

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1642nd  
MEETING**

Monday, 16 December 1968,  
at 3 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 25:	
The Korean question ( <i>concluded</i> ):	
(a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;	
(b) Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;	
(c) Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations;	
(d) Need to put an end to the discussion in the United Nations on the unification of Korea . . . . .	1
Organization of work . . . . .	10

**Chairman: Mr. Piero VINCI (Italy).**

**AGENDA ITEM 25**

**The Korean question (*concluded*):**

- (a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/7212, A/C.1/L.966, 967, 968 and Corr.1 and 2, 970-972, 975, A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1);
- (b) Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/7182 and Add.1-4; A/C.1/L.966, 967, 968 and Corr.1 and 2, 970-972, 975, 977, 978, A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2);
- (c) Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations (A/7184 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.1/L.966, 967, 968 and Corr.1 and 2, 970-972, 975, 977, 978, A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1);
- (d) Need to put an end to the discussion in the United Nations on the unification of Korea (A/7227, A/C.1/977, 978, A/C.1/L.461)

1. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has before it four draft resolutions on item 25, the Korean question, namely, A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2 and A/C.1/L.461. Before proceeding to the vote, I shall call on those delegations which have asked to explain their votes before the voting takes place. I call on the representative of Australia.

2. Mr. SHAW (Australia): The Australian delegation wishes to give a very brief explanation of vote on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2 and A/C.1/L.461.

3. The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1 calls for the withdrawal of foreign forces from South Korea. Amongst the co-sponsors of that draft resolution are at least four Members of the United Nations which have participated recently in the armed occupation

of a neighbouring State. Members of this Committee can well distinguish between the presence of forces within a country at the request of that country and at the behest of the United Nations, and a situation in which forces have been moved unwanted and uninvited into another country and those responsible have denied the right of the United Nations even to discuss the matter.

4. The Australian delegation will oppose any moves to require withdrawal of forces from the Republic of Korea unless the Government of that country so asks and the purposes for which they were sent have been fulfilled. If the United Nations forces were to leave Korea, they would withdraw thousands of miles away and once again leave a situation in which the encouragers of North Korea could act quickly to support further aggression, as they did in 1950. Indeed the persistency with which the co-sponsors of document A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1 press for the departure of the United Nations forces from that area has an ominous and sinister significance. We fear the purport and intent of that draft resolution and we will vote against it.

5. The Australian delegation will vote also against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2 which is really a supplement to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1. That in document A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2 demands the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK).

6. We oppose that draft resolution because it also is designed to open the way to further acts of aggression in North-East Asia free from objective observation by any impartial international body. We saw last year the consequences of the withdrawal of a United Nations presence from a troubled area. When the supporters of A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2 speak about a solution of the Korean problem, we fear that they mean the sort of solution which was attempted in 1950—the unification by force of arms of the whole of Korea under northern rule. We believe that there are other preferable alternative solutions to the Korean problem, namely, that solution envisaged by the United Nations itself and put forward in draft resolution A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1.

7. The Australian delegation addressed itself also to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.461, which would decide that the Korean question should no longer be discussed in the United Nations. The language used in this draft is in direct contradiction to the facts. The repeated assertions of the delegations which have co-sponsored this resolution, to the effect that it was the United Nations forces who were the aggressors in 1950, are not only untrue but offensive to those sixteen Member nations of the United Nations who supplied forces which

made sacrifices in helping the Korean people to resist aggression from North Korea in 1950. The history books of totalitarian States may readily be rewritten to suit their policies, but the facts of world history and the records of the United Nations are not so easily turned upside down.

8. The sponsors of this document, A/C.1/L.461, argue that the unification of Korea is simply an internal affair of the Korean nation. As I asked earlier, what would they say if in the case of divided Germany, acts of aggression, including the infiltration of large armed bands for assassination and sabotage, were being carried out from one part of Germany into the other? Would this simply be regarded as an internal matter of the German people? Or would it not be held, and rightly so, that the line of demarcation between East and West Germany has the status of an international boundary for the purpose of calling into effect the obligations of the United Nations in respect of non-interference and non-aggression? Why in this Assembly should one standard be applied in Europe and another in Asia.

9. In the light of these considerations the Australian delegation will vote against the resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2 and A/C.1/L.461. These resolutions would not lead to the situation which so many countries in the Asian and Pacific areas seek—a situation in which the many diverse countries of that area might come to respect one another's differences and live together in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. This would accord with the interests of the Asian and Pacific region, and indeed it would seem to us in the interests also of all the great Powers represented in this Assembly.

10. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan): Since I spoke in this Committee [*1639th meeting*] on 13 December, I have paid close attention to the statements of the speakers who followed me; I have also noted that a new draft resolution, A/C.1/L.461, has been introduced. The purport of what a number of those speakers said, and of the draft resolution I have just mentioned, is, in short, that the United Nations should disengage itself completely from Korea. To me this is absolutely incomprehensible because it is completely contrary to reason and common sense.

