

Friday, 6 December 1968,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda items 27, 28, 29, 94 and 96:	
Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (<i>continued</i>)	
Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (<i>continued</i>)	
Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (<i>continued</i>)	
Memorandum of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament (<i>continued</i>)	
Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: Final Document of the Conference (<i>continued</i>)	1

Chairman: Mr. Piero VINCI (Italy).**AGENDA ITEMS 27, 28, 29, 94 and 96**

Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7189-DC/231; A/C.1/L.443, A/C.1/L.444 and Add.1-7, A/C.1/L.445 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.446, A/C.1/L.448/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.449)

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7189-DC/231; A/C.1/L.447 and Add.1 and 2)

Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7189-DC/231)

Memorandum of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament (*continued*) (A/7134, A/7223; A/C.1/974, A/C.1/L.443)

Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: Final Document of the Conference (*continued*) (A/7224 and Add.1, A/7277 and Corr.1, A/7327, A/7364; A/C.1/976, A/C.1/L.449-452)

1. The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform the Committee that the draft resolution which was introduced yesterday by the representative of Bulgaria is in document A/C.1/L.452 which has just been distributed.

2. Before giving the floor to the first speaker on my left I have a statement to make to the Committee.

3. As representatives are aware on 12 November [*1606th meeting*] the delegation of the USSR introduced draft resolution A/C.1/L.443 on the memorandum of the Government of the USSR concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament [A/7134]. This draft resolution was submitted under agenda items 27 and 94. I have been informed by the delegation of the Soviet Union that it has taken into account the fact that, during the course of the debate on the various items relating to disarmament in the First Committee, the importance of the memorandum of the Government of the USSR was noted, and that, furthermore, draft resolution A/C.1/L.448/Rev.1 under item 27—question of general and complete disarmament—takes note of this memorandum and transmits to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament all the documents and records of the meetings of the First Committee concerning all matters relating to the disarmament question.

4. In the circumstances, the Soviet delegation has asked me to inform the Committee that it would not insist on having the Committee vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.443.

5. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): I have asked to speak today in order to introduce to the Committee the draft resolution on the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States sponsored by the delegations of Australia, Austria, Canada, Finland, Japan and Netherlands. The draft resolution, which was submitted on 3 December, is contained in document A/C.1/L.450.

6. The six delegations wish to express what we believe to be the general will of this Committee in acknowledging the important contribution made by the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States to our common search for ways and means to promote disarmament and arms control and thus to strengthen the security of all nations and to harness nuclear energy exclusively for peaceful purposes. Accordingly, we propose that the General Assembly endorse the declaration of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States [*see A/7277 and Corr.1, para. 17 (V)*].

7. We also take it to be the general wish of the Committee that we should make sure that the many constructive proposals contained in the resolutions adopted by the Conference [*ibid., para. 17 (I)-(V)*], will be fully considered and carried forward effectively and without delay. On this objective, it seems to us, there is wide agreement. I shall therefore address myself chiefly to the question by what means we can best attain our common goal.

8. The Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States adopted a great number of recommendations and resolutions, most of which have far-reaching implications for the political and security interests of virtually all nations as well as for their economic and technological progress. They also touch upon the work of numerous United Nations agencies and other international bodies. We believe that in dealing with these recommendations we should bear in mind two basic considerations: first, that real results in the field of disarmament and security as well as in the peaceful uses of atomic energy can be achieved only through full co-operation between all States, those which have nuclear weapons and those which do not have such weapons; and second, that the machinery provided by the United Nations family of organizations must be fully engaged for the task of implementing the various proposals of the Conference.

