towards tolerance, coexistence in freedom and in justice, and the reign of peace among men and peoples.

22. There is nothing so opposed to this idea of brotherhood than the rivalries and mistrust that are confining the world to this dangerous no man's land between war and peace which is identified with the term "cold war". The "cold war" is negative and sterile because it dictates the investment, in weapons which are daily becoming more destructive, of vast resources which science and modern technology could use to accelerate human progress at an incredible pace. The "cold war" limits and hampers material and cultural exchanges between peoples that are

separated into rival camps. Lastly, the "cold war" constitutes a permanent threat of total war, demoralizing and paralysing the creative spirit of man.

23. The under-developed countries have the most to lose from this division of the world, because it is they that stand in greatest need of international co-operation for their own development, and because war would overtake them as a disastrous consequence of the rivalries between the great Powers, in whose decisions they would have had no part whatever.

24. For the under-developed countries, peace and disarmament are essential to existence itself, as well as to the realization of a universal ideal which they, too, uphold. Both in the United Nations and by unilateral diplomatic action, these nations must take positive steps, whenever opportunity arises, to try to reconcile conflicting interests; they must refrain from any acts which might help to poison the international atmosphere yet further; and they must always choose the path of negotiation, which excludes coercion and threats as methods of solving international disputes.

25. The Argentine Republic will work, so far as lies in its power, for a reduction of international tension and for the use of negotiation and the peaceful methods of conciliation and arbitration, in all the international organizations, regional or world-wide, of which it is a member.

26. That is the spirit underlying the most recent international acts of the Argentine Government, such as the Agreement of Uruguayana, signed on 21 April 1961 with the Government of Brazil; the Declaration of Viña del Mar of 11 September 1961, signed with the Government of Chile; and the Act of the Conference of Punta del Este, of 17 August 1961. In all these instruments, the Argentine Republic has confirmed the immutable principles of its international policy and its adherence to the ideal of inter-American and world co-operation.

27. The Argentine Republic is a member of the Organization of American States, and confirms its most resolute adherence to the high principles of Pan-Americanism, which have preserved the indestructible cohesion and solidarity of the American family of nations on the basis of respect for individual sovereignty and for the principle of self-determination and non-intervention. The Argentine Government also believes that President Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress" marks the beginning of a new era in the relations between the United States of America and the Latin American republics. The people of the United States realize that the reinforcement of democratic institutions throughout the hemisphere is the effective and essential basis of continental solidarity. It also realizes that the fate of those institutions is closely bound up with the economic, social and cultural development of Latin America, for which it has pledged substantial and urgent assistance. The Argentine Republic expresses its most fervent hope for the success of this co-operative effort, and has repeatedly declared its conviction that the speedy and generous implementation of the "Alliance for Progress" will enable the nations of Latin America to expedite the fulfilment of their own development plans and intensify their own efforts to overcome the backwardness and structural weakness of their economies.

28. Systems and programmes of inter-American collaboration are not incompatible with Latin Ameri-

ca's participation in world trade and co-operation. None of the agreements I have mentioned—to which should be added the Treaty of Montevideo, which instituted the Latin American Free Trade Association—in any way excludes or conflicts with the system of world co-operation. Latin America is uniting in order to be able to accelerate its rate of development and thus contribute more effectively to world trade. The more our peoples expand, strengthen and coordinate their economies, the greater will be the amount of the goods and services which they can offer to and receive from the world. The developing economies offer vast opportunities for capital investment and technical assistance from the industrial nations, whose rapid expansion requires equally rapid development on the part of the backward nations. At the same time, these latter nations are increasing the output and improving the quality of their food-stuffs and raw materials for the world market, to which they will send their products at competitive prices. My Government has therefore proclaimed the right of the Latin American nations to participate in all trading arrangements made by the European communities, the traditional markets for their products. In our view any discriminatory or protectionist policy, or formation of blocs on the part of the industrial nations will militate against the principles of international co-operation and multilateral trade which constitute the only guarantees of lasting peace.

29. In the past, peace was an aspiration of mankind—an ideal, tragically frustrated at times by man's blindness. Today, with his tremendous powers of invention, man has created such instruments of destruction that peace is no longer a Utopia but has become an absolute necessity. Man, who henceforth can kill his fellows only at the risk of destroying the species, has at the same time become the explorer and conqueror of the polar snows, the master of the deep and of stellar space. Science has laid the universe at the feet of the earth's inhabitants. Such science has no frontiers and pays no heed to ideologies or nationalities. It is as universal in nature as the cosmonaut who circles the globe and looks down upon the minuteness of his abode. And it is in this realm, opened up by man's prodigious intellect, that men and peoples divided by beliefs and interests exist. Man's creative capacity—his ability to transform nature, to wrest from it its uttermost resources, to produce unlimited matter and energy from the splitting of the tiny, invisible atom—ushers in an era unparalleled in human history. No wealth, no material achievement is now beyond the immediate reach of mankind, to be distributed freely and fully for the satisfaction of the petty and transitory needs of the human race.

30. The same act which enables man to journey to the stars is a sure instrument for reconciling the hopes of peoples of the greatest diversity and the most conflicting beliefs. The brotherhood of man has received an unprecedented stimulus from this miraculous flowering of the intellect. The Utopia of which man has dreamed throughout history is now within our grasp. And yet, on this earth, where such a miracle has been performed, two thirds of the people are living in poverty and ignorance while nations accumulate weapons of destruction which they know must never be used and which consume gigantic resources. I belong to a country which is part of this "held back" section of humanity.

31. At this moment, my people is making a tremendous sacrifice to overcome its difficulties and to build up a community which will be politically, democratically and economically independent, prosperous, and happy.

32. On behalf of my country and the millions of people who are striving for their freedom and well-being in this era of the conquest of space, I express my profound faith in the conscience of humanity and in the moral values and intellect of man. I am confident that the representatives assembled here, and their respective Governments, will make this great assembly of peoples into the most active instrument for the peace and well-being of all the inhabitants of the earth. God, who sees man ascend to His heavenly realms, will give him the wisdom to set aside his disputes, and will inspire him to turn his mastery over nature into a common endeavour to redeem the human race from poverty, ignorance and oppression.

33. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the President of the Argentine Republic for the eloquent address he has given us. We shall certainly all ponder it and give it the serious consideration which its importance deserves. May I now request the members of the Assembly to remain seated while I have the honour of escorting the President from the hall.

34. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan): It is not to follow a customary practice but rather to express a real feeling that I wish to congratulate you on your election, Mr. President. The unanimous vote of the General Assembly is recognition of your high qualifications and the esteem your person deserves as one in whom such confidence can be placed for the fulfilment of a task which is particularly important in the prevailing circumstances.

35. We were deeply impressed when on assuming your duties as President of the General Assembly you expressed the feelings of the Members of the United Nations on the tragic and untimely death of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld. I have already associated myself with the tribute you paid to his memory, but at this particular moment I ask your permission to allow me to convey the heartfelt sorrow and sympathy of His Majesty the King, the Government and the people of Afghanistan to the Members of the General Assembly, the members of the Secretariat and to Mr. Hammarskjöld's family and his friends.

36. This message of condolence is also extended to the Swedish Mission to the United Nations and to all those who are related to the devoted members of the United Nations Secretariat who died with the Secretary-General in the line of duty. It is an expression of our deep respect for men who have died serving the cause of peace, the ultimate goal of mankind, for the achievement of which the United Nations is the only existing human institution.

37. This session of the General Assembly is being held at a critical moment in international affairs. The threat to peace is no longer a fear of war as we have known it in the past. The situation is pregnant with the fear of total destruction. The world is no longer confronted with events which might one day become a source of great anxiety to humanity. We are now faced with a concrete situation in which mankind is living in the shadow of war. This is not an imagined fear, for the possibility of war has been explicitly recognized here by those nations powerful enough to make the possibility a tragic reality.

38. In such circumstances it is not proper for any responsible individual—and it is even less proper for any assembly of nations—to spend one moment on anything but the most serious efforts to prevent a further deterioration of the situation.

39. My delegation is particularly disturbed by the attitude demonstrated by the big Powers in their statements during this session: while fully realizing the dangers involved in the present undesirable development of international affairs and while strongly expressing their desire for peace, they have explicitly spoken of the might and power at their disposal. We found that most alarming because the very demonstration of force can well lead to the provocation of its implementation.

40. Admitting that the weak and the powerless do not have effective means of bringing about tangible results, the small countries which make up the majority of the population of the world and the majority of voices in this Organization cannot be deprived of at least one right that they still possess. That is to initiate a course of consideration and action in the General Assembly at this session. These countries should demand from the powerful countries a pledge to refrain from any action that would create or increase the possibility of the use of force in any circumstances. While one might agree with those who think that such a demand by the weak for such a pledge from the powerful might not serve any practical purpose, one cannot possibly agree that such a demand for such a pledge is not most essential. In our view, that is the first task of this session of the General Assembly.

41. The second task in the prevailing circumstances should be the realization that while all of us recognize the existence of many important problems with which the United Nations should deal, it is very urgent that the major political problems of the world, on the solution of which depends the possibility of solving other problems, should receive the immediate attention of the General Assembly during this session. There are ninety-one items on the agenda of this session. The fact that these items have been included in the agenda is sufficient recognition of their importance. At the same time, however, every one of us realizes that a constructive solution to most of these issues is not possible without the creation of the kind of atmosphere which can be expected to prevail only if the efforts of the United Nations are concentrated on the major world problems. There are certain items the discussion of which intensifies international tension and the cold war, which is gradually becoming warmer. My delegation would therefore wish that the General Assembly, having recognized the importance of the items by including them in the agenda, would, in dealing with the problems, reach an understanding temporarily to defer a discussion of them until it had dealt with the major problems, within the limits of a careful analysis of the possibilities at its disposal. That, of course, applies only to the controversial political items.

42. In our view, the major problems confronting the world are the following: the discontinuance of the cold war and the lessening of international tension, and the substitution therefore of peaceful coexistence and international co-operation; the discontinuance of the arms race, and the institution of general and complete disarmament; the discontinuance of war and bloodshed where they exist at present and particularly

the war and bloodshed that has resulted from colonial aggression, through negotiations; and the settlement of the situation in Berlin—although this last question is not yet on the agenda of this session. Those are the major problems confronting the world. To them should be added the problem of concentrating our efforts on solving the situation that has arisen as a result of the sudden death of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld and the problem of the structure of the United Nations. The representation of China in the United Nations is of course basic to a solution of the latter issue.

