

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1760th
 MEETING**

Friday, 13 November 1970,
 at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda items 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 93 and 94:	Page
Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (<i>continued</i>)	
Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (<i>continued</i>)	
Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (<i>continued</i>)	
Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: report of the Secretary-General (<i>continued</i>)	
Establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (<i>continued</i>)	
Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2456 B (XXIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) (<i>continued</i>)	
Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security (<i>continued</i>)	1

Chairman: Mr. Andrés AGUILAR M. (Venezuela).

AGENDA ITEMS 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 93 AND 94

Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7958, A/7960 and Corr.1, A/7961, A/8059-DC/233, A/C.1/1001 and 1010, A/C.1/L.523 and 528)

Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/8059-DC/233, A/8136, A/C.1/L.526 and 527)

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7967 and Add.1 and 2, Add.3 and Corr.1 and 2, Add.4, Add.5 and Corr.1 and 2, A/8059-DC/233, A/C.1/L.529 and 530)

Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/8079 and Add.1)

Establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (*continued*) (A/8080)

Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2456 B (XXIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) (*continued*) (A/7993 and Add.1 and 2, A/8076, A/C.1/L.522)

Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security (*continued*) (A/7994)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia): I should like first of all to preface my statement by expressing my profound shock and that of my delegation at the very sad news of the death of a great man and a great world leader, General Charles de Gaulle. He was a leader who fought for equality and justice for mankind. In Africa, particularly, the memory of his decisions on matters of colonial liquidation will remain indelible. May his soul rest in peace.

2. The report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [A/8059-DC/233] is a commendable document. I would therefore at the outset wish to add my sincere appreciation of the Conference's continuing devotion in this difficult task.

3. For a quarter of a century now, the world has unhappily lived with the problem of disarmament. During this commemorative session, hope of resolving the problem seems even farther away from our grasp. Instead, as the Secretary-General reminds us in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization,¹ new and more sophisticated nuclear weapons are continuing to be developed and each of the super-Powers has built up the capacity of its arsenal to achieve the physical destruction of the other at least 10 to 15 times over.

4. The logic of this mad race in nuclear arms is most dangerous to humanity, for it aims at the complete destruction of man by man himself. What is the reason behind all this? This is the question the world has been asking for the past 25 years and still no one seems to have heard it, no matter how loudly it is asked.

5. I should like to reiterate what many delegations that have spoken before me have pointed out already. That is that there appears to be a growing tendency on the part of the big Powers to shift emphasis from the crucial question of disarmament to one of non-armament, alias preventive disarmament. This kind of trend is most unfortunate, since

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 1A.

it obviously digresses from the major objective in the question of disarmament, namely, the start of a more meaningful determination by the big Powers to put an end to the ever escalating nuclear arms race.

6. I should like to stress that my delegation considers it a fallacious approach to think that, by disarming those who are already disarmed, a peaceful world order will of necessity be ensured.

7. I should like to cite here a provision of the Foreign Assistance Act of the United States Government, which highlights this unfortunate trend towards the non-armament of small nations. Section 119 of the Act states:

“The President is directed to withhold economic assistance in an amount equivalent to the amount spent by any underdeveloped country for the purchase of sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes from any country . . . unless the President determines that such purchase or acquisition of weapons systems is important to the national security of the United States and reports within thirty days each such determination to the Congress.”

8. Whatever the intention may have been when this decision was made, it can have only one meaning; that is, that underdeveloped countries must be left totally without arms for the defence of their territorial integrity and that if the small nations should be attacked, some big brother will fly in to defend them. It is extremely difficult for my delegation to have any confidence in this kind of policy, especially considering that on 17 September 1970 the United States Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Mr. David D. Newsom, announced in Chicago that the United States had decided to license the sale of executive planes of the Lear Jet type to the South African military. Furthermore, the announcement came soon after the summit meetings of the Organization of African Unity and the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which has just passed strong resolutions condemning the intention of the British Conservative Government to resume the sale of arms to South Africa. The argument that the jets involved in this decision are civilian planes is most unconvincing. The fact of the matter is that these aircraft are to be sold to the South African military establishment, and obviously they are to be used for military purposes; indeed the Lear Jet is a very versatile, if not sophisticated, machine.