9. With these considerations in mind the six delegations co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/L.450 believe that the Governments of Member States and the international bodies concerned should be accorded the opportunity to give full and serious consideration to the recommendations addressed to them by the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States. We suggest that the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency and other international bodies, including of course the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, be invited to report to the Secretary-General on action taken by them concerning the recommendations, so as to enable the Secretary-General to submit a comprehensive report, based on the information supplied by those concerned, for consideration at the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

10. We also propose that the General Assembly take up the suggestion contained in resolution G of the Conference [*ibid., para. 17 (IV)*], requesting the Secretary-General to appoint a group of experts, chosen on a personal basis, to prepare a full report on all possible contributions of nuclear technology to the economic and scientific advancement of the developing countries. We expect that the group of experts would naturally take advantage of the experience of the International Atomic Energy Agency in preparing their report. This report would also be transmitted to Governments of Member States in time to permit its consideration at the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

11. The steps we have proposed would enable us at the twenty-fourth session, some ten months from now, to discuss what further measures should be taken to implement proposals made by the Conference of the Non-Nuclear-Weapon States on the basis of a thorough examination of all the implications of those recommendations. At that time we could also usefully consider the question of convening a meeting of the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations for the purpose of discussing disarmament and arms control measures designed to strengthen the security of nations.

12. The delegations sponsoring the draft resolution which I have the honour to introduce have reached the conclusion after extensive consultations that the procedure I have outlined provides us with realistic and practical, and therefore effective, means by which the significant effort of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States can be carried forward in a manner that ensures the constructive

co-operation of all nations. This we believe is the method best designed to help us attain our common objective.

13. Mr. PORTER (United Kingdom): I have asked for the floor to comment briefly on four of the draft resolutions before us: draft resolutions A/C.1/L.449, L.450 and L.451 on the non-nuclear Conference and draft resolution A/C.1/L.448/Rev.1, on general and complete disarmament.

14. I should like first to say something about draft resolutions A/C.1/L.449, L.450 and L.451 on the non-nuclear Conference. We have also just received draft resolution A/C.1/L.452.

15. My Government welcomes the general approach of draft resolution A/C.1/L.450 submitted by Australia, Austria, Canada, Finland, Japan and the Netherlands, and just introduced by the representative of Finland. Although we have reservations about some parts of it, we nevertheless support its broad objective and appreciate the spirit in which it is being put forward.

16. The non-nuclear Conference referred proposals on the civil uses of nuclear energy, including peaceful explosions, and on further measures of disarmament, to certain competent international bodies. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.450 provides for the reports of those bodies to be forwarded to the Secretary-General so that we can consider implementation at the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly. In the view of my delegation, this is the right procedure; it will give us the opportunity at our next session to examine progress made and to decide on the basis of reports by competent experts what further action may be necessary.

17. My delegation will vote for draft resolution A/C.1/L.450.

18. I should like to assure the representative of Cyprus that the problems raised by draft resolution A/C.1/L.449 are of great concern to us all. However, this draft resolution would give the Disarmament Commission tasks far beyond its mandate or purpose, and we hope that it will not therefore be pressed to a vote.

19. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.451 is, in the view of my delegation, defective in several respects. I should like to mention just three of our reasons for thinking so.

20. First, whereas draft resolution A/C.1/L.450 recommends that the Secretary-General place the question of implementation of the results of the non-nuclear Conference, including convening of a meeting of the Disarmament Commission, on the agenda of twenty-fourth session, draft resolution A/C.1/L.451 requests the Secretary-General to consult Member States to ascertain their preference on the alternatives of convening a meeting of the Disarmament Commission either not later than July 1969 or after the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly and before March 1970. We strongly oppose the timing suggested in draft resolution A/C.1/L.451. In our view it is too early now to fix a date or even alternative dates for a meeting of the Disarmament Commission. This can be done only in the light of the reports received from the competent bodies, which are unlikely to be available for our consideration.

much before the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

21. My second reason concerns the mandate given to the Disarmament Commission in draft resolution A/C.1/L.451. In the view of my delegation, co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy is more appropriately dealt with by the International Atomic Energy which, unlike the Disarmament Commission, was created for that purpose. To give this additional function to the Disarmament Commission would, in our view, be to interpolate an unnecessary intermediary between the Agency and the General Assembly.

22. Finally, in section I, paragraph 4, of the draft resolution there is a request for the

“... prompt attention and full co-operation of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Atomic Energy Agency as regards ways and means for the implementation of the programmes and measures contemplated in resolution J”.