43. I have no intention of elaborating at this stage of the general debate on these or other problems that will be discussed during this session—partly because our views on them are known, and basically, because we shall have a chance to express ourselves on them when they come up for discussion.

44. I hope that our basic views on how to approach the present unfortunate situation in international affairs are clear to our colleagues. As a small country, we have no force behind the thoughts we have expressed except our good intentions, derived from our aspirations for peace, and our expectation that the Members of the Assembly, especially the peace-loving small countries, will take note of the seriousness of the situation and seek ways and means which would secure the interests of humanity as a whole. We do not wish to insist that our own way of thinking be generally accepted, but we do insist that if the United Nations is to serve the cause of world peace each Member of it should consider the interests of the entire world as paramount in the present crisis. Only by such breadth of vision can the United Nations make that constructive contribution to the solution of world problems for which this Assembly has been convened.

45. Before concluding, I would like to express our general views on one point which should be recognized as the most urgent task of this session, namely the question of how to meet the situation in which this Organization finds itself in the absence of a Secretary-General. Being well aware of the complexity of the matter in the prevailing circumstances and hoping that an agreement will be reached at the end of the current negotiations, it is our considered opinion that it is far from desirable for anyone to insist upon any controversial position on this matter. Unless full agreement is reached, no hurried measures should be allowed to be taken in the name of urgency. While the urgency of the matter should be emphasized, the lasting interest of the United Nations as an effective world organ for international harmony should not be sacrificed as a result of a psychologically disturbing situation which can easily mislead us and can bring about more difficulties. We cannot allow ourselves to fail to search thoroughly the avenues of an agreement satisfactory to all. In our view, it is better not to make a final decision on this matter in the rush imposed upon us by certain difficulties with which we admit we are confronted. An interim arrangement has been suggested. The Afghan delegation favours this view in principle. Any provisional arrangement which would bring about a unanimous understanding will be acceptable to my delegation. In the case of disagreement, we shall take a stand in the face of the compelling circumstances which we should not like to foresee at this stage.

46. There is, however, an exceptional urgency realized by all of us as to the responsibilities of the

United Nations in connexion with the situation in the Congo. To meet this particular urgency, the Afghan delegation thinks that in the case of a disagreement on the matter of filling the post of the Secretary-General on a temporary basis, with a clear understanding that this temporary arrangement will not affect final positions, it would be more advisable to try to reach an agreement on a provisional arrangement that would enable the United Nations to function effectively in the performance of its responsibilities in the Congo only.

47. The creation of such an authority, under the direction of the Security Council, should be considered possible, while at the same time the Security Council should be continuously seized of finding a solution, as soon as possible, in the interest of the Organization, for filling the post of the Secretary-General.

48. The guiding principle in our thoughts is a stronger United Nations emerging from the present crisis. This goal cannot be achieved without the tolerance, patience and understanding needed for securing full support of all Members of the United Nations for any decision.

49. In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that if the United Nations is expected to be able to fulfil its primary task for the cause of peace, every individual Member of the Organization should avoid a hostile attitude in the interest of the restless and troubled world. The United Nations, to which we belong and in which we have the deepest conviction, is not meant to invite the cold war into the already shaking Organization, or to send the cold war out to the already shivering world.

50. Mr. MARTINO (Italy): In offering our heartfelt congratulations upon your unanimous election, Sir, as President of the General Assembly we voice the feelings of a country which is bound to yours by a traditional friendship which goes back across the centuries to distant times when our two peoples met, on the waters of the Mediterranean, to establish fruitful associations. Your wisdom and experience will be invaluable in the constructive and impartial guidance of our debates.

51. It would be a dangerous mistake to shut our eyes to the harsh realities of the present world situation. The General Assembly meets at a moment which might even mark a crucial turning point in the history of the Organization. Upon how we tackle the problems which confront us will depend whether we shall turn onto the path of progress in international co-operation or will see the triumph of those negative forces which could shatter once and for all the hopes and beliefs which inspired the founders of the United Nations meeting at San Francisco after the Second World War—hopes and beliefs that, in subsequent years, led so many new States to join the United Nations.

52. Our responsibility is great because by our actions we can either dissipate this great moral inheritance, showing that it was nothing but an illusion, or can defend and add to it, proving to the world that the ideals of international co-operation are a reality in which we firmly believe.

53. This is certainly not the time for high-sounding phrases and general declarations of principle, which are easily made, but for deeds and for deeds alone. And the facts show that just when the international horizon is clouded by the Berlin crisis, just when

our Organization is deeply involved in the Congo and just when the responsibilities of the United Nations in such matters as disarmament, assistance to the under-developed countries and support for the independence of countries that have not yet attained that goal have become more pressing than ever, the tragic death of our Secretary-General has robbed our main executive organ of its head. The problem of restoring the efficient functioning of the Secretariat is, in the view of the Italian delegation, the number one problem on which rests the solution of all other questions.

54. How is it to be dealt with? And how is it to be solved? There are some considerations that I would like to submit.

55. The San Francisco Charter clearly embodies a principle, namely, that at the head of the Secretariat there should be a single individual personally responsible for the implementation of our decisions and for the administrative work of the United Nations. This principle is tacitly reaffirmed upon the admission of new Member States joining the United Nations, and these States not only accept the rules contained in the Charter but also automatically acquire—on the same footing as other Member States—the right to withdraw in the event of reforms should they be considered unacceptable. Thus any departure from the institution of a single office of Secretary-General, besides jeopardizing the efficiency of our executive, could, we feel, gravely complicate matters by casting doubt on the continued presence in the United Nations of part of its existing membership.

56. At this stage I should like to emphasize that, when the principle of a single Secretary-General was accepted without dispute, the international community was substantially no different from now. Even then there were Member States ruled by the Communist doctrine, while others followed a policy of neutrality and still others favoured active democratic solidarity. So the present tripartite grouping existed even then. Moreover, the Charter even then provided in Article 51, for the regional arrangements that were to be concluded in subsequent years, including the Atlantic Pact and the Warsaw Pact. The Charter even envisaged the possibility of disagreement between the permanent members of the Security Council as, in fact, it gave them the right of veto. Why, then, did this right of veto not extend to the activities of the Secretary-General? There were several obvious reasons:

57. First, if Security Council decisions already required the consent of all the permanent members, it was generally agreed that the work of the General Assembly should be governed by a different principle—that of the two-thirds majority. It did not occur to anyone at that time that the Assembly's decisions could be vetoed, which would happen, however, once the Secretariat was given the power to obstruct the implementation of its decisions.

58. Secondly, the main executive organ of the United Nations cannot be paralysed at the whim of one party except at the cost of total inefficiency.

59. Thirdly—and this deserves special attention—the General Assembly should, like any political assembly, have to deal with a single responsible individual from whom, in given circumstances, it can withdraw its confidence by a vote of censure. But, by accepting the "troika" principle, we would be taking the serious step of sanctioning what would amount to irresponsibility on the part of the Secretariat, as it is obvious

that you cannot censure a person to whom you have accorded the right of veto. In essence, the so-called "troika" system would introduce the veto—which would turn the executive organ into a deliberating body—not merely into the Secretariat but, as a matter of fact, into the General Assembly as well, and that would clearly be unacceptable.

60. Once we have shown the legitimacy and the need of having one Secretary-General, the course we must take to ensure the smooth running of the only executive organ we possess is revealed in its true light. We all know the rules laid down in the Charter. We therefore know that the Security Council is competent to make a designation which the General Assembly is asked to ratify. But while awaiting that designation, which we hope will be made as speedily as possible, can we just stand back and implicitly abdicate our right to adopt any further valid decisions simply because there is no one to implement them or to continue to carry out decisions already taken in the past? Do we consider that the problems confronting us are not urgent and that we can complacently postpone their consideration indefinitely? Such an attitude would, in our opinion, be irresponsible and would certainly fall short of the expectations of public opinion in our respective countries. We therefore have no choice but to find a provisional head for our executive. Besides, when the United Nations was first established and when, on the expiry of the first Secretary-General's term of office, the General Assembly was faced with a similar problem—since the Security Council could not agree on a new nominee—it solved it by taking immediate action. In the present international situation it is imperative that we should assume the responsibilities that the General Assembly, at an earlier session, had no hesitation in assuming.

61. In dealing with the grave problems that cloud the political horizon I have already had occasion to mention the question of Berlin. Let me now make a few brief comments on that subject.

62. Some time before the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held at Belgrade, the Italian Government, through its Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, who had returned from a journey to Moscow, voiced the belief that the time was ripe for direct negotiations between the Powers concerned. This belief still holds firm. But, in our minds, negotiation means the exchanging of views, in search of a solution that would take into account the interests of both sides, and not the unconditional acceptance of all the requests advanced by one side. We have a different word to define that type of exchange: we call it capitulation or surrender, not negotiation.

63. Yesterday the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union pointed out the danger to world peace stemming from the present partition of Germany [1016th meeting]. But he forgot to mention where responsibility lies for the failure to reunify Germany. Reunification by means of free elections, which was also reaffirmed in principle at the Conference of Foreign Ministers held at Geneva in 1955, was never permitted precisely by the Soviet Union.

64. Mr. Gromyko, who yesterday so solemnly and firmly assured us that the Communist countries had chosen that order of their own free will, forgot to mention the reason why the inhabitants of East Germany have always been prevented from expressing their free will. It is simply because they have never had the opportunity to do so, that even today a barrier

still stretches across the Brandenburg Gate in the centre of the city of Berlin.

65. It is hard to counsel acceptance of the view that what is lawful for one party is not only unlawful for the other but actually a threat to peace. In this respect the case of East Berlin is of considerable relevance. Originally its status was governed by the same agreements as those which gave rise to the régime in West Berlin. But whereas any discussion of the de facto absorption of East Berlin into East Germany was taboo—even though its inhabitants were so eager for a different arrangement that a sort of Chinese wall had to be erected to prevent their exodus to West Berlin—the citizens of West Berlin are denied any contact with West Germany Sic voc non vobis.