11. Everyone knows about the aggression launched against the Republic of Korea some eighteen years ago. Everyone knows that it was only the intervention of the United Nations, faithful to its highest duty under the Charter, which, at the request of the Republic of Korea, prevented the conflict resulting from the North Korean aggression from spreading and quite possibly engulfing the world in flames.

12. Everyone knows that a state of tension has persisted in the area since the Armistice, and has become more intense over the past year because of the belligerent activities of North Korea. Everyone knows that only the continued presence of the United Nations in Korea has prevented tension from mounting even further and, so perhaps very likely, leading once again to open conflict.

13. What, then, is it that the proponents of United Nations disengagement from Korea seek? Do they wish to see present tensions further intensified? Do they wish to

see the question of the reunification of Korea settled by force of arms? Do they repudiate the solemn principle of peaceful settlement enshrined in our Charter?

14. In the light of recent serious violations of the Armistice Agreement, and the repeated declarations of the North Korean Premier Kim Il Sung—which I do not think it necessary to quote, because many previous speakers have already done so—let us not be mistaken about the real but concealed intentions of North Korea.

15. Japan adheres to the Charter. We wish to seek the reunification of Korea brought about by peaceful means. We want everything possible done, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, to maintain the peace and security of the area. Accordingly, we are a co-sponsor of, and will vote for, draft resolution A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1. For the same reasons we strongly oppose draft resolutions A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2 and A/C.1/L.461, and will cast our vote against them.

16. Mr. PEDERSEN (United States of America): The United States will vote against the three draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2 and A/C.1/L.461. These resolutions, with almost identical co-sponsors, have one common aim. They seek to compel the United Nations to end its vital role in preserving peace and security in Korea, and in seeking the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea by peaceful means.

17. We have heard lengthy and repetitious attempts by the sponsors of these resolutions to justify their appeals for support—even to the extreme of rewriting history. However, no amount of sugar-coating can camouflage the bitter and dangerous pill they are attempting to peddle. Shorn of rhetoric, distortion and misstatement of fact, their objective is clear: remove the shield against renewed aggression that the United Nations Command provides; take away the unwelcome and impartial eyes that UNCURK casts on North Korean infiltration and terrorism under the guise of an alleged “spontaneous revolutionary struggle”; leave to the North Korean régime, no doubt with the support of its allies, the job of reunifying Korea by the means they know so well—the use of force; and even stop talking about Korea in the United Nations at all and leave it to its intended fate.

18. Not content with pre-emptory demands to “do away” with the United Nations in Korea because it “prevents the liquidation” of the problem, the Soviet representative on 13 December added to these objectives a blatant attempt to intimidate those countries which have contributed to the preservation of peace in Korea by their participation in UNCURK, a tactic likely to have no effect other than to underline the Soviet Union's disrespect for actions of this Organization which do not suit it.

19. We have also heard honeyed words testifying to the benign and peaceful nature of the North Korean régime. On 11 December [*1637th meeting*] we heard quoted the statement of that régime of 21 September to the effect that:

“Today peace in Korea is maintained only by the persevering efforts on the part of the Government of the

Democratic People's Republic of Korea." [See A/C.1/966.]

Later reference was made to the "lofty principles" which guide that régime.

20. We are, I believe, justified in asking what strange rape of language glorifies armed infiltration, subversion, terrorism, and attempted assassination as persevering efforts toward peace? What strange judgement to describe as "lofty" the principle enunciated by the Premier of the North Korean régime, Kim Il Sung, in his statement of 7 September, that:

"We are making full preparations to be mobilized in the decisive struggle to accomplish the national liberation and attain the cause of national unification . . . the decisive struggle can be brought to victory only by a forcible method."

21. In demanding that the United Nations end its vital role in Korea and that it withdraw its protective shield so that North Korea and its supporters can achieve reunification by force, the Soviet Union demonstrates its determination to exclude the United Nations from its responsibilities for peace and security in yet another area of the world, as it did at the time of the initial North Korean aggression and has done on subsequent occasions elsewhere, including South-East Asia, and most recently, Eastern Europe.

22. Rather than taking the irresponsible step of ending the United Nations role in Korea, we call on the United Nations for increased efforts to achieve its legitimate objectives. We call for respect for the Armistice Agreement<sup>1</sup> so frequently ignored by the North Korean régime. And we call for more frequent reports by the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea so that the Members of this Organization may be kept informed in a timely fashion of any further disruptions of peace and stability in Korea.

23. This Committee heard the representative of the Soviet Union last Friday make what I suppose was intended to be a clever offer to show a propaganda film of a press conference to which North Korea had subjected some of the crew of the *Pueblo*. This was a cynical and shameless effort to exploit the plight of an honourable and courageous group of men who have been held incommunicado by North Korea for nine months, and to whom the North Korean authorities have even refused access by unquestioned neutral representatives.

