

**United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1194th
MEETING**

Tuesday, 14 November 1961,
at 10.20 a.m.



SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda items 73 and 72:

<p><i>Continuation of suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and obligations of States to refrain from their renewal (concluded)</i></p> <p><i>The urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international control (concluded)</i></p>	}	163
--	---	-----

Chairman: Mr. Mario AMADEO (Argentina).

AGENDA ITEMS 73 AND 72

Continuation of suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and obligations of States to refrain from their renewal (A/4801 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.291/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1-3, A/C.1/L.292 and Add.1-3) (concluded)

The urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international control (A/4799, A/C.1/L.292 and Add.1-3) (concluded)

1. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, recalled that at the 1193rd meeting the representative of Italy had implied that the Soviet Union was prepared to deliver a mortal nuclear blow against any aggressor. It was obvious that at the present time any war might develop into a nuclear war, and since Italy was a member of NATO and had allowed the United States to establish bases in its territory, it would immediately be drawn into such a war, with all the inevitable consequences. For the Italian people, as for all the peoples of the world, safety lay, not in alliances and military bases, but in general and complete disarmament. That was the solution which Italy should support in the United Nations, instead of trying to justify the use of nuclear weapons.

2. Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) said that he fully understood the desire of the sponsors of the fourteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.291/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1-3) to prevent nuclear tests being carried out on the African continent; with that end in view, his delegation had supported General Assembly resolution 1379 (XIV) in 1959, when Africa had been directly threatened. The draft resolution now before the Committee was an entirely different matter. First of all, in its resolution 1648 (XVI) the General Assembly had already formally called for the suspension of all nuclear tests in any part of the world, so that the adoption of a new resolution relating to a specific area would cast doubt on the effectiveness of the more general resolution. In addition, world public opinion might get the impression that nuclear tests were particularly reprehensible in Africa, but less so in

other parts of the world. Furthermore, it could be objected, particularly with regard to sub-paragraph (b) of the operative part, that it was for each African State to decide for itself whether its territory, territorial waters and air space were or were not to be used in testing, storing or transporting nuclear weapons. The General Assembly could not impose restrictions on the use which those sovereign States made of their national territory.

3. His delegation could not support a draft resolution which was designed to protect only one region of the world. It considered that denuclearization, like peace and security, was indivisible and it would not be satisfied until the whole world had been freed from the nuclear menace.

4. Mr. QUAISON-SACKEY (Ghana) stated that the sponsors of the fourteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.291/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1-3) had accepted the amendment submitted by Libya (A/C.1/L.296).

5. He pointed out that the draft resolution expressed the apprehensions of the peoples of Africa, who, unlike the peoples of Latin America, had already been exposed to the effects of nuclear explosions and were in danger of being exposed to them once more. Despite certain misunderstandings, which would be dissipated in due course, there was no disagreement among the African countries regarding the establishment of a denuclearized zone.

6. Mr. IFEAGWU (Nigeria), referring to the Italian amendments (A/C.1/L.295), stressed that the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.292 and Add.1-3) would in no way weaken the right of self-defence as defined in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations; it was designed solely to forbid the use of atomic devices for military purposes, because of the fearful consequences which such use would have for mankind.

7. So far as the fourteen-Power draft resolution was concerned, it was not, as the representative of the Ivory Coast had alleged, an attempt to get something in by the back door, since the text had already been submitted the previous year. The intention was not to insulate Africa from the problems that faced the world, but to begin the denuclearization of the whole world with a region which had not yet been contaminated. That would not establish a precedent, since the method had already been used to neutralize the Antarctic and its application to outer space was being contemplated.

8. Sir Michael WRIGHT (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the NATO countries, by the very terms of the treaty between them, could take only defensive measures. It was absurd to maintain, as the USSR representative had done at the 1193rd meeting, that the United Kingdom and the other members of NATO were preparing to launch a nuclear and rocket war against the Soviet Union.

9. The representative of the USSR had also implied that, in his Government's opinion, it was contrary to the Charter to use nuclear weapons in self-defence. In that case, one might ask why, in 1946, the Soviet Government had not accepted the United States proposal^{1/} that all countries should give up making and possessing nuclear weapons and why in the preceding two months it had exploded more than thirty nuclear devices with a total yield of over 120 megatons. Only recently, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. Khrushchev, had acknowledged that, in a war, if one of the sides considered its position hopeless, it would use nuclear weapons. The representative of the USSR had himself said that his country would use such weapons to defend itself, which was the very position he had attacked the day before.