66. From this rostrum we wish to renew our appeal for negotiations, with the hope that there will be no misunderstanding as to its meaning. Anyone who would today passively agree to a different course might find himself tomorrow the prisoner and victim of his own weakness.

67. In the view of the Italian delegation, the problem of disarmament today is more crucial than ever for the preservation of world peace. This belief springs from the awareness that the solution to all the delicate problems that vex us can be more easily found once a bold step has been taken towards a system which, by progressive stages, can bring about general, complete and controlled disarmament.

68. In stressing the urgency of disarmament in an age when technology conditions the lives of nations as a whole, both in the civilian and the military fields, we are none the less aware that such priority is conditional upon a complementary but equally important requirement, as the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom pointed out this morning [1018th meeting], that is the simultaneous establishment of a adequate security system.

69. This system should be the cornerstone of any effective and fruitful international reconstruction. Our inclination to proceed towards general and complete disarmament can be justified only in so far as, in our progress towards the ultimate goal, we can be certain of safeguarding an international justice which will guarantee that all parties respect their undertakings. The present balance of terror should therefore be replaced by a system of guaranteed co-operation which will permit economic and social development for all peoples based on freedom and respect for individual opinions.

70. With these considerations in mind, the Italian delegation heartily welcomed the United States-USSR statement of agreed principles of 20 September 1961 [A/4879]. These principles enunciated for the safeguarding of disarmament negotiations fully reflect our views. We have always held that a programme for general and complete disarmament, in order to cope with the realities of present and future situations, should be combined with limited but progressive measures designed to promote that "gradual approach" to the problem, to which President Kennedy referred in his address to the Assembly [1013th meeting]. These initial measures, which could even be adopted immediately, as they present no inherent difficulties, would be of great psychological value and would mean a substantial step towards solving the disarmament problem.

71. The thorny but vital question of controls, so well defined in the statement of principles, nevertheless impels us to associate ourselves with the reservations put forward by Mr. Stevenson and reiterated in his letter of 20 September. The latest happenings with regard to the nuclear test talks as well as the previous experience concerning the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament, considered in the light of Soviet statements on control, justify this caution. At the same time, the Italian delegation cannot but restate its conviction that any proposed agreement for the suspension of nuclear tests or for the reduction of armaments and armed forces would be meaningless in the absence of suitable guarantees.

72. The Italian delegation hopes that the present inconsistency between the readiness to sign a joint statement on the principles of disarmament and the Soviet Government's decision to resume nuclear tests will soon be overcome. It would not be hard to quote entire pages from speeches made three years earlier by Soviet statesmen and diplomats in the United Nations and elsewhere prompting separate negotiations on the cessation of nuclear tests as a necessary precondition for disarmament, and roundly condemning any Power that would dare to be the first to break the moratorium. But I shall refrain from doing so and shall simply recall here that it was the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union who made a solemn appeal to the conscience of the entire world when he stated: "If in the present circumstances a State should resume nuclear testing, the consequences of this action would be hard to foresee", and he added that it would "assume a heavy burden of responsibility in the eyes of the peoples of the world".

73. On 4 November 1958, in this very Hall, we unanimously approved a resolution [1252 (XIII)] endorsing those principles. Would we be prepared to repudiate them today? Such an attitude would fail to reflect the deep-seated conviction of our peoples. Nothing has changed, technically speaking, since the day on which we took that unanimous decision.

74. We cannot fail to face two unpleasant facts which, alas, do not seem to aim at promoting the climate which is essential for a constructive resumption of negotiations on disarmament and international security. The first of these facts is the torpedoing of the negotiations which, in the space of three years, had almost resolved the difficult task of preparing a draft treaty. The second is the unilateral violation of the moratorium on nuclear tests, accompanied by the proclaimed intention of endowing the arsenals of the communist world with 100-megaton atomic warheads. But what most alarms and even terrifies people are the reasons which the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union has given for his decisions. He has stated plainly and explicitly that "the resumption of nuclear tests is in the interests of the Soviet Union". I confess that it is hard for me—and perhaps not only for me—to regard this as a contribution to disarmament rather than as a new and powerful incentive to the armaments race.

75. My country, however, notwithstanding this bitter and frightening situation, considers that every effort should be made to leave the door open for an agreement. At Geneva we took part in the disarmament discussions and concurred in the efforts towards a true agreement. We even tried to curb our impatience and that of others and to spur ourselves and our friends on to persevere in the undertaking, however arduous

it might appear. And it is in that same spirit that we now lend our support to the plan laid down by President Kennedy. This plan, in form and in substance, seems to us, within the framework and in accordance with the principles of the United Nations, to provide a basis for negotiations which, by paving the way for disarmament through security, could usefully contribute to the establishment of a new and better world order.

76. Allow me to make a few comments on economic problems which, in my view, are no less important than the political ones for the survival of mankind.

77. The United Nations is the largest body in which countries with different patterns of production and different levels of economic development can air their problems and exchange opinions with a view to taking common action to promote economic growth and social progress throughout the world. The need for a balanced expansion both of production and trade has gradually emerged in recent times as the key to the development of all countries irrespective of their stage of economic level. This need did not fail to obtain a response in the United Nations.

78. Italy has already made a substantial contribution toward the goal of economic interdependence and general co-operation and is now taking an active part in the many activities that the United Nations is carrying out in all spheres of economic and social development—be it the expansion of trade and increased financial assistance or intensified efforts in the field of pre-investments or the utilization of human resources. To that end, Italy has also substantially increased its contribution to the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. Italy's over-all economic effort, up to the end of 1960, had already reached the figure of \$930 million.

79. The last session of the Economic and Social Council showed the growing importance of social and economic factors; and the declaration adopted at Belgrade at the conclusion of the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, concerning the strengthening and development of our Organization, reflects the belief of those countries that it is these very economic and social activities of the United Nations which had and will have the greatest impact on the civil progress of the less developed nations. We feel that the United Nations would do well to explore further the opportunities for expanding co-operation especially in those regions where appropriate action and methods of consultation could promote a greater flow and better use of economic and social assistance. My Government is fully aware of the magnitude of the problem and of its moral and political scope. We therefore propose to increase our efforts in order to assist those countries which are now in the process of development. Of course, we can do so within the limits of our economic possibilities and of our basic commitment to develop the depressed areas of Southern Italy. We also hope that every effort will be made by all of us here to expand and intensify this Organization's economic and social activities. The primary task of the Organization is to discourage, impede and halt any threat to world peace; but this task is closely linked with economic and social action to combat poverty and improve the living conditions of mankind.

80. In concluding my remarks, I should like solemnly to reaffirm the complete and unreserved support of the Italian Government for the principles underlying the United Nations and our firm determination to contribute to their defence and implementation. In

bequeathing them to us, the founders of this Organization have bequeathed us a priceless legacy. Once again, as far back as 1945, when it was first established, and later at the time of the Korean crisis, the Suez crisis and the Congo crisis, the world looked to the United Nations as to the only pillar of peace. It is in this building that the hopes of troubled mankind, aghast at the spectre of a new war, are centred. The world knows, to echo the words of President Kennedy that "Mankind must put an end to war, or war will put an end to mankind" [1013th meeting, para. 40]. It knows that this is still the only *urbs pacis*, the only real citadel of peace on earth. The very fact that in times of greatest international tension, when the fate of the world seems to hang on a slender thread, all mankind looks to the United Nations as its last sheet anchor, shows that this Organization really possesses great moral strength.

81. I am sure, Mr. President, that the sixteenth session of the General Assembly will measure up to the challenge of the times and will, under your able guidance, stand the test and jealously guard its great heritage of ideals so as to hand it down intact, and perhaps even enriched, to further generations. One thing is certain: the future of the United Nations is in our hands and depends solely on us. For its part the Italian delegation pledges all its endeavours to safeguard it.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda (continued)*

FIRST REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/4882) [concluded]

82. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I invite the Assembly to consider the allocation of the items already approved for inclusion in the agenda. Will representatives please refer to the recommendations contained in section II (starting at paragraph 13) of the first report of the General Committee [A/4882].

83. The Assembly will no doubt wish to take into consideration in due course paragraphs 14 to 16 of this document, especially the order and the allocation of the items mentioned.

84. With regard to paragraph 16, the General Committee, at its 139th meeting, recommended that for consideration of chapter V, paragraphs 424-432, of the report of the Economic and Social Council, account should automatically be taken of the General Assembly's final decision as to the allocation of item 87, "Permanent sovereignty over natural resources". The Assembly will therefore examine that recommendation [A/4895] when it comes to the allocation of items to the Sixth Committee.

85. I draw the attention of the members of the Assembly to an amendment submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/L.352] regarding the allocation of the item entitled "Question of disarmament".

86. I propose that the Assembly should proceed with the allocation of items on the basis of the General Committee's recommendations, as they appear in paragraph 19, for the reference of items to the plenary meetings and the various Committees.

87. We shall deal first with the items recommended for discussion in plenary meetings, and then with the items recommended for the First Committee (at which time we shall consider the USSR amendment suggesting that the disarmament item should be discussed in plenary meeting). We shall continue, thus, in the same order, on the basis of the General Committee's recommendations.

88. Are there any comments on the twenty-five items which the General Committee proposes to refer to plenary meetings? I would remind you that items 1 to 9 have already been considered by the Assembly in plenary meeting, so we are dealing with items 10 to 25.

89. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation deems it necessary to repeat its statement, made during the discussion of this question in the General Committee, that it is opposed to any discussion of items 19 and 23, namely the question of Tibet and the question of Hungary; that it is opposed to any discussion of these questions in the General Assembly as a whole, and, of course, to any discussion of them in plenary meeting.

90. As for item 24—the question of the representation of China—the Soviet delegation has also, as is well known, expressed its objections to the item's wording.

91. I request that this view of the Soviet delegation be clearly reproduced in the records of this meeting.

92. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The statement made by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be included in the record.

93. Does anyone else wish to speak on the allocation of items 10 to 25 to the plenary meetings?

94. In the absence of comment, I take it that the General Assembly approves the General Committee's recommendation that items 10 to 25 should be referred to plenary meetings.

It was so decided.

95. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now ask the Assembly to take a decision with regard to the eight items which the General Committee, in its report, recommends should be referred to the First Committee. The first item is entitled "Question of disarmament", and I wish to recall that the Soviet Union has submitted an amendment [A/L.352] under which the item would be considered directly in plenary meeting.