24. No doubt the Soviet Union, which has a great deal of experience with "confessions" made under closely controlled conditions, feels some confidence about what could be done with a film. If the Soviet Union wishes to lend itself to such a callous manoeuvre, I suggest that it show the film in the Soviet Mission, where its control not only of the film but of the environment would be complete. If the Soviet Union had truly desired to have the crew shed light on the *Pueblo* incident, it would have suggested that the Committee invite the crew to appear before it and express

their views openly. That the Soviet Union has pointedly not done.

25. The United States, I am authorized to say, is prepared to stand by the testimony of these men, freely given in circumstances free of intimidation and threat of reprisals. I wonder if the Soviet Union and its allies are prepared to do the same.

26. Finally, the supporters of the draft resolutions designed to compel the United Nations to give up its responsibilities for peace and security in the Far East have made frequent reference in their statements to the necessity of ending the "sterile" annual debate on this question. My delegation, and I am sure the vast majority in this chamber, would like nothing better than to see prevail in Korea the kind of circumstances—the attainment of peaceful unification and the absence of the use and the threat of use of force—which would make debates on the Korean question unnecessary. But if there is any sterility in our debates it comes not from the inadequacy of United Nations objectives which are sound and fully in accord with the Charter, nor from the fact that the Committee, in expressing a willingness to invite North Korea, has asked it to accept, as has the Republic of Korea, the competence of the United Nations to act on the matter. Any sterility stems from the rigidity and inflexibility of North Korea, and from its insistence upon the right to export a "revolutionary struggle" to the South, from the actions of a régime which sends assassination teams across armistice lines to murder the highest elected officials of its neighbour.

27. If the supporters of North Korea are genuinely concerned with the development of peace and stability in the area, if they are genuinely interested in the peaceful reunification of Korea, rather than introduce the kind of resolutions on which we are about to vote, they should prevail upon their North Korean friends to cease provocations, hostility and violations of the Armistice Agreement and urge them to co-operate in United Nations efforts to achieve peaceful reunification. Until that time, I am confident that the United Nations will not falter in its responsibilities.

28. There can be no more just and correct course for this Committee to take than to reject all the draft resolutions designed to abandon the Republic of Korea to the "revolutionary struggle" from the North.

29. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Now that the First Committee has concluded its discussion of questions relating to Korea and is about to proceed to the voting, the USSR delegation deems it necessary to state its views on the draft resolutions before us. Before so doing, however, it would declare once again that the discrimination shown the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in that its representative was denied the fundamental right of speaking in the First Committee at this session during the discussion of questions which are of direct concern to his country, is entirely inadmissible in the United Nations system.

30. My delegation vehemently protests against this unlawful and unjustifiable act, which is contrary to the most elementary concepts of justice and impartiality, the

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1953*, document S/3079, appendix A.

principles and provisions of the Charter, and the practice of United Nations organs. Such an act is not to be tolerated. The United States and its allies in armed intervention in the affairs of the Korean people have once again prevented the United Nations from examining the questions relating to Korea in a normal manner and from obtaining a first-hand and correct account of the position and policy of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with regard to the unification of Korea and the maintenance of peace in that land.

31. The discriminatory decision taken by the First Committee means that those imperialist forces which wish to perpetuate the division of Korea and maintain tension in the area have once again frustrated a serious consideration of the questions relating to Korea.

32. In this connexion, I would draw the Committee's attention to the statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea dated 1 December 1968 concerning this latest instance of discrimination against that country in that its representatives were not invited to take part in the discussion of the Korean question. One passage of this statement [A/C.1/978] reads:

"The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea resolutely condemns and rejects this United States imperialist manoeuvre as a violation of the United Nations principle itself and a gross infringement upon the sovereignty of the Korean people.

"Since the question of Korea is discussed at the United Nations, it is quite natural that the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the party directly concerned, should take part in it unconditionally".

33. Three questions of vital importance for the Korean people are being discussed at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly on the initiative of socialist, African and Asian countries: "Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations"; "Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea"; and "Need to put an end to the discussion in the United Nations on the unification of Korea". My delegation is deeply convinced that implementation of these proposals would be a major contribution to the peaceful political settlement of the Korean question.

34. These important issues have a direct bearing on the vital interests of the Korean people, a people sincerely desirous of peace and the re-unification of its divided homeland, the southern part of which has been under foreign occupation for fifteen years.

35. As our debate has shown, an increasing number of States are becoming convinced that the occupation of South Korea by the troops of the United States and its allies is a major obstacle to the unification of Korea and the free expression of the Korean people's will with regard to such highly important matters as unity and peace in its native land. No matter what feats of rhetoric the Australian advocates of United States occupation of Korea may perform, the whole world knows that this occupation is unjust and immoral.