10. The Soviet Union should abandon such propaganda and join in constructive negotiation on the ending of nuclear tests and on disarmament. Meanwhile it was important not to undermine the Charter by misinterpretations or to create a false sense of safety by pretending that declarations unsupported by a system of international verification could give security.

11. Mr. MENEMENCIOLU (Turkey) said that the revised text of the fourteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.291/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1-3), together with the Libyan amendment (A/C.1/L.296), represented a substantial improvement over the original text. In principle, his delegation was in sympathy with the sponsors' motives. However, certain statements made during the debate, particularly those by Poland and Romania, raised the question of how far attempts might be made in the future to interpret the text in different ways. According to those statements, the draft resolution would create a precedent for the establishment of so-called nuclear-free zones in Eastern Europe, the Adriatic, the Balkans, etc. Those questions were far too important to be introduced into the debate by the back door. In any case, it was strange that those two delegations, which had voted against the resolutions calling for a general prohibition of atomic tests, should now be showing such interest in banning nuclear tests in carefully selected geographical areas.

12. The Turkish delegation had welcomed the Guinean representative's statement that the draft resolution was concerned strictly with the question of atomic tests. It regretted, however, that certain non-African delegations had attempted to introduce cold-war issues into an interpretation of the proposal before it was adopted.

13. For those reasons, the Turkish delegation, in conformity with the position it had already taken on the question of a moratorium without controls or legal commitments, would abstain when the draft resolution was put to the vote.

14. The Turkish delegation further considered that legal arrangements, such as those envisaged in the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.292 and Add.1-3) should form part and parcel of a general, balanced and progressive programme of disarmament. Nuclear disarmament was no doubt essential for the survival of mankind, but was not enough in itself to ensure survival in particular of the smaller countries which did not possess nuclear arms and whose arsenals of conventional weapons were insignificant compared to those of other Powers. The only hope of achieving

concrete results thus lay in a balanced, general arrangement to be carried out in progressive stages that would give no advantage to any one side at any time. For those reasons, the Turkish delegation could not vote for the draft resolution. It would vote for the Italian amendments, which were directly inspired by the Charter of the United Nations, although the draft resolution, even as amended, did not really come within the scope of agenda items 73 and 72.

15. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in reply to the United Kingdom representative, said that NATO was unquestionably aggressive in character. The CENTO documents to which the Soviet delegation had already referred (A/C.1/853 and Corr.2) were adequate proof of the true nature of the Western alliances.

16. As to the Baruch Plan,^{1/} the Soviet delegation had already pointed out that it was not designed to prohibit nuclear weapons, but to perpetuate the nuclear monopoly of the United States and to give that country control over the sources of raw materials for the manufacture of nuclear weapons and over the atomic industries which were beginning to develop in other countries. The United States and the United Kingdom, on the other hand, had taken a completely negative attitude towards the proposals made by the Soviet Union in 1946^{2/} to bring about a genuine prohibition of nuclear weapons.

17. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast), replying to the representative of Nigeria, said he still thought that the fourteen-Power draft resolution represented an attempt to get something in by the back door. For although the text might have been submitted more than a year earlier, the Ivory Coast had been independent for only one year and had, therefore, had no knowledge of it.

18. It was surprising that the representative of Nigeria had not raised the problem when the Conference of Independent African States had met at Monrovia in August 1959. That might have facilitated matters, as the Conference would have been able to adopt a resolution on the subject. It was therefore pointless to adopt a resolution on which the majority of African States were not agreed and which could not be implemented.

19. Had the newly independent States been consulted at the outset, they might have asked the sponsors of the draft resolution to wait a few weeks so that the Heads of State who were to meet in Lagos could study the problem again. It would then perhaps have been possible for all the African countries to respond to the appeal of the sponsors of the draft resolution. At the present moment, that was impossible.

20. Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania), replying to a remark made by the representative of Turkey, said that the Romanian delegation had given no interpretation of the fourteen-Power draft resolution. In any case, that proposal required no interpretation, since the text, particularly of sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of the operative paragraph, was perfectly clear. The Romanian delegation could support that draft resolution, because the Romanian Government favoured the establishment of denuclearized zones wherever the peoples wanted them. The more of such zones there were, the better it would be for the peace and security of the whole world.

^{1/} See Official Records of the Atomic Energy Commission, First Year, No. 1, 1st meeting, pp. 4-14.

^{2/} *Ibid.*, No. 2, 2nd meeting, pp. 26-28.