96. In accordance with rule 92 of the rules of procedure, I shall, following discussion, first put to the vote the amendment of the Soviet Union.

97. Mr. RAPACKI (Poland) (translated from French): The motives which have prompted certain States represented in the General Committee to force the allocation of the question of disarmament to the First Committee, instead of having it considered by the General Assembly in plenary meeting, are neither convincing nor clear to the Polish delegation.

98. There is no more important question than that of general and complete disarmament. Not only is it the decisive question for the future of the world, but it is in fact, today, the key question for the peaceful evolution of the international situation. And, in speaking of the role of the United Nations, and of its authority,

* Resumed from the 1014th meeting.

we should add that its attitude toward the question of general and complete disarmament and its contribution to that cause are decisive criteria.

99. Why, then, should the General Assembly shirk consideration in plenary meeting this most important issue? Procedural reasons have been invoked. Since this is so, let us trace the procedural path followed during the past year by the question of general and complete disarmament.

100. At the fifteenth session, the question of disarmament was referred to the First Committee, which was to draw up appropriate recommendations for submission to the General Assembly in plenary meeting. I shall not say that the work done last year by the First Committee on the question of disarmament was useless. But the apprehensions of the Polish delegation, expressed a year ago from this same rostrum during the discussion of the same item, have been confirmed. The First Committee was unable to submit any draft principles for general and complete disarmament to the General Assembly, and it referred the task to the Soviet Union and the United States.

101. We know that, at the beginning of this session, the United States and the Soviet Union did, in fact, reach agreement on the directives to be given the body which will have to prepare a treaty on general and complete disarmament. I think we can all welcome this step forward and recognize that the main task confronting the First Committee at the fifteenth session, the submission of draft principles for general and complete disarmament to the General Assembly has in fact just been accomplished.

102. Now the General Assembly in plenary meeting must express its view. It alone can consider with proper authority the principles and directives formulated in the Soviet-American document entitled "Joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations" [A/4879]. It alone can complete or correct them. It alone can assure that they are interpreted in a uniform manner, confirm them, and see to it that they are binding upon all the organs of the United Nations which will have to follow up the work.

103. Obviously, the Soviet-American agreement has not eliminated all differences of opinion on the principles of general and complete disarmament; some of these differences are substantive ones. But it is essentially in plenary meeting that they should be discussed. These are basic questions and are not appropriate for supposedly more detailed and more practical debate in the Political Committee.

104. To refer the item again to the First Committee and then from it to plenary meeting would only result in delay, and we have already wasted too much time. The experience of recent years and of the past few months clearly shows the cost of such procrastination.

105. If we had already achieved any real progress towards general and complete disarmament, the world situation would already be very different. There would already be some real basis for slowing down the armaments race, and many difficult problems would not have arisen with such urgency and acuteness. We might have been able to avoid certain measures which have proved inevitable.

106. Thus, experience shows that the question of general and complete disarmament is not the only most important item, but also the most urgent one.

No one claims that all the difficulties in the way of general and complete disarmament can be eliminated within a brief period of time, but it is possible and in fact necessary at least to complete the stage of discussions on the principles and then refer the matter to whatever body is called upon to prepare the implementation of the General Assembly's directives. Only the General Assembly in plenary meeting can do this definitively, and it should do so as soon as possible by starting debate on the question of general and complete disarmament immediately after the general debate.

107. This opinion of the Polish delegation is reflected in the Soviet Union's amendment [A/L.352] to the General Committee's proposal. We shall vote in favour of that amendment, and we appeal to the other delegations to reconsider their position in the light of the present discussion.

108. Mr. LUKANOV (People's Republic of Bulgaria) (translated from Russian): Permit me, Mr. President, on being given the floor by you for the first time, to congratulate you on your election to the vitally important office of President of the sixteenth session.

109. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria supports the amendment [A/L.352] introduced by the delegation of the Soviet Union, and urges that the question of general and complete disarmament be discussed, at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, in plenary meeting.

110. It is natural for the most important and urgent questions to be discussed by the General Assembly in plenary meeting. There is no doubt that general and complete disarmament, which is on the agenda of the sixteenth session, is one such question. There can be no two opinions about that. The importance of this question and the urgency of considering it are not denied even by those delegations which urge its consideration in a subsidiary organ, but not in plenary meetings, of the General Assembly. The United Nations is already losing prestige in the eyes of the peoples owing to the fact of its plenary meetings dealing with "questions" like those of Hungary and Tibet—thought up by the narrow-minded policy of certain Powers—while the question of questions, that of disarmament, is referred to an organ established not by the Charter but by the Organization's rules of procedure. It is just such actions by the Western Powers, and nothing else, that undermine confidence in the Organization.

111. The international situation, now more than ever before, requires that the disarmament question be considered not merely as a matter of urgency but with the maximum degree of publicity, so that all peoples of the world may learn the positions adopted by the individual delegations on this question which is so decisive for the fate of the world.

112. Since certain delegations have advanced procedural arguments in favour of referring the question to the First Committee, I take the liberty of recalling that annex II (paragraph 23) to General Assembly resolution 362 (IV) of 22 October 1949 contains the following statement on the significance of the discussion of questions in plenary meetings:

"The consideration of questions in plenary meetings would have the benefit of the attendance of leaders of delegations and of greater solemnity and publicity."

And it is subsequently stated in the annex that:

"The Special Committee is of the opinion that this procedure would be especially appropriate for certain questions the essential aspects of which are already familiar to Members, such as items which have been considered by the General Assembly at previous sessions . . ."

113. The question of disarmament has been on the agenda of the General Assembly since its very first session. The decisive significance of this question for world peace and the security of peoples has long, and especially in recent years, made it the centre of public attention throughout the world. There can thus be no doubt that its "essential aspects" are well enough known to all delegations. Consequently, not only is there no procedural objection to the consideration of the question of general and complete disarmament in plenary meeting, but, on the contrary, there are procedural reasons for considering this question in circumstances of substantial publicity. A major question should be considered at the plenary meetings of a major organ of the United Nations.

114. This time, too, considerations of a "practical" nature are being advanced. But, as already emphasized, we are not talking about working out the concrete treaty for general and complete disarmament. Even if the First Committee discussed the question of general and complete disarmament, it would still not be charged with the detailed drafting of such a treaty. We are talking about the formulation of general principles which are to serve as a basis for the future treaty on general and complete disarmament, and which should be taken into account by any organ concerned with the problem of general and complete disarmament. It is precisely the plenary meeting that should issue its directives to all other organs of the General Assembly.

115. Two great Powers, the USSR and the United States of America, have presented to the present session of the General Assembly the principles, agreed upon between them, for general and complete disarmament [A/4879]. The General Assembly will have to pronounce on these principles, adopt them, and thus make them its own. It can do this most authoritatively, and most rapidly, in plenary meeting.

116. The position of the United States delegation seems, indeed, more than strange. On the one hand, it considers general and complete disarmament to be the most burning question of the day, and puts its signature side by side with that of the USSR delegation under a set of what we regard as entirely correct principles on this question. On the other hand, however, it undervalues the consideration of this question and proposes that it should be considered in a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly. In view of the tactics of the United States, designed to drag through all the organs of the United Nations the examination of any question in the field of disarmament and to place obstacles in the way of any practical solution of these questions, the present position of the United States delegation as to where and when the question of general and complete disarmament is to be discussed at this session can be interpreted only as a desire to postpone discussion of the question of general and complete disarmament, as an attempt to avoid acceptance of the clearer and more specific obligations flowing from the statement, signed by both the USSR and the United States, on the basic principles of general and complete disarmament.

117. Involuntarily, a doubt arises. Is the position of the United States delegation connected with the disarmament plan [A/4891] submitted by its Government to this session of the General Assembly? From this rostrum, in plenary session, the United States disarmament plan is introduced to the world and praised to the skies; accusations are hurled against others, who are said to interfere with the attaining of agreement on disarmament; while actual consideration of the plan and its organic defects is, apparently, to go forward in the relative quiet of the First Committee.

118. We all know that the path to agreement on general and complete disarmament is still beset by a number of difficulties. As we also know, there are influential people and groups that oppose disarmament and have not yet lost hope that all disarmament talks will break down. They enter upon such negotiations only to the extent that public opinion compels them to do so. This is yet another reason why the question of general and complete disarmament should be discussed openly, before all peoples and with the participation of the most responsible plenipotentiary representatives of the Members States.

119. There must be resolute condemnation for any depreciating of the role of plenary meetings. Such depreciation is implicit in the demand that so serious a problem as general and complete disarmament be considered not in plenary meeting but in the First Committee. The view of certain delegations appears to be that the First Committee is the place where actual business is done and that plenary meetings of the United Nations are not concerned with specific matters. Where an important question of general interest is at issue, let us not be afraid of the word "propaganda". Propaganda for general and complete disarmament is a noble task, worthy of any international organization. In the present case, however, the point is not propaganda, nor even ideas that are in themselves good. We consider that all the Governments represented in the General Assembly can, by taking a clear-cut position in plenary meeting, bar the way to manoeuvres, dodges, formalistic chicanery and other methods of sabotage whereby the great Powers of the West have, so far, blocked any practical solution of the disarmament question.

120. It is high time to bring the problem of general and complete disarmament out of the impasse. For this purpose the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations issued by the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States of America serves as a good, concrete basis. At the beginning of the Joint Statement, the two great Powers reaffirm their adherence to all the provisions of resolution 1378 (XIV) adopted by the General Assembly, 20 November 1959 and expressing the view that "the question of general and complete disarmament is the most important one facing the world today", and state that the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States of America recommend the principles contained in their Joint Statement "as the basis for future multilateral negotiations on disarmament"; they call upon other States to co-operate in reaching early agreement on general and complete disarmament in accordance with those principles.

121. These principles should be discussed and adopted very soon, and in the most responsible manner. For this purpose, the most fitting forum is a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

122. In view of all these considerations, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria objects to the recommendation of the General Committee and supports the proposal that the question of general and complete disarmament should be discussed in plenary meeting.