36. The most recent events in Korea and Korean waters demonstrate that the heightening of tension in that area is the result of the continuing unlawful occupation of South Korea by United States forces and the expansion of provocative activities by these and by the South Korean forces against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

37. No matter how hard Mr. Pedersen, the United States representative, tries to justify that occupation and the activities in question, he cannot succeed.

38. If the situation in the area is to be brought back to normal and the proper conditions are to be created for the peaceful unification of Korea on a democratic basis, the United States and all other foreign forces must be withdrawn forthwith from the territory of South Korea.

39. The United Nations, for its part, must urgently adopt measures aimed at removing this major obstacle, which for so long a time has been obstructing the attainment of unity and peace in Korea and preventing the removal of a dangerous focus of tension in Asia. Such measures are being proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1.

40. The USSR delegation urges the First Committee to approve the draft resolution, submitted by fifteen delegations of socialist, African and Asian States Members of the United Nations. The crux of this proposal is the clearly formulated requirement for the withdrawal within a period of six months of all United States and other foreign military personnel, with their weapons and equipment, deployed in South Korea under the flag of the United Nations. A United Nations decision on the withdrawal of United States and other foreign forces from South Korea would help to remove one of the most dangerous focal points of international tension in the world and, at long last, open the way to a peaceful unification of the Korean nation without outside interference.

41. It was most convincingly shown in our debate that the imperialist forces are making use of that unlawful United Nations organ—the notorious United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea—to perpetuate the division of Korea and the occupation of South Korea by foreign forces.

42. Many delegations have clearly and convincingly demonstrated that this Commission is being used as a cover for the arbitrary rule of the foreign occupying forces in South Korea. The Commission is merely a tool for foreign interference in the affairs of the Korean people, and is being employed to legalize and perpetuate the occupation of South Korea and to frustrate the peaceful unification of the country by the Korean people itself on a democratic basis. As long experience teaches us, the Commission's annual reports serve the same purposes. All this is being done in order, contrary to the cornerstone principles and provisions of the United Nations Charter, to press through unlawful resolutions, which suit the United States and its partners in the occupation of South Korea, to continue the Commission in existence in order to lend to that occupation the name and the flag of the United Nations.

43. Because of these unlawful acts, after over twenty years of discussion of the so-called Korean question in the United

Nations, the cause of unification and restoration of peace in Korea has not advanced one inch. On the contrary, more and more obstacles are being placed in the way of the Korean people, new difficulties are being created, and the situation in Korea is further exacerbated.

44. The debate on questions relating to Korea both at the previous session and at the current session bears witness to the fact that an increasing number of States Members of the United Nations are coming to realize, firstly, what an unsavoury part is being played by the organ which still bears the fictitious title of United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea; secondly, that the existence of this unlawful organ is one of the principal obstacles to the unification of Korea; and, lastly, that this organ does serious harm to the United Nations by undermining its international prestige and authority. In the light of these considerations, the socialist, African and Asian countries in their draft resolution [A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2] propose the dissolution of this not merely useless, but actually harmful, Commission.

45. Many of the earlier speakers have rightly emphasized that the sooner a decision is taken to dissolve this Commission, the sooner will the way be opened to a peaceful unification of the Korean people.

46. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the United States has asked to speak on a point of order.

47. Mr. PEDERSEN (United States of America): I understand that the representative of the Soviet Union is now addressing himself, and has been for some minutes, to explanation of vote on a draft resolution of which his delegation is a co-sponsor. It is my understanding from the rules of procedure that explanation of vote is limited to explanation of vote on a draft resolution of which one is not a co-sponsor.

48. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the United States has asked me to remind the representative of the Soviet Union that co-sponsors do not speak in explanation of vote on draft resolutions of which they are co-sponsors.

49. I give the floor again to the representative of the Soviet Union.

50. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): That is the United States representative's interpretation; but I have the right to speak to these resolutions, which have been submitted to the Committee and are to be put to the vote, and that is why I am commenting on them.

51. As in previous years, the United States, jointly with its allies in aggression in Korea and the occupation of the southern part of the country, has submitted a draft resolution [A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1] to the Committee. The main purposes of that proposal are once again, and for one more year, or until the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly, to lend the name and flag of the United Nations to the continuing occupation of South Korea by the troops of the United States and its military allies, to prolong their interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people, and to paste the label of "legitimacy" on

this occupation and interference, this international violence and misrule, so that they may continue their campaign of slander, hostility and hatred against a socialist State—the Democratic People's Republic of Korea—in the name of the United Nations.