This paragraph seems to assume that the two organizations referred to have accepted as a matter of course the programmes and measures contemplated in resolution J [*ibid.*] whereas, resolution J in fact recognizes, the organizations themselves must take that decision.

23. These are three of the reasons why we cannot accept draft resolution A/C.1/L.451.

24. In conclusion, I should like to introduce briefly an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/L.448/Rev.1 on general and complete disarmament. We propose the addition of a new fourth preambular paragraph which would read:

“Noting with satisfaction the agreement of the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of the United States of America to enter into bilateral discussions on the limitation and the reduction of both offensive strategic nuclear weapons delivery systems and systems of defence against ballistic missiles.”

25. We feel that the draft resolution would not be complete without a reference to that agreement. These talks could be an important step towards the halting of the nuclear arms race and therefore towards our ultimate aim of general and complete disarmament.

26. I hope that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution can accept the amendment and that it will have the Committee's approval.

27. The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the next speaker, I wish to inform the Committee that New Zealand has now become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/L.444 and Add.1-7. The number of the co-sponsors of that draft resolution therefore is now twenty-two.

28. Mr. HUSAIN (India): We have just listened to the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom relating to draft resolution A/C.1/L.448/Rev.1, in regard to general and complete disarmament. As a co-sponsor of that draft resolution, I have already been in touch with the other eight co-sponsors and I am glad to say that all nine

co-sponsors agree to accept the addition proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom of a fourth preambular paragraph of that draft resolution. This may therefore be done, and we have no objection.

29. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Yesterday [1631st meeting] I read out to the Committee the text of the draft resolution submitted to this Committee by the delegations of the People's Republics of Hungary and Bulgaria [A/C.1/L.452].

30. Today I should like to give some explanations with regard to that draft resolution. I emphasized yesterday already that we had submitted it because the texts submitted by other delegations were so drafted that they did not meet the present situation nor the general desire to discuss draft resolutions concerning those particular points in the work of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States that can receive general acceptance among the Members of our Organization.

31. Indeed, all these draft texts, in our opinion, as will readily be apparent on reading them, are not such as to make any contribution to the objectives of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. On the contrary, that Treaty does not seem to be mentioned in any of these draft texts, perhaps because certain objections have been raised either by some of the sponsors or by certain delegations whose wishes had to be met. We believe that all our work here, just as in the case of the work that was done at the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapons States, should give a new impetus to the speedy ratification and implementation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, so that the countries which participated in the drafting and the signing of that Treaty may enjoy the benefits resulting from it, both from the point of view of disarmament and of the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

32. In all the drafts I have just mentioned—and this is one of the reasons why we cannot agree to them—it is provided that a meeting of the Disarmament Commission may be requested to study the questions discussed at the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States.

33. We do not believe that the Disarmament Commission, which had precisely the same membership as our Committee—126 members as in the First Committee and in the General Assembly—should, in addition to its present tasks, and especially concurrently with our Committee, undertake to deal with the work of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States. We believe that that work could be done here by our Committee and by the General Assembly. If necessary, the General Assembly itself could decide to have a special session during which the First Committee could be called upon to meet to discuss these questions.

34. Furthermore, what is important—as the speaker before last emphasized—is that in two of those draft resolutions it is proposed that the Disarmament Commission should be entrusted with tasks which are not within its sphere of competence, namely, with dealing with the peaceful uses of atomic energy which, as we have already stressed in one of our previous statements [1616th meeting] would be infringing on the work of other United Nations bodies. That would mean that the Disarmament Commission,

which is a disarmament body, would have to deal with the peaceful uses of atomic energy and other aspects of that problem, though there are other United Nations organs which deal with that question and the General Assembly can always be convened to discuss it or can discuss it at a regular session.