123. At the same time, the Bulgarian delegation considers that the most correct course would be for all questions forming part of the disarmament problem to be discussed together. This would be, not merely entirely logical, but eminently useful for our work. It is more than obvious that the isolation of any question like, for instance, that of the discontinuance of nuclear weapons testing, or its separate discussion, would be irrational, since in present conditions such questions can be successfully considered only in the context of the problem of general and complete disarmament.

124. Mr. DAVID (Czechoslovak Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): The proposal that the General Assembly should consider the question of disarmament in plenary meeting is far from procedural. We are dealing with a matter of great political significance, which is determined by the importance of the disarmament question itself and the attention with which the peoples of the whole world are following its discussion at the General Assembly's sixteenth session.

125. What we have to do is to create the most favourable conditions for the achievement of definite progress on this question. There are serious political and practical grounds for considering the question in plenary meeting.

126. The rightness and the usefulness of discussing the most important political problems at plenary meetings of the General Assembly were fully confirmed when the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples was being considered at the General Assembly's fifteenth session [1514 (XV)]. There is no doubt that this discussion did much to underline the political importance of the Declaration as adopted, and with it the pressing necessity of arriving at an immediate and radical solution of the question of colonialism.

127. It will not be the General Assembly's task to enter, with regard to disarmament, into a detailed discussion of technical questions, which fall to be dealt with in committee work. The General Assembly must, first of all, discuss and approve a directive for the consideration of such details in a smaller disarmament body, and help to set up such a body.

128. In our opinion, the Soviet-United States Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations [A/4879] of 20 September 1961 might serve as a useful basis for such a directive.

129. Thus it would seem entirely natural that the General Assembly, as the most important forum of the United Nations, should discuss and unanimously approve the Agreed Principles and so demonstrate its genuine concern that progress should be made with consideration of the disarmament question, which constitutes the crucial problem of our day.

130. The arguments advanced by those who oppose discussion of disarmament at plenary meetings of the General Assembly are unconvincing. It is clear that their negative attitude does not spring from a desire to bring about the most propitious circumstances

for a serious consideration of this question at the sixteenth session, as its far-reaching significance demands.

131. We find this particularly surprising since the majority of delegations rightly regard disarmament as the most urgent problem of the day.

132. The Czechoslovak delegation repudiates such an approach and fully supports the amendment submitted by the USSR [A/L.352], in which it is proposed that the question of disarmament be considered at plenary meetings of the sixteenth session, immediately after the general debate.

133. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The General Assembly has before it the report of the General Committee [A/4882] on the allocation of items and organization of the session. The Soviet delegation considers that the question of general and complete disarmament should be discussed in the highest forum of the United Nations; and we have submitted a formal amendment [A/L.352] to the report of the General Committee, to the effect that the disarmament problem should be referred for examination not to the First Committee, but to the General Assembly in plenary meeting.

134. Two years ago in this Hall—on 20 November 1959—we unanimously adopted a resolution [1378 (XIV)] in which the General Assembly recognized that the question of general and complete disarmament was the most important one facing the world today and called upon Governments to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem. By this decision alone we are bound to give the highest priority to the disarmament question, to do everything in our power to ensure it is not thrust into the background but occupies, from the outset, a central place in the work of this session.

135. Everyone will agree that the problem of disarmament, so far from losing its importance since 1959, has become an even more burning and urgent issue. Although two years have passed since the General Assembly adopted that resolution, we are no nearer to a practical solution of this problem than we were then, despite persistent efforts by the Soviet Union and other peace-loving States. Indeed, we have recently witnessed a sharp intensification of the arms race and of military preparations by several members of the NATO military bloc, and above all by the United States of America.

136. In this heated atmosphere of warlike speculation, militarist and "revanchard" forces are once again rearing their heads in Western Germany, reckoning on a new war in order to take their revenge and doing everything possible to bring about a clash between the great Powers. In face of the feverish military preparations engaged in by the United States and several other NATO members, the Soviet Union has been obliged to take steps for the strengthening of its security and the security of its friends. But the Soviet Government is consistently striving for peace, and to this end is a resolute advocate of general and complete disarmament.

137. To remove forever the Damoclean sword of nuclear war which is hanging over the peoples' heads, there is only one course—general and complete disarmament. We cannot procrastinate any longer, referring the question from Committee to Committee and putting off a solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament. As matters now stand,

every day that passes without a solution of the disarmament problem means new mountains of weapons, new atomic and hydrogen bombs, new rockets; and all this, as must be obvious to everyone, still further complicates the situation and intensifies the danger of war.

138. The General Committee's recommendation that the question of disarmament should be referred to the First Committee is—if we are to speak frankly, with no diplomatic euphemism—in fact a recommendation that the discussion of the problem of general and complete disarmament be protracted and its solution delayed, a recommendation that the stature of the problem be reduced. The question of general and complete disarmament is not just an agenda item, concerning one or other delegation or even a group of delegations. It concerns all peoples, all States, every human being on earth. It is the major, the fundamental question—that of war and peace—affecting the life and death of the peoples. How in such circumstances is it possible to play procedural games, referring the question of disarmament to one of the Committees? To whose advantage is that? At all events, it is in our opinion of no advantage to anyone who wants this session to succeed, to be a real turning-point in the search for a solution of the disarmament problem.

139. The interests of peace and security, the interests of the well-being of the peoples, demand that the problem of disarmament be discussed in the highest and the most authoritative forum of the United Nations—at plenary meetings of the General Assembly. On the eve of the opening of the Assembly's sixteenth session, the Soviet Union and the United States of America succeeded, as a result of bilateral talks, in agreeing on the principles which should govern general and complete disarmament [A/4679]. Agreed joint documents on such principles have been submitted to the General Assembly. Thus we have a point of departure for the urgent work of preparing a treaty on general and complete disarmament. In these new circumstances, there is all the less justification for attempts to create new delays in the solution of this question. It is the General Assembly's duty to take advantage of this opportunity which has presented itself, and to initiate a businesslike and detailed discussion of general and complete disarmament, with the broadest and most active possible participation of all Members of the United Nations, at its plenary meetings immediately after the general debate.

140. The General Assembly should examine the joint proposals of the USSR and the United States, listen carefully to the opinions of other Members who urge the speediest possible conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament, and take a decision which will begin the translation into reality of the peoples' age-old demand for a world without weapons and without war.

141. The Soviet delegation calls upon Members of the United Nations to support its amendment, to the report of the General Committee, proposing that the question of disarmament be considered at plenary meetings of the General Assembly.

142. The General Assembly must not shirk its duty; it must weigh the responsibility resting upon it, approach the question with all seriousness, and decide, not to refer the question of general and complete disarmament to some Committee, but to consider it at its plenary meetings.

Mr. Padilla Nervo (Mexico), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

143. Mr. YOST (United States of America): My delegation is somewhat surprised to hear the Assembly confronted by this barrage of speeches from our communist colleagues, proposing that the question of disarmament be discussed only in the plenary session and that the normal detailed examination of the problem in the First Committee be altogether omitted. The same proposal was made by the Soviet delegation in the General Committee and was thoroughly discussed there [138th meeting]. The Committee decided by a majority of 12 to 3, with 4 abstentions to maintain without change the recommendation contained in the Secretary-General's memorandum that this item be discussed in the first instance in the First Committee.

144. The reasons are simple and clear. Of course, we all agree that the question of disarmament is a matter of vital importance. The address made by the President of the United States last Monday morning [1013th meeting] clearly reveals my country's profound feelings on this score.

145. It does not in any way detract from the importance of an agenda item if the General Assembly asks that it be discussed first in the appropriate Committee. On the contrary, in asking for the normal consideration of this item in the forum where it has always been taken up previously, we are in fact recognizing that the question of disarmament is important and that it is also complex and difficult. In fact, rule 101 of the rules of procedure specifically describes the First Committee as the Committee charged with the regulation of armaments.

146. We must not be confused. What is of overriding importance for all men everywhere is not slogans on disarmament, not speeches on disarmament, but the actual beginning of negotiations for reductions of national armaments and armed forces under proper safeguards, as a means of approaching the goal of general and complete disarmament. The problem before the Assembly is how best to move towards actual arms reduction. The United States and the Soviet Union have, fortunately, agreed on a statement of principles [A/4879]. However, that is only the beginning—a good beginning, but one which is not binding on other Members of the United Nations.

147. The question is: What shall the General Assembly do about principles of disarmament? What attitude should the Assembly take towards disarmament? What can the Assembly best do to ensure that disarmament negotiations are started again in conditions best calculated to result in useful agreement? These are questions that require careful and thorough consideration. They will be more likely to receive such consideration in the workmanlike atmosphere of the First Committee, a body which customarily deals with such matters, than in plenary meetings of the Assembly. There we can best examine, in the first instance, principles and plans and the utility of the various types of forums in which disarmament negotiations could be carried forward. The documentation before us is extensive. It covers both general principles on which the Soviet and United States Governments have reached agreement and specific measures such as those outlined in the United States plan presented to this Assembly [A/4891]. Other delegations will no doubt have proposals of their own which they will

wish to present and to have examined with care and attention.

148. These are matters which demand thorough study. They demand the kind of serious scrutiny which they can best receive from the representatives to this Assembly seated in the First Committee. When the Committee has completed its consideration of the subject and has issued its report, recommending the adoption of one or more draft resolutions, the time will come for discussion in plenary meetings. That discussion will be infinitely more meaningful if it is based on the work of the First Committee.

149. Accordingly, I urge that the General Assembly support the recommendation of the General Committee that the question of disarmament should be referred to the First Committee for consideration.

Mr. Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.

150. Mr. SHTYLLA (Albania) (translated from French): The delegation of the people's Republic of Albania, considering the problem of disarmament to be the most important and urgent problem of our age, fully agrees with the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and supports that country's proposal [A/L.352] that the question should be considered directly in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly immediately after the general debate.

151. The Albanian delegation considers this proposal fully justified by the importance of the problem of disarmament and by the very serious nature of the present international situation. No one can deny that the situation is becoming every day more grave, or that one of its most striking aspects is the arms race. In response to the proposals and peaceful moves made by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in order to strengthen peace and to improve the international situation—such as the proposal to conclude a peace treaty with Germany this year—the Western Powers, and particularly the United States of America, have only accelerated the arms race and taken important military measures leading to war.