9. I should also like to reiterate what my President, Mr. Kenneth Kaunda, said in his statement to the General Assembly on 19 October 1970 [1872nd plenary meeting] regarding the British intention to resume the sale of arms to South Africa. He pointed out that to supply arms to South Africa was to cast a vote for *apartheid*, supporting South African expansionism and dominance, and that it also meant giving South Africa authority to establish its military presence in the rest of southern Africa.

10. I want here to make reference to the British argument that their intention to resume the sale of arms is motivated by the threat of the Soviet naval presence in the Indian Ocean—a trade route to which the West attaches a good deal of importance. According to my information, the naval

strength of the USSR stands at over 450,000, and that of South Africa is about 3,500. Included in the South African figure is a Citizen Force unit of about 1,250 men still under training. To me it seems paradoxical, therefore, that even with South Africa showing the best will in the world, such a small navy should be expected to be able to defend the interests of the Western Powers against the odds of such an enormous USSR navy. Quite frankly, I think that Britain will have to come up with a more credible argument. I should like therefore to request the British delegation to repeat our appeal to Westminster to withhold a decision on this issue in order to avoid a possible racial conflagration in southern Africa.

11. In the statement made by my delegation last year [1702nd meeting], we welcomed the opening of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) in November 1969. I should like to point out that my delegation still welcomes these very significant talks. It is my earnest hope that, with goodwill on both sides, some far-reaching decisions can emerge from them. However, as the Secretary-General has pointed out, these talks can only be more meaningful and realistic if they include other nuclear States in the deliberations. In this connexion, I would strongly urge the two super-Powers to consider the possibility of involving the People's Republic of China, France and other potential nuclear nations in the talks. Although hope is a word that has lost much of its real meaning and impact, I should like to wish those concerned every success in their efforts, and to appeal to them to strive to achieve something realistic during the period of the Disarmament Decade.

12. Like the representatives of Yugoslavia and Indonesia in their statements on this item, I wish to make a brief reference to the recent Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in September in the capital of Zambia. At this important Conference, the Heads of State or Government reaffirmed their resolve to co-operate among themselves and with other States in the drawing up of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. They agreed on priorities which they considered could be of help in working out a programme, and these are outlined in the Declaration on Disarmament adopted at that Conference. I would therefore like to appeal to representatives of this Committee to peruse the Lusaka Declaration on the question of disarmament.

13. Although my delegation is extremely concerned at the growing tendency to lay emphasis on non-armament rather than genuine disarmament, my delegation is not unhappy to see the present form of the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof [A/8059-DC/233, annex A]. Comparing the draft with the one that was under consideration last year,² it is quite evident that both the delegations of the USSR and the United States of America have adopted a very encouraging and accommodating attitude. It can be seen that a number of points brought up in the criticisms voiced by many delegations last year, including those of the non-aligned countries, have been

² Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1969, document DC/232, annex A.

incorporated in the present draft. However, it seems to me that the main issue, that of disarmament of the sea-bed, has not been comprehensively covered in the draft. I also consider that the wording of article VIII of the draft treaty, which makes withdrawal of States parties from the treaty optional, has rather unsettling connotations. If a State party can consider it is jeopardizing its national interests by fulfilling the obligations laid down in the treaty, and if in such an event the State party can give notice to withdraw from the treaty, this raises the possibility that the national interests in question might well be based on reasons other than the peaceful use of the sea-bed and ocean floor. However, my delegation concedes that there are difficulties involved in attempting to draw up a draft treaty which would be wholly acceptable. It will not, therefore, hamper any efforts that may be made during the current session to have the treaty adopted by the General Assembly. In this regard, I sincerely hope that the amendments submitted by Burma, Ethiopia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sweden, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia [*ibid.*, annex C, sect. 26] will be favourably considered.