52. We have heard slanderous and hostile fabrications from Senator Symington, while today we heard a repetition of them in Mr. Pedersen's statement. As far as I was able to judge from his remarks, the United States and its friends will not allow a showing of the film of the press conference of foreign correspondents and the crew of the United States Navy spy ship *Pueblo*. And yet today when the representative of the South Korean puppet régime was making his third statement, United States officials employed in the Secretariat and particularly in public information services, organized a veritable floor show. Floodlights suddenly appeared, as did the possibility of filming the representative of the South Korean puppet régime while he was speaking.

53. How much longer will United States citizens on the Secretariat staff be allowed to act in such a high-handed fashion? Some time ago, a similar United States show was staged during Senator Cooper's statement, and today during the statement of that United States puppet, the representative of South Korea.

54. The USSR delegation believes that the time has come to put an end to this. We appeal to the Secretary-General, and to his representative, Mr. Narasimhan, who is in charge of General Assembly affairs, to stop this scandalous high-handedness on the part of United States officials, who take command and give orders in the United Nations Secretariat as if they were in their own house and who turn any Committee they please into an American show. While I am on the subject, I should like to invite members of the Committee to see in the USSR mission the film of the press conference of a group of foreign correspondents with the Captain and crew of the United States Navy spy ship *Pueblo*. They will then see in black on white, as they say and hear the *Pueblo*'s Captain tell in good English the story of the unlawful incursion of this United States spy ship into the territorial waters of Korea, including the purposes for which he and his crew were sent there and what intelligence, to be used against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, they collected. Plainly, so long as United States forces and the United States Command continue to act as masters in the territory of South Korea, such incidents will be repeated and tension in the area will continue to increase, and so will the threat to peace.

55. It is time for the First Committee and the General Assembly to arrive at this conclusion, despite the slanderous statements of the United States delegation and its supporters concerning the Democratic Republic of Korea, its peace-loving policy and its sincere desire to achieve the unification of Korea by peaceful means.

56. Even a cursory examination of the draft resolution submitted by the United States and its partisans reveals the fact that the United Nations is invited once again to follow the course, condemned by history and cursed by the Korean people, which is imposed on it year after year by the United States and its allies in the occupation of South Korea. The sponsors of the draft propose that the unlawful



Commission should be continued in existence and even activated. The occupation Powers are seeking once again to impose on the Assembly a resolution prolonging the occupation of South Korea by their forces under the flag of the United Nations.

57. As the experience of many years has shown, adoption of such resolutions, which ignore the interests of the Korean people, will not deceive anyone with regard to the true purposes of the United States in Korea or disguise the fact that the activities of the imperialist forces in Korea are hostile to the Korean people and endanger peace in the Far East.

58. The true task of the United Nations with respect to Korea is to see to it that the Korean people is afforded full opportunity to settle its own national affairs, without the presence of foreign troops in the country and without outside interference, under whatever name.

59. My delegation therefore appeals to the First Committee to reject this imperialist draft resolution. The USSR delegation, fully aware of its duty in the United Nations and of its great responsibility for the destinies of the Korean people and peace in the Far East, will vote for the first three draft resolutions I have mentioned, and against the fourth [A/C.1/L.453].

60. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) (*translated from French*): In view of my Government's position on the Korean question, which was made known here in the course of last year's debate [1520th meeting], my delegation will abstain from voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1 and A/C.1/L.461. It will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1-2. With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1, we request a separate vote on operative paragraph 5. If our request for a separate vote is granted, we shall vote against that paragraph, and abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole. However, if our request, contrary to practice, is not granted, we shall be obliged to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1.

61. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): My delegation would like to explain briefly our position in regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2 and A/C.1/L.461.

62. We all know about the increasing military and provocative activities directed at the Republic of Korea during the past few years, and to what degree the threat from the North long ago became a real menace to the security and independence of the Republic of Korea. All these three draft resolutions have one common objective in mind, that is to say the total elimination of the United Nations from Korea as well as the total abandonment of the Republic of Korea to the aggressive and expansionist policies of North Korea.

63. I should like to ask the indulgence of the Committee while I read out certain excerpts from an article published in *The New Republic* of 16 November of this year, 1968, so as to be able to explain my position more clearly in regard to those draft resolutions. As you know, the publication *The New Republic* has a rather high standing among those

Americans who call themselves liberals, so there is no need for me to explain further the credentials of this particular publication. The article in question was written by Mr. Russell Warren Howe, and I now quote from it:

"Now firing incidents occur daily in and around the 152-mile long, misnamed 'Demilitarized Zone' which crosses the country, two kilometers on either side of the demarcation line. The fighting is mostly with North Korean infiltrators and particularly exfiltrators trying to return home after sabotage and other missions conducted from landing spots on the coast of South Korea.

"Those who suspect that all these suicide-squad attempts at agitation, sabotage, or the preparation of future guerrilla bases mean that Kim plans war note that he has promised to 'reunify the country' by 1970."