152. According to the Charter of the United Nations, the General Assembly may discuss any question within the scope of the Charter, and in particular any question relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. There is therefore no procedural or practical reason why the question of disarmament should not be discussed directly in plenary meetings. On the contrary, our delegation believes that consideration of this problem by the General Assembly will demonstrate the importance which the United Nations attaches to this problem and will contribute to a more rapid adoption of appropriate measures, with a view to the conclusion and implementation of an agreement on general and complete disarmament.

153. The United States delegation is at great pains to force the General Assembly itself to consider non-existent and provocative issues such as the question of Tibet and the question of Hungary, questions which do not exist, but which serve the cold war policy of the United States. However, when there is any question of considering problems of vital importance, such as disarmament, it tries to prevent them from being considered directly in plenary meetings.

154. I do not think this is a simple question of procedure, or a procedural quibble: it concerns the

fundamental attitude of the United States delegation with regard to this problem.

155. We believe that consideration of the question of disarmament, which has been delayed for several years, can no longer be postponed. In spite of the sustained efforts of the Soviet Union, and because of the basically negative attitude of the NATO Powers, no solution to this problem has yet been found. We believe—and I think our view is shared by all delegations which are truly concerned for the maintenance of peace—that the solution of this problem is a matter of urgency and of deep concern to all peoples of the world. The amendment to the first report of the General Committee which has been proposed by the delegation of the Soviet Union [A/L.352], best meets the present need.

156. We therefore reaffirm our support for the Soviet proposal and appeal to the General Assembly to adopt it, rather than the recommendation of the General Committee, and to decide that the question of disarmament will be considered directly in plenary meeting immediately after the general debate.

157. Mr. MANESCU (Romania) (translated from French): First, Mr. President, may I congratulate you on your election to the high office of President of the sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

158. The most important problem now facing mankind—the key problem, on which international peace and security chiefly depend—is general and complete disarmament. Only the settlement of this problem will decide, ultimately, whether mankind is to undergo the infinite sufferings of a nuclear war or to be spared. The achievement of general and complete disarmament could eliminate all means of making war, abolish the military machines and war potential of all States and end the arms race forever. By depriving aggressors of the material means of making war, general and complete disarmament would abolish war between States and ensure lasting peace on our planet. At the same time, the immense resources released by disarmament could be used to promote the industrialization of the developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, to modernize their agriculture, to improve the living conditions of their peoples, to develop education and to improve public health.

159. General and complete disarmament, which was unanimously approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 1378 (XIV) of 20 November 1959, has become an imperative necessity and an urgent task which must be fulfilled.

160. As you will recall, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, desiring a comprehensive debate on the problem of general and complete disarmament and the adoption of appropriate measures by the General Assembly, proposed at the fifteenth session that this question should be discussed in plenary meeting. The delegations of the Western Powers, particularly the United States delegation, opposed this and insisted that the item should be referred to the First Committee which they considered to be the body best qualified to give serious and detailed consideration to the matter.

161. As experience has shown, and as a result of the negative attitude of the Government of the United States of America and of other Western countries, the debate in the First Committee did not bring a solution of the problem of disarmament any closer.

Although several constructive proposals were laid before the Committee, obstruction by the United States of America and its allies prevented any agreement on guiding principles or with regard to organs in which negotiations on the question of general and complete disarmament should be resumed. Moreover the United States of America and its NATO allies have accelerated the arms race by increasing their military budgets, which have now reached record figures. They have increased the size of their armed forces and have intensified the rearmament of the revenge-seekers of West Germany, making that country the main force for the preparation and unleashing of a new war.

162. The military expenditure of the United States now amounts to over \$50,000 million. This is the first time in history that a State has spent such large sums in peace-time for military purposes.

163. All peoples of the world are disturbed by this dangerous development in the international situation, and everywhere they are raising their voices in firm demands for an end to the arms race and the effective achievement of general and complete disarmament.

164. However, we note that the representatives of the United States and of its military allies wish once more to prevent consideration of the problem of general and complete disarmament in the most representative forum of the United Nations—the plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

165. Speaking in favour of referring the problem to the First Committee, these representatives resort to the arguments which were used a year ago, and which were shown to be invalid. The question of the forum in which the question of general and complete disarmament should be discussed is not a question of mere form, of a technical and procedural nature; it is a question of substance with wide political implications. The Government of the Romanian People's Republic considers that the General Assembly is the most appropriate forum in which to organize in co-operation with all States, the means of achieving our common aim which is general and complete disarmament.

166. Reference of the problem of general and complete disarmament to the plenary meetings of the General Assembly would demonstrate the interest and the high sense of responsibility with which the United Nations approaches this important question.

167. The debate would then take place in the highest United Nations organ and this might help to create the necessary conditions for a resumption of negotiations on disarmament.

168. In the opinion of the Romanian delegation, the Soviet-American agreement on principles for general and complete disarmament is an acceptable basis for the resumption of these negotiations by all States.

169. The Romanian delegation desires to contribute to a positive solution of the problem of disarmament, and therefore favours discussion of this question in plenary meetings of the General Assembly. We are convinced that this will facilitate the adoption by the General Assembly of an appropriate resolution on directives for disarmament negotiations, and will also help to solve the problem of deciding in what body these negotiations should be held, in accordance with the interests of all parties.

170. Miss BROOKS (Liberia): Allow me, Mr. President, to extend my personal congratulations on your election as President of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly.

171. The Soviet amendment [A/L.352] contains two points. One is the question of allocation and the second is the question of priority, even though the question of priority is not fully stated in the proposal.

172. On the question of allocation, my delegation in the General Committee took the position that, if the Powers could not agree on the forum in which the question could be discussed that would mean very little hope for a result as to the substance of the matter, and therefore, my delegation would abstain.

173. The question of priority arises in connexion with items 4 and 5 of the list of items which the General Committee recommended, in its first report [A/4882], for allocation to the First Committee—"The urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international control" and "Continuation of suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and obligations of States to refrain from their renewal". It cannot be denied that there is urgent need to discuss the question of disarmament and reach a decision on the solution thereof. It is also true that the hopes of the peoples of the world have been shattered, as we are aware when we think of the discussions here in the General Assembly and at the disarmament conferences in Geneva.

174. While the nuclear Powers are trying to determine the course which they should take in order to arrive at a solution of the disarmament question, my delegation feels that there is an immediate need for a continuation of the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests. The air has been polluted, and it seems that, if some immediate step is not taken for the cessation of these tests, perhaps man will not be fit to exist on the day when a solution of the disarmament question is reached.

175. My delegation will therefore abstain on this question.

176. Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): I apologize for delaying the vote, and I will do so for only one minute, but I would not wish the silence of my delegation to be interpreted as meaning that we are indifferent to this question. Those who followed the debates on this subject at the Assembly last year and in the General Committee last week will, of course, be familiar with the United Kingdom's point of view. It is that by far the best procedure is to discuss so significant and so complex a subject in the First Committee before bringing it to plenary. The representative of the Soviet Union, in bringing forward his draft resolution, described this as an important and urgent problem the solution of which brooks no delay. I would assure him and other representatives who have spoken that, of course, we fully endorse that view, as, I am sure, does every delegation here. But where we differ with the delegation of the Soviet Union and its friends is in their conclusion that these considerations argue for direct discussion of this item in plenary meetings of this Assembly. It is the view of my delegation that this is a matter which is far better conducted, in the first instance, in the First Committee.

177. We have, of course, welcomed most warmly the agreement that was reached last week between the United States and the Soviet Union on the statement

of principles in connexion with negotiation of a disarmament agreement. We are hopeful that this will expedite consideration of disarmament in this Assembly and will help to get serious negotiations going again in the near future. We feel that this should provide the right atmosphere for those negotiations to continue.

178. I am bound to say, however, that, in listening to some of the speeches this afternoon, I felt that the accusations of bad faith repeatedly made against the West can do nothing but exacerbate feelings and will not help forward the discussions. I believe that when we are accused in that way it serves no good purpose, and I very much regret that those accusations have been made in this field. It would be very easy for me to retaliate in kind. I would only suggest that representatives who are in doubt consider the past history of discussions on disarmament. I take it no further than that, not because I could not—it would be only too easy—but because I do not wish, as I have said, to exacerbate feelings on this subject.

179. It is the conviction of my delegation that, if we really want to see these discussions go forward in the most helpful way, this can best be done in the First Committee. It is for that reason that I hope the Assembly will reject the proposal of the Soviet Union.

180. Sir Muhammad ZAFRULLA KHAN (Pakistan): I beg to be forgiven for my intervention at this late stage of the discussion of this item. But I do wish to say this in support of what has just been stated by the representative of the United Kingdom: it seems to us that the question of disarmament, although extremely important and very urgent, is a complex question which has many facets, and that it can be much more conveniently dealt with in Committee rather than immediately in the plenary. But I also wish to add a word with regard to what has been said by the representative of Liberia. Were it the concern of those who have moved for the item to be taken in plenary to move on quickly with it, and if there were no other consideration behind it, one would have thought that, as ancillary to the question of disarmament, they would at least have proposed that items 4 and 5 also should be taken in plenary, inasmuch as at the moment they have a greater and sharper urgency than the question of disarmament, since the danger from nuclear tests is now present, operative and proceeding. We had intended to make that proposal ourselves. But then, thinking that that kind of proposal might delay matters rather than expedite them, we have intended to move in the First Committee that those items should have priority. We still intend to make that motion when the agenda comes before the Committee and the Committee is engaged in planning its programme.

181. Therefore, the plea that I would wish to make is that the question of disarmament should go to Committee, as recommended by the General Committee, and should not be taken up first in the plenary. But, if it is likely to be taken up in the plenary, I would then formally move that items 4 and 5 should be discussed in plenary also as ancillary to the question of disarmament.

182. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We shall now proceed to vote. In accordance with rule 92 of the rules of procedure, I shall first put to the vote the amendment submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union [A/L.352]. This amendment aims to have the

agenda item entitled "Question of disarmament" considered in plenary meeting.

The amendment was rejected by 53 votes to 11, with 29 abstentions.

183. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now invite the Assembly to vote on the General Committee's recommendation that the question of disarmament should be allocated to the First Committee.

The recommendation of the General Committee was adopted by 65 votes to 9, with 19 abstentions.

184. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now ask the General Assembly to vote on items 2 to 8. The General Committee, in its report, recommends that these items should be allocated to the First Committee. If there is no comment, I shall take it that the Assembly approves the recommendation of the General Committee.

