

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1245th  
MEETING**

Friday, 5 October 1962,  
at 3.10 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

## CONTENTS

<i>Opening statement by the Chairman . . . . .</i>	<i>Page</i> 3
<i>Tribute to the memory of Sir Claude Corea, former Permanent Representative of Ceylon to the United Nations, and of Mr. T. G. Narayanan . . . . .</i>	3
<i>Election of the Vice-Chairman . . . . .</i>	3
<i>Election of the Rapporteur . . . . .</i>	3
<i>Order of discussion of agenda items . . . . .</i>	3

**Chairman:** Mr. Omar Abdel Hamid ADEEL  
(Sudan).

### Opening statement by the Chairman

1. The CHAIRMAN opened the session with a word of welcome to Rwanda, Burundi, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago. He was certain that those young, dynamic States would lend new impetus to the work of the Committee.

2. As the first representative of an African country to occupy the Chair, he hoped to have the support and understanding of the members of the Committee, to whom he wished to express his deep gratitude for the honour they had conferred on his country and on himself.

### Tribute to the memory of Sir Claude Corea, former Permanent Representative of Ceylon to the United Nations, and of Mr. T. G. Narayanan

3. The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of all the Committee's members, paid a tribute to the memory of Sir Claude Corea, former Permanent Representative of Ceylon to the United Nations, and to the memory of Mr. T. G. Narayanan, Secretary of the First Committee during the sixteenth session of the General Assembly.

4. Mr. SUBASINGHE (Ceylon) said that his delegation was most grateful for the tribute paid to the memory of Sir Claude Corea, and would convey the Committee's condolences to the Government of Ceylon and to Sir Claude's family.

### Election of the Vice-Chairman

5. Mr. BARNES (Liberia) nominated Mr. Ralph Enckell (Finland) for the office of Vice-Chairman.

6. Mr. VAN DER STOEL (Netherlands) and Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) seconded the nomination.

*Mr. Enckell (Finland) was elected Vice-Chairman by acclamation.*

7. Mr. ENCKELL (Finland) expressed his gratitude to the members of the Committee; their choice was a tribute to his country, which had always supported the cause of the United Nations.

### Election of the Rapporteur

8. Mr. MALITZA (Romania) nominated Mr. Karoly Csatorday (Hungary) for the office of Rapporteur.

9. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) and Mr. AMONOO (Ghana) seconded the nomination.

*Mr. Csatorday (Hungary) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.*

10. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) said that he was grateful to the members of the Committee and would try to be worthy of their confidence.

### Order of discussion of agenda items (A/C.1/868 and Add.1)

11. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the letters of 24 and 27 September 1962 addressed to him by the President of the General Assembly, which listed the agenda items allocated to the First Committee for consideration and report (A/C.1/868 and Add.1). Before opening debate on the order of consideration of those items, in accordance with rule 100 of the rules of procedure, he wished to say that, following exchanges of views with several delegations, he felt that the members of the Committee would agree to begin by considering the following four items: first, item 77 of the General Assembly's agenda, entitled "The urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests"; second, item 90, entitled "Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament"; third, item 93, entitled "Condemnation of propaganda favouring preventive nuclear war"; and fourth, item 26, entitled "Question of convening a conference for the purpose of signing a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons: report of the Secretary-General".

12. Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom) said that he was prepared to accept that order of priority. He observed that, since the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament was to reconvene on 12 November 1962, it was desirable that consideration of the items affecting that Conference should be completed by that date.

13. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would have preferred the Committee to consider first the item concerning the condemnation of propaganda favouring preventive nuclear war; discussion of that item would have helped to dispel the distrust which, as had been pointed out many times, was an obstacle to the solution of the other problems before the Committee.

However, if, as the Chairman had indicated, most members of the Committee favoured the suggested order of priority, his delegation would bow to their wishes.

14. Mr. DEAN (United States of America) said that the order proposed by the Chairman for consideration of the first four items would enable the Committee to carry on its work in an effective manner. However, it was desirable that any representative who might wish, during the consideration of any of those items, to touch upon other matters relating to disarmament should be able to do so.