The article goes on to say:

"... South Korea has become a 'capitalist miracle'. GNP now rises at 19 percent a year, quadrupling the economy every four years and promising a per capita income of about \$3,000 (Canada today) in 20 years, despite the fact that the population may have nearly doubled by then.

"... This is also a showcase territory for the UN Development Program, which has done remarkable work in the field of agriculture, forestry, fishing, nutrition and scientific research."

64. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the Soviet Union has raised a point of order. I now call on him.

65. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I was expecting the United States representative to tell us what all this has to do with explanations of vote. Since he has not done so, I shall ask the representative of Thailand what the reading out of magazine articles in the First Committee has to do with explanations of vote. Those of us who want to can read the articles in the periodical he mentioned. But to read such articles to us in a statement of explanation of vote, when the general debate is over, is somewhat unusual.

66. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the United States of America on a point of order.

67. Mr. PEDERSEN (United States of America): I had not thought of interrupting the representative of Thailand inasmuch as he was proceeding in accordance with the rules, and especially since the last time I called attention to rule 90, which says that the Chairman "shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment", the representative of the Soviet Union in effect said he would do whatever he wanted regardless of what the rule said.

68. The CHAIRMAN: I call again on the representative of Thailand.

69. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): As you may recall, Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of my reading of this article I did try to explain the reason for my doing so. I have two more paragraphs to go and I give my promise to the representative of the Soviet Union that my statement will be about one tenth as long as the statement he has just made.

70. The article goes on:

“One respected opinion in Seoul believes Kim’s warlike gestures, including the attempt on Park and the *Pueblo* seizure, are only aimed at deterring investment here. Others are not so sure. Kim”—that is, North Korea—“has 400,000 troops and a thousand aircraft, reportedly including MIG-23s. His army has the formidable PPS-43 Russian submachine gun.

“‘We and the North Koreans are the same people, equally stubborn and tough. We both want to reunify Korea’, says a scientific institute director who hopes for peace. ‘If the United States, and maybe Moscow’—and I am not so sure now—‘weren’t counselling patience, we would have slaughtered each other long ago. We may still do so. After all, the final choice rests with us’.”

71. These words have such a meaningful message for all of us in this room; we who are trying to help the Korean people, both in the North and in the South, to achieve unification should not lose sight of the import and significance of this message. We should do everything we can to counsel patience and reunification by peaceful means, even without the co-operation of the Soviet Union and others. We should also not do anything—as is asked of us by the socialist group in draft resolutions A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2 and A/C.1/L.461—to upset the delicate situation in Korea. Indeed, we should do absolutely nothing to encourage—nay, to incite—the North Koreans to take actions which could result in the re-enactment of a large-scale armed conflict in Asia. Dissolution of the UNCURK, which symbolically represents the United Nations, the withdrawal of the United Nations forces at this time and under the present circumstances, and the unjustified ending of United Nations discussion of the question of Korea, would, in effect, be an open invitation to the North Koreans and their sponsors to intensify their aggressive military activities against the Republic of Korea. Surely, we cannot, in full consciousness of the facts and the dire consequences, allow ourselves to support or even to acquiesce in any draft resolution which may very well launch a major conflagration and adversely affect peace in that part of the world.

72. For these reasons, my delegation urges the Committee to reject categorically draft resolutions A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2 and A/C.1/L.461, which by various means and devices have one common objective, namely, total elimination of the United Nations from Korea and abandonment of the Republic of Korea to the North Korean aggressive and expansionist acts.

73. Mr. WILLIAMS (Sierra Leone): When Sierra Leone voted for draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1-4 on the question of inviting the two Koreas, we did so because we believed then—and we continue to believe now—that the way to solve a dispute between two parts of the same nation is to bring them together in a neutral atmosphere where tranquillity can reign and a way to peace and reunification can be found. For the same reason, we abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/L.423, since it did not fully meet our ideas for a solution to a problem which has been before the United Nations for twenty years.

74.. We believe that big-Power interests are a sizable part of the obstacles to a speedy solution of the Korean question.

75. Perhaps I can make this quite clear if I quote what my Minister for Foreign Affairs, the Hon. L. A. M. Brewah, said in the General Assembly on 8 October 1968, during the general debate. Speaking on the twin issues of Korean and Viet-Nam he said:

“... the concern of my Government over our failure in this Organization to fulfil our obligations to the People’s Republic of China in no way lessens the concern and anxiety we feel over the problems affecting the happiness, welfare and stability of the Korean and Viet-Nam Republics, respectively. We may be the least competent of States, at this juncture in time, to offer any form of counsel, least of all censure, to those powerful external forces whose ideological, military, strategic, economic and other undeclared interests have clearly militated against the settlement of these long-standing feuds between brothers of the same household. The unification of these two countries, Korea and Viet-Nam respectively, which, until less than twenty years ago, were each one and indivisible, their peoples, brothers and compatriots within one common body politic, is as much our concern as is the problem of any African State.