35. The intentions of those who insist on convening the United Nations Disarmament Commission may be seen from the statements made here, first by the representative of Italy, who, in his statement yesterday said:

“It seems to us that very little purpose could be served by convening the Disarmament Commission for the sole purpose of dealing only with disarmament”,—and yet it is a Disarmament Commission—“leaving aside the problems of security and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.”
[1630th meeting, para. 102.]

36. That is precisely what we, for our part, regard as not necessary. We consider that the question of the peaceful uses of atomic energy could be discussed by other bodies, since there are bodies in the United Nations dealing with such questions.

37. The same reasoning was used by the representative of Brazil—my neighbour on my left—who said that his delegation had not changed its opinion since work had begun and that it wanted the *ad hoc* committee, which was to be set up and which would infringe on the competence of existing United Nations organs and institutions, to have the terms of reference laid down for it. He wished the Disarmament Commission to have the same tasks as the *ad hoc* Committee. It would merely be a special Committee set up under the aegis of the Disarmament Commission. He said in this connexion:

“We have not changed our views, but we have restricted the scope of our claims in keeping with the spirit of conciliation and compromise, as it was felt in some quarters that it would be more convenient to utilize one of the existing bodies in the machinery of the United Nations. That explains the recourse to the Disarmament Commission which has been inactive for several years.”
[Ibid., para. 110]

38. These are so many reasons why we cannot accept these draft resolutions and that is why we have introduced the draft resolution circulated as document A/C.1/L.452. In it we have tried to include all the necessary elements which would secure the votes of those who really wish to promote the earliest possible implementation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which has already been signed. We have also endeavoured to include all the useful points brought out at the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States so as to make a real contribution to the work that should be undertaken if progress is to be made in disarmament—including non-proliferation of nuclear weapons—as well as in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

39. The Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States held at Geneva from 29 August to 28 September 1968 adopted several resolutions as well as a Declaration *[A/7277, para. 17]*. A certain number of proposals made in the resolutions adopted at that Conference are constructive and should be carefully studied with a view to their imple-

mentation. Some of those proposals are to be found in resolution D on bilateral discussions between the Soviet Union and the United States. By your leave, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read some of the provisions of that resolution. Paragraph 3 reads as follows:

(The Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States,) “Recalling that article VI of the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons embodies an undertaking of the Parties to the Treaty to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament.”

The operative paragraph of that same resolution:

“Urge the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to enter at an early date into bilateral discussions on the limitation of offensive strategic nuclear-weapon delivery systems and systems of defence against ballistic missiles.”

40. I was able to give the views of my delegation on these important questions at some length at yesterday's meeting *[1631st meeting]* and so I need not dwell on them now.

41. Another resolution which we think deserves particular attention is resolution G on the appointment of “a group of experts . . . to prepare a full report on all possible contributions of nuclear technology to the economic and scientific advancement of the developing countries”.

42. We believe that the resolution our Committee will adopt on agenda item 96 of this session should reaffirm what is said in paragraph 2 of the resolution I have just mentioned regarding “the desirability of taking advantage of the experience of the International Atomic Energy Agency in preparing the report”.

43. The delegation of Bulgaria believes that resolution I whereby the International Atomic Energy Agency is to “. . . undertake to examine the basis on which arrangements can be made by the Agency to secure finances from international sources for the creation of a ‘Special Nuclear Fund’ . . .” is a proposal of great importance to many countries, more particularly to developing countries.

44. We also wish to mention resolution M which:

“Requests all nuclear-weapon States and those non-nuclear-weapon States which are in a position to do so, to provide access for students and scientists for purposes of training and acquisition of knowledge on a non-discriminatory basis to their scientific institutions and nuclear establishments engaged in research and development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.”

45. It is only natural that the constructive proposals adopted at the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States should be implemented so as to contribute to the attainment of the goals of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We believe also that a thorough examination of the recommendations of the Conference is called for on the part of the Governments of Member States as well as of the international organizations to which those recommendations are addressed. It is with that end in mind that the delegation of Bulgaria, together with the delegation of Hungary, has introduced draft resolution A/C.1/L.452. In that draft, with which representatives have already been

able to acquaint themselves, the Secretary-General of the United Nations is requested to transmit the resolutions and the declaration of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States to the Governments of States Members of the United Nations, the International Atomic Energy Agency, to the specialized agencies concerned and to other international organizations concerned. At the same time we propose that the Secretary-General should ask the International Atomic Energy Agency, the specialized agencies concerned and other international bodies concerned to give careful consideration to the recommendations addressed to them by the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States and to include information on the results of that consideration in their annual reports to the General Assembly.

