

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1199th
MEETING

Tuesday, 21 November 1961,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 19:	
Question of disarmament (<i>continued</i>)	187

Chairman: Mr. Mario AMADEO (Argentina).

AGENDA ITEM 19

Question of disarmament (A/4868 and Corr.1, A/4879, A/4880, A/4887, A/4891, A/4892, A/C.1/856, A/C.1/L.297 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.299 and Add.1) (*continued*)

1. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) read the text of his Government's reply to the United States note (A/4969) on the resumption of the Geneva negotiations on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests. In its reply, his Government announced that if, at the present time, the United States and the United Kingdom considered that the resumption of talks might help to reconcile the different positions, it was willing to make a further effort, it being understood that general and complete disarmament was the common aim of the three participating Powers. In taking that decision, his Government assumed that the General Assembly, taking into account the agreement reached between the USSR and the United States on the principles of disarmament (A/4879), would at its sixteenth session adopt a resolution on the resumption of negotiations on all the questions concerning general and complete disarmament and the establishment of a negotiating body. It would be understood that, if one of the Powers carried out nuclear weapons tests during the negotiations, the other party would be obliged to draw the obvious conclusions.

2. Mr. DEAN (United States of America) said that his delegation was gratified that the Soviet Union had agreed to resume negotiations with a view to the conclusion of a treaty for the prohibition of nuclear weapons tests under effective international control. That was an important step which should help in achieving the programme for general and complete disarmament placed before the General Assembly by the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, on 25 September (1013th plenary meeting).

3. He read the text of a statement which had just been issued by his Government in Washington, according to which the United States delegation to the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests was instructed to return to Geneva in preparation for the resumption of the negotiations on 28 November 1961. The statement recalled that the United States and the United Kingdom had on 18 April tabled a full text of a draft treaty incorporating all the articles and annexes which had previously been agreed among the three delegations (A/4772) and that the United States had made a series of further compromise proposals on the outstanding issues (A/4772/Add.1) two weeks before

the Conference had recessed. The Soviet Union had not yet replied to those proposals, but it should be possible to reach early agreement on a treaty that would ensure the ending of nuclear weapons tests under effective control. The statement further noted that, in view of the tests recently carried out by the Soviet Union in defiance of the moratorium, the United States would continue to take such actions as it deemed necessary to safeguard its national security interests until a controlled test-ban agreement had been achieved.

4. He also called the Committee's attention to the statement on nuclear testing issued by the President of the United States on 2 November 1961.

5. Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) endorsed the remarks made by the United States representative. He welcomed the decision of the Soviet Union to resume the negotiations, in compliance with the desire of the General Assembly. The United Kingdom was eager to return to those negotiations in the hope of establishing thereby a treaty which would eliminate all further testing and promote the consideration of the problem of disarmament, so that general and complete disarmament might be achieved.

6. Mr. VAKIL (Iran) said that, despite the recent series of tests, the increase of military budgets and the gathering momentum of the arms race, some progress had been made. The Committee had before it a joint statement (A/4879) in which the United States and the USSR rejected war as an instrument of national policy and set forth the principles on which general and complete disarmament should be based. His delegation was happy to note that in paragraph 7 of those principles the authors had recognized the need to strengthen the political and legal international institutions at the same time as steps were taken towards disarmament.

7. The current debate showed, however, that differences of opinion persisted between the Soviet Union and the United States, particularly in regard to inspection and control, and that impaired the value of the agreed principles. It was also regrettable that the representatives of the United States and the USSR had not been able to reach agreement on the composition of a negotiating body. It was clear that the Soviet Union was attaching undue importance to the participation of the non-aligned nations. The question of disarmament was undoubtedly a matter of concern to every nation, and his delegation had already in 1960 supported the principle of geographical representation in the negotiating body, but the difficulty could not, unfortunately, be reduced to questions of organization. What was needed was a new attitude at the conference table; old precepts must be discarded and bold and imaginative approaches made.

8. Despite former disappointments, his delegation was encouraged by the news that the major nuclear Powers were to resume negotiations on the prohibition

of nuclear tests on 28 November. Those talks, together with the preparatory work to be done by the First Committee for the resumption of negotiations on general and complete disarmament, should bring humanity closer to its ultimate goal.

9. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) moved that the general debate on disarmament should be temporarily adjourned under rule 117 of the rules of procedure, and that the Committee should vote immediately on the Indian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.299).

10. Mr. MATSUI (Japan) felt that the Committee might wish to hear the views of the United States and USSR representatives on the Indian motion.

11. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had no objection to the proposed procedure, provided that the general debate on disarmament was resumed after the vote on the draft resolution.

12. Mr. DEAN (United States of America) recalled that, on 15 November, the Soviet delegation had handed his delegation the text of a draft resolution on the establishment of a body for disarmament negotiations. His delegation had, later that same day, transmitted to the Soviet delegation its own draft resolution, to which the latter had not yet replied.

13. His delegation was always ready to meet with the Soviet delegation on the subject of the establishment of a negotiating body or any other relevant matter, and bore in mind its duty to report the results of such an

exchange of views to the United Nations. The United States therefore fully approved the objective of the Indian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.299). In fact, what the draft requested was precisely what his delegation was doing.

14. Likewise, his delegation had no objection to the procedure suggested by the representative of India.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of objections, he would declare the Indian motion adopted.

It was so decided.

16. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to document A/C.1/L.299/Add.1, which indicated that Ghana and the United Arab Republic had joined India in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/L.299.

17. Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) proposed that the draft resolution should be adopted by acclamation.

18. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of objections, draft resolution A/C.1/L.299 and Add.1 would be considered as adopted unanimously.

It was so decided.

19. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) proposed that the text of the draft resolution just adopted should be transmitted as quickly as possible to the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.