

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1169th  
MEETING

Wednesday, 18 October 1961,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Order of discussion of agenda items (continued)</i>	33

**Chairman:** Mr. Mario AMADEO (Argentina).

### Order of discussion of agenda items (A/C.1/844, A/C.1/L.281/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.282, A/C.1/L.286) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that in accordance with the ruling he had given at the previous meeting, the Committee would proceed to vote on the requests for priority, the proposals and the amendments before it.

2. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that at the previous meeting it had at first seemed clear to the Soviet delegation that the Afghan proposal (A/C.1/L.286), for which the representative of Afghanistan had requested priority, would be put to the vote first. The Soviet delegation had therefore thought it sufficient to submit an amendment to that proposal alone. From the explanation given by the Chairman with regard to the voting, however, it appeared possible that the Afghan proposal would not be put to the vote first. His delegation therefore wished to submit orally a similar amendment to the Indian proposal (A/C.1/L.282) and to the United States proposal (A/C.1/L.281/Rev.1).

3. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that he had closed the debate on the order of discussion of agenda items and had announced the beginning of voting. Under rule 129 of the rules of procedure, therefore, he could not admit proposals except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting. The Committee could, of course, reverse his ruling by a vote.

4. Mr. DEAN (United States of America) supported the Chairman's ruling.

5. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) pointed out that the Chairman's ruling was binding unless it was challenged by one or more delegations and then overruled by a majority vote.

6. Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania) said that the voting had not begun on any of the substantive proposals before the Committee, but only on the requests for priority. There was, moreover, no absolute deadline for the submission of amendments. It would therefore be in order for the Soviet Union to submit its amendments.

7. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that he had already given a ruling and that unless it was challenged it must hold good.

8. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would not challenge the Chairman's

ruling and would not press his delegation's amendments. The fact that his delegation had expressed its intention to submit an amendment to the United States proposal should not be taken to indicate that it intended to vote in favour of that proposal. In the circumstances, it would vote in favour of giving priority to the Afghan proposal.

9. The CHAIRMAN, amplifying the statement he had made at the previous meeting with regard to the voting procedure, explained that the result of the vote on the Indian request for priority would decide whether the Indian proposal would have priority over the United States proposal; the latter would normally have had priority, having been submitted first. That vote would not prejudice the request for absolute priority made by the delegation of Afghanistan; it would be put to the vote immediately after the Indian request for priority, regardless of the outcome of the voting.

10. Mr. DEAN (United States of America) said that since the Indian delegation had accepted the United States amendment (A/C.1/L.284) to its proposal (A/C.1/L.282), he would support the Indian delegation's oral request for priority.

11. The CHAIRMAN said that as the United States had yielded priority to the Indian proposal, there was no need to take a vote on the Indian request for priority.

12. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) said that while he appreciated the United States representative's gesture, he could not accept the view that the United States was unilaterally entitled to grant priority to the Indian proposal. The United States had made no proposal in that connexion and therefore had no proposal to withdraw. A request for priority for the Indian proposal had been made to the Committee, and the Committee alone could take a decision on it.

13. After further discussion, in which Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea), Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania), Mr. DEAN (United States of America), Mr. KALONJI (Congo, Leopoldville), Mr. Krishna MENON (India), Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) and Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) took part, the CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections, the Committee could be taken to have approved unanimously the Indian delegation's request for priority for its proposal.

*It was so decided.*

14. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Afghan delegation's request for priority for its proposal (A/C.1/L.286).

*The Afghan request for priority was rejected by 61 votes to 23, with 10 abstentions.*

15. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said that since his delegation's request for priority had not been granted, he would withdraw the Afghan proposal.

16. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that although the Afghan proposal had been withdrawn, his delegation maintained its amendment (A/C.1/L.287). He asked that it should be put to the vote when the Committee voted on the Indian proposal (A/C.1/L.282) and the United States proposal (A/C.1/L.281/Rev.1).

17. The CHAIRMAN said that he could not grant the Soviet representative's request, since he had already given a ruling on the matter. Amendments could not be transferred from one proposal to another. Under rule 82 of the rules of procedure, however, a motion could not be withdrawn by its proposer if it had been amended. The representative of Afghanistan was therefore not entitled to withdraw his proposal until a decision had been taken on the Soviet amendment.

18. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) disagreed with the Chairman's interpretation of rule 82. A motion was not amended until the amendment was adopted. If the amendment had merely been submitted, but not yet adopted, the sponsor of the motion was entitled to withdraw it, and no vote could then be taken on the amendment.

19. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he agreed with the Chairman's interpretation of rule 82. He was entitled to insist on a vote on the Afghan proposal and on the Soviet amendment. Since, however, the representative of Afghanistan had decided to withdraw his proposal, he would not insist on either.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that as the Soviet representative was not pressing his request for a vote on his amendment, the Afghan proposal would be considered to have been withdrawn.

21. The Committee would proceed to vote on the Indian proposal (A/C.1/L.282), as amended, following the acceptance by the sponsor of the United States amendment (A/C.1/L.284).

*The proposal, as amended, was adopted by 83 votes to 10, with 4 abstentions.*

22. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian amendment (A/C.1/L.285) to the United States revised proposal (A/C.1/L.281/Rev.1).

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Costa Rica, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad.

*Against:* Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of

America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville).

*Abstaining:* Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Poland, Romania, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

*The amendment was rejected by 51 votes to 33, with 15 abstentions.*

23. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States revised proposal (A/C.1/L.281/Rev.1).

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico.

*Against:* Poland, Romania, Senegal, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Mali.

*Abstaining:* Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Libya, Madagascar.

*Present and not voting:* Guinea.

*The proposal was adopted by 54 votes to 13, with 31 abstentions.*

24. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote, said that in the view of his delegation the question of banning nuclear tests could not be fruitfully discussed outside the context of disarmament in general. His delegation had therefore been unable to support either the Indian proposal or the United States proposal, even though their substance and the motives which had prompted their introduction had been somewhat different.

25. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) explained that his delegation had not participated in the vote on the United States proposal because it did not feel that positive results could be obtained by supporting the position of either the Soviet Union or the United States; the problem of disarmament could be solved only through agreement between those two Powers. The vote just taken would not, in his view, contribute in any way to the success of the Committee's efforts.

26. Mr. QUAISON-SACKKEY (Ghana) proposed that, now that items 73 and 72 had become the first and second items on the Committee's agenda, item 19 (Question of disarmament) should be taken as the third item, and item 81 (Prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons) as the fourth item.

27. Mr. RONAN (Ireland) supported the Ghanaian representative's proposal.

28. Mr. FEKINI (Libya) also supported the proposal, and further proposed that item 80 (Question of Algeria) should be placed fifth on the agenda.

29. Mr. DEAN (United States of America) suggested that, in accordance with rule 121 of the rules of procedure and for the sake of orderly procedure, proposals relating to the order of the remaining items of the Committee's agenda should be submitted in writing.

30. The CHAIRMAN, drawing attention to the last part of rule 121, observed that he was authorized to permit the discussion of proposals even though they had not been circulated in writing. Consequently, he regarded the proposals made by the representatives of Ghana and Libya as in order.

31. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Chairman's ruling, which was in keeping with established practice, and expressed the hope that the United States representative would not insist that the procedural proposals put forward should be circulated in writing. The USSR delegation fully agreed with those proposals. Moreover, the Committee might be well advised to complete the arrangement of its agenda at once, by deciding that agenda item 20, relating to Korea, should be taken as the sixth item, agenda item 21 (Report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space) as the seventh item, and agenda item 78, concerning the Cuban complaint, as the eighth item.

32. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) supported the proposals of Ghana and Libya that the question of the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons and the question of Algeria should be taken as the fourth and fifth items of the Committee's agenda, respectively. He also agreed that the Committee should decide at once on the order of the remaining items.

33. Sir Michael WRIGHT (United Kingdom) agreed that the question of disarmament should be taken as the third item and the question of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons as the fourth item, but suggested that further consideration might be desirable before the Committee came to a final decision on the order of the remaining items.

34. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the meeting should be adjourned, and that the various procedural proposals should be discussed and voted on as the Committee's first business at its next meeting.

35. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) proposed that a vote should be taken without further delay on the proposals relating to the order of all the remaining items of the agenda.

36. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported that proposal.

37. Mr. DEAN (United States of America) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

*The motion for adjournment was adopted by 33 votes to 29, with 18 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.