46. The Secretary-General is also requested to appoint a group of experts, about which I have just spoken, to prepare a full report on all possible contributions of nuclear technology to the economic and scientific advancement of the developing countries. Our delegation believes that the Secretary-General should submit to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session a report on the results of the consideration by the International Atomic Energy Agency, the specialized agencies concerned and other international bodies concerned, of the recommendations of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States.

47. The adoption of the draft resolution, the main points of which I have just outlined, would, in the opinion of the Bulgarian delegation, represent a new contribution to the solution of the problems presented by the major discoveries in the field of nuclear science and nuclear technology. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria attaches particular importance to the possibility of ensuring international co-operation so as to strengthen the security of States, extend international co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and facilitate and promote to that end a wide exchange of scientific information.

48. The draft resolution we have submitted represents, in the opinion of our delegation and of the sponsors, the common denominator of all the wishes expressed here and of all the trends that prevailed both at the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States and in our Committee in respect of the measures to be taken for the implementation of the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and for the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

49. All the provisions in this draft resolution are constructive and appeal to all delegations. That is why, on behalf of its sponsors, I call on all the members of the Committee to vote in favour of that draft resolution so that we may help to bring about the speediest possible ratification of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and assist in the work to be done in the future so that mankind may benefit from the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

50. Mr. SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): I want to state for the record that my delegation has taken note of the suggestion just made by the representative of Bulgaria that a special session of the General Assembly could be convened to deal with the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States. I consider that this is a very important suggestion and I shall transmit it to my Government urgently.

51. May I add that my delegation, after giving full consideration to that suggestion, may speak about it again in the near future.

52. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): I have asked to speak again in order to clarify a point. I understand the desire of the delegation of Brazil that a special session should be convened immediately if possible, to examine these questions.

53. Actually, my delegation considers that the discussion of these questions should be taken up only after prolonged study and after the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons has come into force, without any recourse to a special session, for example after the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly. There is thus no need now to hold a special session of the Disarmament Commission, which would be premature, useless and likely to delay the ratification, and therefore the implementation, of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. That is not our aim and that is why we have suggested that we should reconsider these problems only after they have been studied thoroughly.

54. I think that this clarification will enable the representative of Brazil to understand what we meant in our statement.

55. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): At the present stage of our examination of disarmament questions, the Byelorussian delegation will confine its remarks to the draft resolution on the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States submitted by the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Italy, Pakistan and Yugoslavia [A/C.1/L.451].

56. Study of the six-Power draft resolution leaves one with the impression that the authors have become so far divorced from reality as to overlook the existence of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, a treaty approved by the General Assembly and signed by over eighty States, and to ignore the need to make it enter into force at an early date. The basic idea of the draft resolution is to divert the General Assembly from the measures that should be taken under the Treaty. The authors of the draft have also failed to take it into account that when it was decided to convene the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States there was a general and clear understanding that the Conference must in no way hinder efforts to achieve the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. All these considerations are being discarded, and the draft resolution speaks only of approval and implementation of the recommendations of the Conference.

57. Without going into the substance of these recommendations at the present stage, I would merely note that the ninety-two delegations which adopted those recommendations included twenty-eight delegations from countries which still have not signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and that five of the six co-sponsors of the draft resolution before us are of their number. Furthermore, forty States Members of the United Nations did not take part in the work of the Conference; nuclear Powers were represented merely by observers. It should also be emphasized that not one of the Conference's

resolutions was adopted unanimously, that eight of them were supported by fewer than half of the States Members of the United Nations, and that not one resolution was endorsed by two thirds of the States Members of the United Nations. It would seem, therefore, that the results of the Conference should be carefully examined, the substance of these recommendations studied, the reasons for disagreements looked into, etc.