It was so decided.

185. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now turn to the six items which the General Committee has proposed should be allocated to the Special Political Committee. If there are no objections, I shall take it that the General Committee's recommendation is adopted.

It was so decided.

186. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The General Committee lists in its report nine items which it proposes should be allocated to the Second Committee. If there is no comment, I shall take it that the Assembly approves the General Committee's recommendation.

It was so decided.

187. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We now come to the ten items which the General Committee recommends for allocation to the Third Committee. If there is no comment, I shall take it that the Assembly approves the General Committee's recommendation.

It was so decided.

188. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The General Committee lists in its report fifteen items which it recommends should be allocated to the Fourth Committee. If there is no comment, I shall take it that the Assembly approves the recommendation of the General Committee.

It was so decided.

189. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The General Committee lists nineteen items which it recommends should be allocated to the Fifth Committee. If there is no comment, I shall take it that the Assembly approves the recommendation of the General Committee.

It was so decided.

190. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now invite the Assembly to vote on the five items which the General Committee recommends should be referred to the Sixth Committee.

191. Mr. QUAISON-SACKEY (Ghana): I am very chary of speaking at this late hour as in fact I would have wished that we might have admitted the delegation of Sierra Leone, especially as the Prime Minister himself is here. I have taken the floor to propose to the Assembly that item 5, "Permanent sovereignty over natural resources", recommended for allocation

to the Sixth Committee, should be allocated to the Second Committee. I make this contention on the grounds that the question of sovereignty over natural resources deals in fact with economic self-determination, the manner in which States wish to dispose of their resources, the manner in which States want to draw up their economic programmes and so on.

192. We agree that the item is tinged with legal aspects and, in fact, with political aspects. But it is our view that if it is discussed in the Second Committee, the emphasis would be laid on economic aspects. If, later on, the Second Committee in its wisdom felt that certain aspects of it should be emphasized, political or otherwise, then they could refer the matter to the appropriate Committee. Thus, I move that the item should be referred to the Second Committee.

193. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I would recall that the General Committee, at its 139th meeting, recommended that paragraphs 424 to 432 of chapter V of the report of the Economic and Social Council should be dealt with in the same manner as agenda item 5 which we are now discussing.

194. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I wish to support the motion made by the representative of Ghana to refer the item to the Special Political Committee. It is true that this subject has its legal aspects and that it also has very important economic aspects, but its origin is from the right of self-determination of peoples; and it has come with that subject previously from the Third Committee. It should have the sanction of the Special Political Committee because of its political aspects. Then from that Committee it may go for its legal aspects to the Sixth Committee and for its economic aspects to the Second Committee. But for the time being, it is my delegation's view that the subject should go first to the Special Political Committee.

195. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I would like the representative of Ghana to clarify his proposal.

196. Mr. QUAISON-SACKEY (Ghana): When I spoke I referred specifically to the Second Committee and not to the Special Political Committee. My recollection is that the representative of Cyprus did in fact hold the view in the General Committee that the item should be referred to the Special Political Committee. I am sure that in view of the argument which I put forward here, and knowing full well that he and I should not cross swords on matters like this, he will give us his support on the matter of referring the item to the Second Committee.

197. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I am very sorry for the misunderstanding. In the General Committee the representative of Ghana supported the view and spoke in favour of assigning this item to the Special Political Committee. So when he took the floor I was not taking note of what he was saying because I took it for granted that he would be consistent in his policy. Of course, everyone has the right to change his view in the meanwhile, and I quite appreciate his attitude about the economic aspects. However, I still think the item should go to the Special Political Committee.

198. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): The United States delegation in the General Committee voted in favour of referring this item to the Sixth Committee on account of the many legal problems

that are involved. At the same time we recognized there and we recognize here that the problem of sovereignty over natural resources is essentially an economic-legal matter. It participates in both fields. We are entirely prepared to support the proposal of the representative of Ghana that in the first instance the item be referred to the Second Committee on account of its economic aspects. I venture the suggestion to modify one made by the representative of Cyprus in the General Committee that we might in the first instance refer the item to the Second Committee with reference, however, as necessary, to the Sixth Committee on account of the legal aspects that are involved or, if appropriate, to the joint consideration of the two Committees. I wonder if, by any possibility, the representative of Ghana might be willing to consider that as an addendum to his proposal; in other words, if the Second Committee finds that there are legal considerations involved, that it then refer the matter to the Sixth Committee for joint consideration.

199. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I understand that the delegation of Ghana accepts this compromise proposal.

200. Mr. QUINTERO (Panama) (translated from Spanish): I should like to repeat what I said at the meeting of the General Committee [138th meeting] at which this item was first discussed—namely that although, in my opinion, this item concerning the permanent sovereignty of peoples and nations over their natural wealth and resources is quite within the competence of the Sixth Committee, I do not think there is any objection to the question being dealt with by another Committee also, or to its being allocated to a separate Committee. As was pointed out at that meeting, and as I also stated on that occasion, this problem has both economic aspects of the greatest importance and political implications.

201. In view of the fact that it was proposed and agreed without a vote, at the last meeting of the General Committee [139th meeting], that the allocation of this item should follow the allocation of the report of the Economic and Social Council, chapter V, paragraphs 424 to 432, I feel that it would be best if the two questions were considered together. Consequently, it seems to me entirely correct that the item should go to the Second Committee, without of course, as the United States representative has just said and as was stated by members of the General Committee at the meeting which I have mentioned, such procedure precluding the possibility of the legal aspects, which are also very important, being referred to the Sixth Committee for consideration.

202. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I too should like to make my contribution to the solution of this problem in a conciliatory way.

203. A number of proposals have been put forward. The first was that of Ghana, to the effect that this question should be considered in the Second Committee; thereafter, Cyprus proposed that it should be considered in the Special Political Committee; and finally an amendment was tabled by the United States representative proposing that the question be considered in the Second Committee and if necessary, either jointly or separately, in the Sixth Committee.

204. To all these proposals I would propose a sub-amendment to the effect that the proposals of Cyprus

and Ghana be combined with the addition, if necessary, that the question could also be considered in the Sixth Committee. In other words, we might take up all three proposals and formulate them as follows: item 5, mentioned for consideration by the Sixth Committee, could be examined at a joint meeting of the Special Political Committee and the Second Committee, and could, if necessary, be referred to the Sixth Committee.

205. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): I think I must express the view that we are getting a little complicated here.

206. I would like to say that we support the original proposal of the representative of Ghana. This item should obviously go, we believe, to the Second Committee because it is primarily an economic question. It has, obviously, as we all realize, legal points as well. Naturally, there are political aspects, but we believe strongly that this is an item, which is of such importance, particularly to the under-developed countries, that it should be dealt with in an atmosphere free from political controversy and dealt with in a climate and in a frame of mind designed to reach positive results which will benefit the under-developed countries that are principally interested in the question.

207. We strongly believe that the best atmosphere and climate in which to reach the desired results the under-developed countries are so interested in will be found in the non-partisan atmosphere of the Second Committee, and then referred by it, as necessary, to the Sixth Committee.

208. Mr. COOPER (Liberia): I should like to ask that we adjourn or suspend the decision on this question for the time being and take up the next item inasmuch as there are some ladies present in the delegation from Sierra Leone and I think we should be gallant enough towards these ladies to take up the next question. I am sure that the delegation of Sierra Leone would like to participate in this discussion. I move that we suspend this question until tomorrow and take up now the question of the admission of Sierra Leone.

209. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We have before us a request for adjournment of the item. However, we had almost concluded and we were about to take a vote. Will the representative of Liberia agree to our finishing with the item and taking a vote upon it? I thank him for agreeing to this.

210. May we now proceed to vote on the various proposals submitted in connexion with the allocation of agenda item 87, entitled "Permanent sovereignty over natural resources"? We have before us the following proposals:

The General Committee's proposal that the item should be allocated to the Sixth Committee;

The proposal of Ghana, with an amendment accepted by the sponsor that it should be allocated to the Second Committee;

The proposal of Cyprus that it should be allocated to the Special Political Committee;

The amendment of the Soviet Union, the effect of which would be to have the item discussed initially in a joint meeting of the Special Political Committee and the Second Committee, and then, if necessary, referred to the Sixth Committee.

211. I think it would be simpler to vote first on the Ghanaian proposal that the item should be allocated to the Second Committee.

212. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I think you will remember, Mr. President, the rule of procedure whereby a sub-amendment is voted upon before a proposal or any amendment. There is all the more reason to vote on my sub-amendment first, since it is exclusive in the sense that it combines all the proposals in one.

213. I would therefore ask you to put to the vote in the first place my sub-amendment to the effect that item 5 be discussed by the Special Political Committee and the Second Committee jointly, and, in case of need, referred to the Sixth Committee.

214. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of the Soviet Union asks that a vote should first be taken on his proposal that the item should be discussed jointly by the Second Committee and the Special Political Committee and, if necessary, referred to the Sixth Committee. I put this proposal to the vote.

The sub-amendment proposed orally by the Soviet Union was rejected by 38 votes to 18, with 32 abstentions.

215. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): May we vote on the proposal of Ghana, as amended, under which the item would be allocated to the Second Committee and, if necessary, to the Sixth Committee? I put this proposal to the vote.

The proposal was adopted by 61 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions.

216. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): In the circumstances, need we take a vote on the other proposals?

217. Since no delegation insists that a vote be taken on the other proposals, the General Assembly therefore decides that the agenda item entitled "Permanent sovereignty over natural resources", and chapter V, paragraphs 424 to 432 of the report of the Economic and Social Council will be considered by the Second Committee, and, if necessary, referred to the Sixth Committee.

It was so decided.

218. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): If there are no observations on the other four items which the General Committee recommends should be allocated to the Sixth Committee, I shall take it that the Assembly approves this recommendation of the General Committee.

It was so decided.

SECOND REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/4895)

219. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): With your co-operation, the General Assembly has just completed its consideration of the adoption of the agenda and of the allocation of the agenda items. The main Committees will be informed of the decisions which the Assembly has just taken.