“The dedication of my Government to the principle of ‘malice towards none and charity to all’, leaves us with no other option but to join our voices with all peace-loving Member States which, in this Assembly over the years, have sought to arouse the conscience of the two super-Powers of the world, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, to relax the positions they have long held with respect to these two groups of States.

“Let us spare no energy, relax no effort, until the peace-loving peoples of Viet-Nam and Korea are once again united in their traditional bonds of harmony and fraternity.” [See 1686th plenary meeting, paras. 67, 68 and 69.]

76. Sierra Leone believes that the establishment of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and the presence of observers in Korea has helped to reduce the tension in the area and has contributed to a détente. What is needed is the urgent prodding of the two parts to seek a peaceful settlement leading to unification. We believe that the United Nations has a role to play and that the services of the Secretary-General can be better utilized than at present, due to the reluctance of all concerned. We therefore cannot support the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/L.461, which seeks to remove the item from the United Nations. Neither can we support draft resolution A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2, since it would dissolve the Commission, which we believe has played a role and can continue to do so. We cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1 for a similar reason. We would abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1, as we would on the others, as none of them contains the element of big power politics which, in our opinion, is a major factor in the whole Korean question.

77. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) (*translated from French*): The delegation of Dahomey would like to explain very briefly its vote on the various draft resolutions before us dealing with the Korean question.

78. The Government of Dahomey fully endorses the noble objectives of the United Nations in Korea, which are "to bring about by peaceful means, the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea, under a representative form of government and the full restoration of international peace and security in the area".

79. We do not believe that it is accurate to say that our Organization has nothing to do in Korea, and is interfering illegally in what does not concern it. In fact, though Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter does consider matters within the domestic jurisdiction of States as forbidden territory, that same Charter not only authorizes the United Nations but makes it its duty to deal with matters threatening international peace and security.

80. But the division of Korea after the Second World War created a potentially explosive situation which might at any time jeopardize international peace and security, unleashing a bloody catastrophe. So true is this that such a tragedy did break out in 1950 and lasted for three long years, costing many human lives and causing heavy material losses.

81. Such a tragedy might recur if the international community does not remain alert. In fact, we are deeply concerned at the present recrudescence of incidents between North and South Korea and we remain convinced that a United Nations presence in that region of the world is more necessary than ever today.

82. We respect, though we do not share, the views and arguments of those who, in good faith, want a withdrawal of the United Nations from Korea and support draft resolutions A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1 and A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1-2. But we cannot help having serious doubts about the consequences of such a withdrawal when, in these circumstances, we consider them in connexion with those who, in the name of liberation from the foreign yoke and non-interference in the domestic affairs of States, sharply condemn the presence of the United Nations in Korea, a presence which is symbolical, beneficial and desired by the Government of the Republic of Korea, whilst at the same time they themselves openly resort to military intervention elsewhere, not only without the consent, but against the declared will of the legitimate authorities of other States.

83. We do not see how the United Nations can in any way be an obstacle to the unification of Korea. As I already said six years ago in this same room [1306th meeting], the only unification which the United Nations opposes in Korea is a brutal unification by armed force of the type that was intended and tried in 1950 by North Korea, and which called for United Nations intervention as part of its duties for the maintenance of peace.

84. We are still convinced that a majority of the Members of our Organization do not wish to encourage a recurrence of such a drama, and far from wishing that the United Nations should dissociate itself from the situation in Korea, will on the contrary, encourage its efforts to achieve a peaceful unification of the country.

85. The delegation of Dahomey will therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1 and against draft resolutions A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1-2, and A/C.1/L.461.

86. The CHAIRMAN: This ends the list of delegations who have to speak before we vote. The representative of Poland has asked to speak on a point of order.

87. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland): I would like to make a proposal concerning the voting procedure. I would like to request that when we are voting on the four resolutions submitted on item 25 of the agenda, we may use the roll-call procedure vote.

88. The CHAIRMAN: A roll call has been asked for on all resolutions before the Committee on item 25. We will therefore proceed by a roll call. The first draft resolution to vote on is the one contained in document A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1. The representative of Upper Volta has asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 5 of that draft resolution.

89. Mr. PEDERSEN (United States of America): We have consulted the other co-sponsors of resolution A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1, and we have no objection to a separate vote on paragraph 5. Inasmuch as a separate vote has been requested for one paragraph of the resolution, we would also like paragraph 3 to be put to the vote separately.

90. The CHAIRMAN: A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 3 of the same draft resolution.

91. May I ask the representatives of the United States and Upper Volta whether they are also asking for a roll-call vote on these paragraphs?