21. Mr. ZOPPI (Italy), replying to the comments made by the Soviet representative at the beginning of the meeting, said that the Soviet Union had made the question an issue of the cold war between East and West. He wondered why the Soviet Union was so interested in the twelve-Power draft resolution when it would not hesitate to use nuclear weapons if necessary, as Mr. Khrushchev himself had stated only recently. Did members of the Committee believe that the Soviet Union, in voting for the draft resolution, did not intend to use nuclear weapons in case of war? And did they believe that the United States and other Western countries, in voting against the proposal, intended to use them? The difference in attitude towards the draft resolution was easily explained. The Soviet Union was ready to vote in favour of a draft resolution which it did not intend to respect if it should prove contrary to its own interests. When the democratic countries, on the other hand, supported a draft resolution it was with the intention of abiding by it. The purpose of the Italian amendments (A/C.1/L.295) to the twelve-Power draft resolution was to avoid placing those countries which honestly believed in the importance of United Nations resolutions in a difficult position.

22. Mr. GUIRMA (Upper Volta) said that his delegation and those of the eleven other countries, members of the Union africaine et malgache, on whose behalf he was speaking, would abstain from voting on the fourteen-Power draft resolution, even as amended. The fate of the continent of Africa was directly linked with that of the other continents. To seek to denuclearize Africa alone was an ostrich-like policy, particularly when the proposal looked very much like pure propaganda.

23. The problem of disarmament was indivisible. Partial solutions merely aggravated the problem, which should be settled at a summit conference of African States, not by their representatives at the United Nations. So long as there was a single atomic bomb in the world, Africa would feel that its security was directly threatened.

24. It was false and indeed absurd to say that the States of the Union africaine et malgache were trying to spare the feelings of certain foreign Powers which Africa interested from the viewpoint of the dangerous atomic game. His delegation particularly could make that statement with assurance; the President of the Upper Volta, Mr. Yaméogo, had always stated that there would be no foreign military base in that country, and had kept his word. During the present month of November 1961, transfers were being effected from the former Administering Power to the newly independent State in a friendly and brotherly spirit. Nuclear weapons would never be stockpiled or tested in the Upper Volta.

25. The United Nations would probably be doing more effective work if it had before it draft resolutions resulting from agreements already concluded and requiring international guarantee, instead of draft resolutions which had hardly been studied at all. In that connexion, the delegation of the Upper Volta welcomed the twelve-Power draft resolution, since it was broad in scope and well constructed and would prepare the ground for discussion between the African Heads of State on the objectives of the fourteen-Power draft resolution. The delegation of the Upper Volta would vote for that draft resolution and against the Italian amendments to it, which distorted its meaning and bearing.

26. Mr. TURBAY AYALA (Colombia) said that his delegation would have wished to see all delegations, or at any rate those of the African States, united on the fourteen-Power draft resolution, and to that end had endeavoured, though vainly, to present an amendment. To its great regret it would therefore be obliged to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, though it had every sympathy for the young republics of Africa.

27. The Colombian delegation appreciated the sincere motives of the sponsors of the twelve-Power draft resolution as also of the Italian delegation in submitting its amendments. The question, however, was one which related to general disarmament rather than to the suspension of nuclear tests, and it could only be settled by agreement between the parties. If the draft resolution were to be adopted without the Italian amendments, it would put countries which complied with its recommendations in an unfavourable position. On the other hand, if it were to be adopted with the Italian amendments, it would appear to authorize the use of nuclear weapons in certain cases. The Colombian delegation was morally unable to support a resolution which would permit the possible use of atomic weapons, even for purposes of self-defence. For those reasons, it would vote against the Italian amendments and would abstain from voting on the twelve-Power draft resolution.

28. Mr. SANCHEZ Y SANCHEZ (Dominican Republic) repeated that to his great regret he could not support the fourteen-Power draft resolution. There were differences of opinion between the African States, and no single group of them could arrogate to themselves the right to speak in the name of the whole continent. The measures contemplated in the draft resolution lacked universality. Latin America and all the other continents would be entitled to demand the same protection against the nuclear threat.

29. His delegation had intended to vote for the twelve-Power draft resolution, in view of the eminently moral considerations by which it had been inspired. But a more careful study of the text, in addition to the lack of unity among the African countries, had led his delegation to reconsider its position. In point of fact, the draft resolution had no connexion with agenda items 73 and 72; it related rather to agenda item 19, in other words the question of disarmament. Accordingly his delegation would have to abstain from the vote on it.

30. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said he would vote for the fourteen-Power draft resolution because, as a neighbour of Africa, Cyprus was favourably disposed to all proposals presented for the benefit of the African countries, and because his delegation hoped that the ban on nuclear tests in Africa would be extended to Cyprus. The draft resolution, moreover, re-emphasized the resolution calling for the banning of nuclear tests everywhere that had already been adopted. It was to be hoped, in that connexion, that the example of the African States would be followed, and that the other regions of the world would come to realize the danger from nuclear tests just as keenly. In that sense the draft resolution could thus be considered a first step towards the cessation of all such testing throughout the world.

31. His delegation would also vote for the twelve-Power draft resolution. It considered that Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which recognized the right of self-defence, could not be cited as a pretext for limiting the prohibition on the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. If the use of the weapons in

question for purposes of defence were to be permitted, the declaration would become meaningless. On the other hand, the declaration should have prohibited not only the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, but also nuclear testing.

32. Mr. HAMID IBRAHIM (Ethiopia) said that he would vote against the Italian amendments, since their purpose was contrary to that of the twelve-Power draft resolution. They would have the effect of sanctioning the use of weapons of mass destruction where such use was not at variance with the United Nations Charter, whereas the purpose of the draft declaration was precisely to outlaw the use of such weapons finally and categorically. The danger they represented would be the same whether or not they were employed in conformity with the Charter.

33. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said that he would vote for the fourteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.291/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1-3). First of all, the fact that the draft resolution concerned only Africa should not raise difficulties for any non-African country, and his delegation strongly hoped that similar measures would be adopted for the other parts of the world. Secondly, the motives of the African countries were eminently peaceful, and it was to be hoped that the Governments of other regions would adopt a policy similar to theirs and that by dissociating themselves from the interests of the nuclear Powers they would renounce the policy of military pacts and contribute to the welfare and security of their own people and of humanity at large. Thirdly, the Afghan delegation was supporting the aspirations towards peace that had moved the sponsors of the draft resolution, without regard to such differences of opinion as might exist between the various African countries. Fourthly, sub-paragraph (b) of the operative paragraph meant that the General Assembly would call upon Member States to refrain from using the territory, territorial waters or air space of Africa in storing or transporting nuclear weapons, and to refrain from testing in any environment that would in any way directly endanger the welfare of the people of the African continent. In that connexion, all rights should be reserved as to any action by nuclear Powers on the high seas, in internal waters, or in any territories anywhere, which would endanger the welfare of non-nuclear Powers. Finally, his delegation would not object to the amendment submitted by Libya (A/C.1/L.296), but it would prefer the word "neutral" to be retained.

34. The CHAIRMAN said the Committee would vote first on the fourteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.291/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1-3). He reminded the Committee that the sponsors had accepted the Libyan amendment (A/C.1/L.296) and that consequently the word "neutral" had been deleted from sub-paragraph (c) of the operative paragraph. Separate votes had been requested on each of the sub-paragraphs of the operative paragraph.

35. He put sub-paragraph (a) to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania,

Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland.

Against: United States of America, France.

Abstaining: South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Peru, Portugal.

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 61 votes to 2, with 35 abstentions.

36. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (b) of the operative paragraph of the fourteen-Power draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan.

Against: United States of America, France.

Abstaining: Luxembourg, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan.

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 56 votes to 2, with 40 abstentions.

37. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (c) of the operative paragraph of the fourteen-Power draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelo-

russian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Panama, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Cameroun, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger.

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 58 votes to none, with 41 abstentions.

38. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the fourteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.291/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1-3) as a whole, as amended.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Panama, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Cameroun, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 42 abstentions.

39. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Italian amendments (A/C.1/L.295) to the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.292 and Add.1-3). He reminded the Committee that the representative of Japan had asked for a separate vote on the first part of the sixth amendment, reading "Substitute the words 'to consider the means of prohibiting' for the words 'for signing a convention on the prohibition of'". He would therefore put that part of the sentence to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen.

Abstaining: Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The first part of the sixth amendment was rejected by 50 votes to 25, with 25 abstentions.

40. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Italian amendments as a whole (A/C.1/L.295), with the exception of the part of the sixth amendment which had been voted on separately and rejected.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Federation of Malaya, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador.

Against: Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia.

Abstaining: Federation of Malaya, Finland, Guatemala, Iran, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Somalia, Sweden, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile.

The amendments were rejected by 50 votes to 28, with 22 abstentions.

41. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.292 and Add.1-3).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan.

Against: South Africa, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of

America, Australia, Belgium, China, France, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua.

Abstaining: Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Norway.

The draft resolution was adopted by 60 votes to 16, with 25 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.