58. In disregard of these facts, the authors of the draft resolution ask us to approve forthwith the recommendations of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States and it is only after such approval that the Secretary-General is to transmit the recommendations to Governments "for due consideration"—in other words, we are invited to approve them without having considered them. A similar approach is used in those paragraphs of the draft resolution which request the International Atomic Energy Agency and other organizations to carry out the Conference's recommendations or invite the Secretary-General of the United Nations to prepare various reports. This is being done without so much as ascertaining the views of Governments or international organizations, without taking into account the programmes of work of the IAEA and other organizations, or considering the means at their disposal, their competence, and their earlier and permanent obligations. Moreover, the sponsors of the draft resolution expect all these things to be done without delay and reported on to the next session of the General Assembly.

59. The question of convening the United Nations Disarmament Commission is decided in a highly original manner, the Commission's terms of reference being changed, as it were, in passing. We are asked only one question: Should a meeting of that Commission be called before July 1969 or before March 1970? But it is being decided in advance that the Disarmament Commission is to be transformed from an organ of the United Nations into an organ for the implementation of the recommendations of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States—something that is entirely outside its sphere of competence.

60. By way of camouflage we are told that, in settling the question of the date on which the Disarmament Commission should be convened, we should take into account the reports of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and also of the International Atomic Energy Agency and other concerned organizations. But is it not a matter of common knowledge that the IAEA will hold its session after the opening of the General Assembly session or that many of the other reports will be submitted only while the General Assembly session is in progress.

61. This does not seem to trouble the authors of the draft resolution, who also attach no great importance to such comments as Governments may have to make. They propose that, without waiting for such comments, we should decide that the Disarmament Commission should—and I quote—

"...ensure by appropriate means continuous and efficient efforts in these fields"—

fields, I would add, which are not within its competence.

62. The six-Power draft resolution, in violation of the United Nations Charter, would oblige the Secretary-General to approach and collaborate with States which are not Members of the United Nations; not all such States, however, but only a chosen few. For example, he would have to collaborate with the Federal Republic of Germany, which has not signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and which is eager to build up a nuclear arsenal, but he must not even think of establishing contact with the German Democratic Republic, which has signed the Treaty.

63. For all these reasons, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR deems the draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Italy, Pakistan and Yugoslavia to be totally unacceptable and will vote against it.

64. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia). Since no other representative wishes to speak, I do not wish to take up the time of the Committee in presenting my point of view on the immediate draft resolutions, but having heard the protagonists of two draft resolutions on the question of non-proliferation and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, noting that the representative of the Byelorussian SSR stated categorically that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution which he mentioned *[A/C.1/L.451]*, and noting the explanation by the representative of Bulgaria of the draft resolution which he co-sponsored with the delegation of Hungary *[A/C.1/L.452]*, I think that there is a chasm which cannot be bridged. It is categorical. Some delegations will vote against one draft resolution, and others against the other draft resolution. Therefore, we find ourselves in the same position as we were in even before the Conference in Geneva. The differences in position have not changed at all. I do not know whether the co-sponsors of both draft resolutions would find it advisable to meet over the weekend and try to bridge the differences, if they are bridgeable—and I am not sure that they are.

65. What is the use of confronting us with two draft resolutions such as we have before us and dividing the Assembly into two camps? Perhaps some compromise could be worked out if they were to meet over the weekend.

66. On the other hand, I must say that there may be new political alignments in the world among those possessing nuclear weapons and those who have not seen fit to participate in our work. I mean mainland China. It is quite possible that there may be new alignments, and we in Asia cannot make up our minds as of now—I mean those of us who abstained on the treaty—about which draft resolution we should support.

67. Therefore, may I, through the Chairman, appeal to the respective sponsors to present us with something that might be a workable paper or a workable draft resolution, instead of assuming the same positions which we had before.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.