92. It seems that that is not the case.

93. I am going to put to the vote operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1.

*Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 77 votes to 10, with 27 abstentions.*

94. The CHAIRMAN: I am going to put to the vote operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1.

*Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 72 votes to 25, with 21 abstentions.*

95. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Bulgaria has asked for the floor, I presume on a point of order.

96. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): This is not a point of order. I wish merely to explain my delegation's vote on the two paragraphs that have just been voted on separately before we vote on the draft resolution as a whole, since the separate vote on these two paragraphs could affect the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

97. The CHAIRMAN: May I remind the representative of Bulgaria that once we have started on the voting, one cannot interrupt the voting except to raise a point of order on the conduct of the voting. I am afraid I cannot give the representative of Bulgaria the floor on an explanation of vote. If he would like to speak on a point of order, I give him the floor.



98. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): When the delegation of the United States asked for the floor to request a separate vote on one of the paragraphs of the draft resolution, it wanted at all costs to submit that draft in a favourable light and to obtain more votes in its favour and in support of this paragraph which it was difficult, of course, to put to the vote in another way. As the United States delegation knew full well that many delegations will oppose other paragraphs and the entire draft resolution, it was determined to act as if that paragraph represented the whole draft resolution. But such a paragraph, inserted in a draft resolution as bad as this one, cannot have any influence on the development of the situation and on the manner of the voting which should take place here. In fact, if something more or less acceptable is inserted in an undesirable whole, the whole cannot thereby be made acceptable. That is why the delegation of Bulgaria—and I believe other delegations likewise—abstained in the separate vote requested by the delegation of the United States.

99. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of New Zealand on a point of order.

100. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, you still have to give your ruling on that so-called point of order raised by the representative of Bulgaria. I shall wait until you give your ruling, whether that was a point of order in connexion with the voting, before I comment on my opinion that this was an abuse of the rules of procedure.

101. The CHAIRMAN: To the request made by the representative of New Zealand, I think he is well experienced in the labours of the United Nations to know that we are rather flexible in interpretations of the rules, so I give him the floor.

102. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I will merely state my opinion that there is a certain limit to the flexibility imposed upon the Chairman under the rules of procedure, but will go on to say that the flexibility which was given in that case was taken advantage of to the point where it would constitute abuse of the orderly procedure of this Committee, since it was an explanation of the vote after the vote, and not a point of order in connexion with the conduct of the voting.

103. The CHAIRMAN: We will now proceed to vote upon the whole text of the draft resolution. A roll call has been asked for.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

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

*In favour:* Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China,

Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico.

*Against:* Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania.

*Abstaining:* Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Afghanistan, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Finland, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/L.453 and Add.1 as a whole was adopted by 72 votes to 23, with 26 abstentions.*

104. The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1. A separate vote has been asked on the fourth preambular paragraph, which reads as follows:

*“Confirming that at the meetings of the Security Council held on 25 and 27 June and 7 July 1950 no unanimous agreement was reached among the permanent members of the Security Council in the discussion of the Korean question,”.*

*The fourth preambular paragraph was rejected by 57 votes to 24, with 35 abstentions.*

105. The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote the other parts of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

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

*In favour:* Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania.

*Against:* Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand,

Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

*Abstaining:* Afghanistan, Austria, Burma, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Cyprus, Finland, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Maldive Islands, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Tunisia, Uganda, Upper Volta.

*The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.454 and Add.1 was rejected by 67 votes to 25, with 29 abstentions.*

106. The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/L.455 and Add.1 and 2.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

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

*In favour:* United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic.

*Against:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey.

*Abstaining:* Afghanistan, Burma, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Cyprus, Finland, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Maldive Islands, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Tunisia, Uganda.

*The draft resolution was rejected by 68 votes to 27 with 27 abstentions.*

107. The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to a vote draft resolution A/C.1/L.461.

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

*In favour:* Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq.

*Against:* Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland.

*Abstaining:* Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Cyprus, Finland, Ghana, India, Indonesia.

*The draft resolution was rejected by 70 votes to 24, with 28 abstentions.*

108. The CHAIRMAN: Are there any delegations that would like to speak now in explanation of their vote? As there are none, I should like to inform the Committee that we have now concluded our consideration of agenda item 25.

## ORGANIZATION OF WORK

109. The CHAIRMAN: On the basis of the decision previously taken, the Committee is now in a position to take up the remaining items relating to disarmament. The Committee will vote on the draft resolutions tomorrow morning. Are there any delegations that would like to speak now in explanation of their vote? As there are none, the Committee will proceed with explanations of vote before the vote tomorrow morning. I would ask those delegations wishing to speak before the vote to inscribe their names on the list of speakers in order that we may be able, if we finish the voting early enough in the morning, to take up the next item, which is the question of outer space. I would also request those delegations wishing to speak in the general debate on outer space to inscribe their names on the list of speakers, as we intend to conclude our consideration of that item in two or three meetings, at most.

*The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.*