15. The item relating to condemnation of propaganda favouring preventive nuclear war might more properly be discussed under the heading of general and complete disarmament, as it had been by the Eighteen-Nation Committee at Geneva. In that connexion, it was regrettable that the Eighteen-Nation Committee had been unable to agree on a resolution, the Soviet delegation having demurred just when agreement had seemed at hand after long and arduous preparation.

16. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that one of the main reasons, if not indeed the main reason, for the failure to reach agreement on a resolution in the Eighteen-Nation Committee was the fact that the United States delegation had been unwilling to include certain provisions, among which had been one banning propaganda favouring preventive nuclear war. That was why his delegation had proposed the inclusion of the relevant item in the General Assembly's agenda; he hoped that the members of the Committee, including the United States, would be able to reach unanimous agreement on it.

17. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should adopt his suggestion concerning the order of consideration of the first four items.

*It was so decided.*

18. Mr. BURNS (Canada) pointed out that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space had met during the week preceding the opening of the seventeenth session of the Assembly. Since the report of the Legal Sub-Committee had given rise to disagreement, many delegations had expressed a desire to have the matter discussed fully by the General Assembly. His delegation hoped that the members of the First Committee, and particularly countries which did not belong to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, would provide guidance for the latter's future work.

19. The Committee's consideration of the Korean question had over the years settled into a fixed pattern of protracted and controversial debate.

20. His delegation therefore proposed that agenda item 27, entitled "International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space: reports of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the World Meteorological Organization and the International Telecommunication Union", and agenda item 28, entitled "The Korean question: (a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea; (b) The withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea", should be considered as the fifth and sixth items on the Committee's agenda.

21. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could not accept that

proposal. The situation in South Korea was serious and was a source of danger not only to the Far East but to the whole world. The Committee's consideration of the Korean question had perhaps been monotonous, as the Canadian representative had said, doubtless referring to the fact that the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK), a body which had long since outlived its usefulness, was of interest to no one. At the present session, however, the Committee had before it a matter placed on the agenda at the request of his delegation which should enable it to approach the problem from a new standpoint. The withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea was an urgent need; it would mean the liberation of the Korean people and would at the same time contribute substantially to the relaxation of world tensions.

22. The agenda item concerning international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space was certainly an important one; indeed, the Canadian delegation, like some other members of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, would have done well to recognize its importance earlier. It was particularly important that members of the First Committee, instead of clinging to their previous positions, should make an effort to resolve the legal problems which had brought the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to an impasse. However, the Canadian proposal was actually a politically motivated attempt to delay until the end of the session, and indeed to prevent, the consideration of the Korean question by the First Committee.

23. His delegation therefore wished to make a counter-proposal, in the form of an amendment to the Canadian proposal: that the Committee should give fifth place on its agenda to the Korean question and sixth place to the question concerning the peaceful uses of outer space.

24. Mr. OKAZAKI (Japan) said that he supported the Canadian proposal. While the Korean question was extremely important, that of international co-operation in outer space must be given priority, for the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, which had met for the first time with its full membership in 1962, contained a number of suggestions which called for urgent consideration. The conquest of space was steadily progressing, and it was essential to organize international co-operation in that field as quickly as possible.

25. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland), recalling the Canadian representative's view that the debate on the Korean question had settled into a fixed pattern, said it was a fact that the First Committee had formed the habit of relegating that debate to the end of the session and conducting it hurriedly and by methods somewhat lacking in impartiality. It was high time to put an end to those practices and to approach the problem in a new spirit. The Soviet Union's action in calling for the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea afforded just such an opportunity.

26. The Polish delegation supported the Soviet view that the Korean question should be debated before that of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space.

27. Mrs. SUPENI (Indonesia) believed that the problem of Korea was more urgent than the question of outer space. It was perhaps natural that Canada, which was a member of the Committee on the Peace-

ful Uses of Outer Space, should attach more importance to that field of activity, but Indonesia, a Far Eastern country, was greatly concerned about the situation prevailing in Korea. In that connexion, the Indonesian delegation found it difficult to understand the position taken by Japan.

28. The United Nations had been unable for twelve years to carry out its many decisions on Korea, and should exert all its efforts at the current session to solve the problem at last; the sooner that was done the better. For those reasons, she felt that the Korean question should be considered fifth, immediately after the items relating to disarmament.

29. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said that all the items were important, for different reasons, and the order of priority in debating them should be determined on the basis of their relative urgency. That was why the Committee had given priority to the items relating to disarmament. Thus it was logical to take up next the question of outer space, which was related to that of disarmament, since the problem to be solved was in fact that of preventing the extension of the arms race to outer space. That was not a purely technical question: since there as yet existed no treaty binding States to use outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes, it was urgent that appropriate provisions should be made. In particular, it would be necessary to discuss the juridical aspects of the question and to promote peaceful co-operation among States. Finally, the question of outer space was the more urgent because there had been no opportunity to discuss it at the last session.

30. While earnestly hoping that the important question of Korea could be resolved, the Peruvian delegation believed that the question of outer space must be discussed first.

31. Mr. LALL (India) proposed that the Committee should refrain from making an immediate decision on the relative priority to be given to the question of outer space and that of Korea, leaving the Chairman to continue his consultations so that the problem might be solved without loss of time to the Committee. The Committee already had worked enough for a few weeks; and the procedure he proposed was not without precedent.

32. Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom) recognized that time should not be lost on a mere procedural point. Nevertheless, he felt that the Committee, having already debated the question sufficiently, should fix the order of priority of all the items on its agenda at once. In that connexion, he agreed with the Peruvian representative that the main consideration was the relative urgency of the items, rather than their importance. While it felt that the Korean question was important and should be discussed at the current session, the United Kingdom delegation nevertheless believed that the question of outer space should be given priority because of its urgency.

33. Mr. DUGERSUREN (Mongolia) said that the urgency of a question resulted from its importance. The Korean question was both important and urgent; there was no doubt that it was one of more concern to the peoples of the world than the problem of outer space. Mongolia had already, a year ago, contended that the key to the problem was the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea, and it considered that the Korean question should be discussed before that of outer space.

34. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space the United Kingdom representative had suggested that consideration of the juridical aspects of the question should be deferred for a year. It was curious therefore that another representative of the United Kingdom now felt that those same juridical questions should be examined as a matter of great urgency. And it was certainly the juridical aspects which were in question, since the technical matters were uncontroversial.

35. The Soviet delegation did not deny the importance of the question of outer space, and it was in favour of international co-operation in that field. However, it could not permit the universal aspiration for a peaceful solution of that problem to be used to prevent the Committee from discussing so essential and urgent a question as that of Korea. Moreover, the Committee must bear in mind the opinions expressed by countries which were neighbours of Korea and by other States located in that part of the world.

36. The Soviet delegation had made a major concession in connexion with the order of priority of the first four items, and it asked other delegations to agree in their turn to make a concession. If, however, the Indian proposal could settle the present difficulty, the Soviet delegation would not press for a prior vote on the amendment it had presented.

37. The CHAIRMAN said he wondered how far the Soviet proposal could be regarded as an amendment to the Canadian proposal within the meaning of rule 131 of the rules of procedure; according to that rule, an amendment could merely add to, delete from or revise part of the original proposal.

38. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Canadian representative had not submitted any new proposal. In the list of items allocated to the Committee given in documents A/C.1/868 and Add.1, the question of outer space was listed before the Korean question; the Canadian representative had thus merely supported, on that particular point, the order of items in those documents. The Soviet proposal therefore constituted an amendment not to the Canadian proposal but to the text of those documents, and, as such, was the only one that had been submitted. However, that was a subsidiary question, pending a decision by the Committee on the Indian proposal.

39. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) thought that the Committee should decide without delay on the Indian proposal, which should clearly have precedence.

40. Mr. DEAN (United States of America) felt that since the Committee was so close to voting, it would be preferable to fix the order of priority of all items immediately, so as to enable delegations to organize their work for the entire session and so that there would be no need to return later to the question of priority.

41. The CHAIRMAN stated that the Indian representative's proposal constituted a motion for adjournment of debate on the item under discussion within the meaning of rule 120 of the rules of procedure. He therefore put it to the vote as a matter of priority.

*The proposal was adopted by 41 votes to 29, with 12 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.