220. With regard to the item entitled "Admission of new Members to the United Nations", I invite Members of the Assembly to consider the second report of the General Committee [A/4895]. Paragraph 1 of this report recommends that the item be included in the agenda and allocated to the plenary meeting. If

there is no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly approves this recommendation.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 92

Admission of new Members to the United Nations

221. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now propose that the Assembly take up the recommendation of the Security Council concerning the application of Sierra Leone for admission to the United Nations [A/4888]. In this connexion, the Assembly has before it a draft resolution [A/L.353 and Add.1-4] submitted by thirty Member States.

222. The Security Council has unanimously recommended the General Assembly to admit Sierra Leone to membership of the United Nations. May I take it that the General Assembly decides by acclamation to admit Sierra Leone to membership of the United Nations?

The draft resolution was adopted by acclamation.

223. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I declare Sierra Leone a Member of the United Nations.

The delegation of Sierra Leone was escorted to its place in the General Assembly hall.

224. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): It is with some pride that I venture on behalf of the entire membership of the Assembly, to regard the arrival among us of the delegation of Sierra Leone as a step forward in the history of our Organization. It is a signal privilege for me to welcome the distinguished delegation of Sierra Leone, which the General Assembly has just admitted to membership of the United Nations. I most sincerely congratulate the Government and people of Sierra Leone on this admission, which was decided upon unanimously by the Members of the General Assembly. I am convinced that this young and noble African State, in joining the great international family, will make a useful contribution to our work for peace and concord, in accordance with the high principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

225. I invite the Prime Minister of Sierra Leone to address the Assembly.

226. Sir Milton MARGAI (Sierra Leone): It is with mixed emotion that, on behalf of the Government and the people of Sierra Leone, I accept with gratitude the honour which has been conferred upon my country on its admission as the one hundredth Member of the United Nations.

227. The circumstances of the death of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, have thrown a cloud of sorrow upon all of us. Although we ourselves did not have the privilege of first-hand experience of the great qualities for which we have heard the late Secretary-General extolled by those who knew him well, yet we in Sierra Leone are among those who saw in his devotion to duty and in his championship of the rights of the smaller nations those qualities which we felt were most needed by a man who was chosen by destiny to direct the fortunes of this great family of nations. We therefore join in expressing sympathy to the family of the late Secretary-General and to his country, both of which nurtured him in preparation for such an invaluable service to the world. We also extend sympathy to the families and countries of all the other

officials of the United Nations who lost their lives in the same tragic accident in a quest for peace.

228. This cloud of sorrow, however, has not completely over-shadowed the joy we feel in joining the United Nations. There is no magic in numbers, but we are particularly pleased that it has been our good fortune to round off the number of Member countries to the first hundred. We are especially happy that this good fortune has been ours during the session when, for the first time in the history of the United Nations, the honour of being President of the General Assembly has been conferred on a native of our continent of Africa, and in a month when, also for the first time, the President of the Security Council is a fellow African, and indeed a neighbour. We therefore join all your many friends, Mr. President, in congratulating you upon your unanimous election to this most exalted office, and wish for you and for all of us during the year of your presidency a full realization of your and our dream that peace will be preserved and that the welfare of all the peoples of the world will be advanced.

229. Next I wish to thank our neighbours, the Republic of Liberia and the Republic of Guinea, for so kindly associating themselves with our colleagues of the British Commonwealth in sponsoring our application before this Assembly. Our thanks are due also to the members of the Security Council who did us the great honour of unanimously adopting a resolution recommending our admission, and to all delegations which, by their votes and by their kind words, have welcomed us to the United Nations. In thanking our Commonwealth friends we wish here publicly to record our gratitude to the Government and people of the United Kingdom who made our transition from a colonial dependency to an equal member of the Commonwealth such an orderly, peaceful and friendly process. When, in future, both within and without the United Nations, we persistently champion the cause of a speedy and final end to every variety of colonial rule everywhere in the world, we wish the fact to be remembered that we do not speak out of bitterness, but out of conviction that the right of self-determination which we ourselves now enjoy is a right which all men everywhere must enjoy. We wish, further, to make it clear that we reserve the right to express ourselves fully and independently on all issues.

230. I do not intend on this occasion to make any pronouncements on the important problems on the agenda of this Assembly. At a later stage my delegation will crave your indulgence, when we ask to participate in the general debate. I shall now publicly record the pledge, which we have already given with our application for membership, to uphold the Charter of the United Nations. I pledge, further, on behalf of my Government and people, that we shall do all in our power, while Sierra Leone is a Member of the United Nations, to deal with all questions brought before the Assembly with an open and impartial mind, and with no predetermined position or alignment. Our yardstick will always be the yardstick of truth. We are a small country—but our size is in no way a measure of the friendship for which we have been noted and which we now offer to every country in the world. Nor is the size of our country a measure of our capacity to bring to the counsels of this great Assembly the results of the long years of training and discipline and experience which enabled us to pioneer, in developing the natural and human resources of other

parts of West Africa which preceded us to independence and to membership of the United Nations.

231. We have no territorial ambitions, and we seek no position of leadership. We ask only that as we respect the sovereign rights of all countries our own sovereignty will be similarly respected. With this assurance we offer our co-operation, first to our neighbours in Africa and then to all other countries in every effort to restore and maintain human dignity everywhere, to establish firm foundations for peace, and to improve the physical, social and spiritual well-being of all mankind.

232. Finally, it is because we had confidence in the aims and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations that we sought membership in it. This confidence, now that we are members, inspires us to look beyond the mists which appear to dim the road immediately ahead. Although the future seems dark, let us not let go of each other's hands, and let us collectively put our hands in the hand of God who alone can bless our efforts by leading us through our present difficulties to lasting peace and goodwill.

233. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the Prime Minister of Sierra Leone for his admirable address. I have a long list of speakers and I intend, with your co-operation, to give most of them the floor at this meeting. Then, if there is no objection, we shall postpone any remaining speeches until tomorrow's meeting.

234. Mr. GRIMES (Liberia): The Government of Liberia considers this a most happy occasion, and the task I now perform is a very pleasant one indeed. It is with much satisfaction that we have co-sponsored resolutions both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly for Sierra Leone's admission to membership in this international Organization. The history of Sierra Leone is very closely linked with the history of my country. Our two peoples share a kinship and have a common border as well as a common culture.

235. While Sierra Leone might be regarded as the youngest Member of this family, it is important to know that for more than half a century this country was the principle source of education for the countries of West Africa; it has been our tower of intellectual strength. We rejoice that the independence of Sierra Leone is another victory in the continuing struggle of the African people to achieve human equality and dignity, very necessary for the maintenance of peace.

236. My Government is certain that this great country which becomes the one hundredth Member of this Organization shall give to this body its finest and noblest efforts in making it the greatest instrument of peace mankind has so far created. We congratulate Sierra Leone on its admission to the United Nations and welcome it to this Organization.

237. Lord HOME (United Kingdom): When this morning my statement followed that of the representative of Liberia we were talking about matters which involved some controversy. But this afternoon we are very happy that the theme we are discussing is one which brings us all together to welcome Sierra Leone as a new Member of our Organization.

238. I had the very greatest delight, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, in co-sponsoring the resolution recommending admission of Sierra Leone. If in recent years we have had more than our fair share of this

privilege, I think my only answer can be that we cannot have too much of a good thing. Later, during this session, we shall be coming back to you again on the same theme. But I rejoice with the Prime Minister of Sierra Leone that as a Member of the Commonwealth he comes to join this great Organization and comes to join it as the one hundredth member.

239. Sierra Leone has a long history and a very fine tradition, which I cannot go into this afternoon, but it was Hanno, the Carthaginian, I think, who first set eyes on their distinctive hills some five hundred years before Christ. And it was five hundred years ago that Pedro d'Cintoro, gave it the name by which it has become known to the whole world. But it is really the name of the capital, Freetown, which tells us more than anything else about Sierra Leone. Because Freetown was just that: a place where the slaves were brought back to start life afresh and be free. And when they came back and they gathered together under a cotton tree, I believe, one hundred and seventy-five years ago, they started the first tentative experiments in self-government and democracy. So, Sierra Leone comes to us as a country which not only welcomed people back home who had been slaves but having brought them back welded them together with the people from inland; and so they have an experience in harmonizing the interests of different peoples within a single community.

240. Lastly, I should like to welcome the Prime Minister, Sir Milton Margai, and the Foreign Minister, Dr. John Karefa-Smart, and his colleagues.

241. For the benefit of those who do not know him, I might tell one story about the Prime Minister. I do not think that anyone would guess what portfolios he chose when he took office: he chose the portfolios of health and natural resources, not only because these matters were hardest and presented the most daunting problems, but also because they were nearest to the needs of his people. He comes here today leading a country standing on its own strength and independent in its own right.

242. I share some of the pride in the fact that Sierra Leone has been admitted to the United Nations by a unanimous decision.

243. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia): Australia was very happy to join in sponsoring the admission of Sierra Leone to membership of the United Nations.

244. It is a very good indication of what has happened in our development since the creation of the United Nations that the one-hundredth Member should be both a nation of Africa and a member of the British Commonwealth. The last few years of this Organization's life have shown the emergence into full nationhood of most of the great continent of Africa. They have shown the results of British policy over a long period, a policy which has enabled those who have been associated with the United Kingdom in a dependent status to take their place in the international community as equal partners. Those of us who are already independent members of the Commonwealth look forward to a long period of association with the newest member of the Commonwealth and the newest Member of the United Nations.

245. Australia already has relations of some intimacy and the very greatest friendship with Sierra Leone. A number of people from Sierra Leone have been in Australia as students. Officials of the administration of Sierra Leone have been in Australia working along-

side Australian officials. We know that this association will not only continue, but that it will grow.

246. We are very glad that Sir Milton Margai, the Prime Minister of Sierra Leone, was able to come here today himself and make the first statement in this Organization on behalf of his country. His nation's achievement of independence is one of his achievements. We know that he and his Government will now pursue to the full the opportunities that are offered by membership in this Organization. We look forward to having the representatives of Sierra Leone

as colleagues here. We already know the Foreign Minister, Mr. Karefa-Smart; he was here last year. We also know Mr. Collier, the new permanent representative of Sierra Leone, and some of the members of his delegation.

247. I speak not only on behalf of the Government of Australia but also on behalf of the people of Australia in expressing our pleasures at having Sierra Leone among us as the one hundredth Member of the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 7.5 p.m.