14. I should now like to address myself briefly to the question of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*]. Zambia's stand remains unchanged, namely, that we still have reservations about the efficacy of the non-proliferation Treaty and cannot therefore sign it. Although the Treaty came into force on 5 March 1970, it is still essentially a non-armament measure and its importance, in the view of my delegation, is only potential. The nuclear super-Powers cannot be said to have demonstrated sufficient faith and goodwill to be entrusted with the destiny of all mankind. In his statement yesterday [*1758th meeting*], the representative of Malta, Ambassador Pardo, also expressed doubts regarding the effectiveness of the non-proliferation Treaty. He cited the example, *inter alia*, of South Africa's stated intention to co-operate with any non-communist nation in the field of nuclear technology. Since South Africa is among the rapidly growing number of nuclear countries, it certainly seems implicit to my delegation that there is an intention on the part of South Africa not only to develop its nuclear power but also to spread it.

15. Article V of the non-proliferation Treaty stipulates that potential benefits from peaceful uses of nuclear explosions may only be made available to non-nuclear States party to the Treaty. May I repeat that the view of my delegation on this matter is that nuclear benefits arising within the framework of the non-proliferation Treaty should not be exclusive to non-nuclear weapon States parties to the Treaty only; rather they should also be made available without discrimination to those non-nuclear-weapon States which are not yet parties to the Treaty.

16. At its twenty-fourth session, on 16 December 1969, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2602 E (XXIV), declaring the decade of the 1970s a Disarmament Decade, and requested the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to work out "a comprehensive programme, dealing with all aspects of the problem of the cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which would provide the Conference with a guideline to chart the course of its further work and its negotiations".

17. The delegations of Mexico, Sweden and Yugoslavia at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament have produced a draft comprehensive programme of disarmament [*A/8059-DC/233, annex C, sect. 42*]. My delegation would like to express its gratitude to the three delegations for this achievement. In my opinion the draft has dealt with some very important issues and I think that it goes a long way towards the goal of general and complete disarmament during the decade of the 1970s.

18. Before concluding my intervention, I should like to stress the belief of my delegation in the very urgent need for an absolute adherence to the Moscow partial test ban of 1963.³ This, in the view of my delegation, is an important prerequisite for instilling confidence before any real disarmament decisions can be taken. All of us here are aware, as indeed many delegations have already pointed out, that on the very day the United Nations began its commemorative session on 14 October, three major Powers carried out nuclear tests.

19. My delegation would like to join those who have already condemned this outright and flagrant violation of the Moscow Treaty. This kind of behaviour, by otherwise responsible nations, makes it extremely difficult for the observation by Member States of other treaties and/or conventions adopted by this Organization.

20. I should like therefore to add the name of my delegation to the call for a more comprehensive nuclear test ban. In this respect, may I voice my delegation's support for the views so eloquently expressed in this Committee on this subject by the Swedish representative, Mrs. Myrdal [*1750th meeting*].

21. These are some of the considerations that will guide my delegation when the various draft resolutions are put to the vote.

22. Mr. MESSIA (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that my delegation takes the floor in this debate, and so first of all I wish to greet you with the utmost deference and congratulate you. At the same time I am very pleased to have you as our Chairman in this important Committee. Mr. Chairman, to these feelings I would add my very special satisfaction at seeing in the Chair a Venezuelan diplomat of your eminent qualifications, particularly during these days when in the capital of Spain we have been holding ceremonies in tribute to Bolívar and have brought up to date, and if possible, have drawn even closer the ties of brotherhood which join your country with mine.

23. At the same time I wish to extend my greetings and best wishes to Ambassador Farah and Ambassador Cerník, the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur of our Committee, respectively.

24. On the occasion of the death of General de Gaulle, flags are still flying at half-mast today in many countries of the world, and for this same reason many of our hearts are

³ Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964).

and will continue to be in mourning. Among the other outstanding characteristics for which he was honoured, his name will always remain as a symbol of the intelligence and courage of a man standing alone at a critical time, who was triumphantly able to oppose the most adverse events of history, including some which, normally, to use an expression which de Gaulle himself seemed to like, should have overwhelmed him.

25. As an outstanding Frenchman his thoughts and his words will always remain in the most demanding of anthologies. As a fighter, he fought without ever counting the weapons or measuring the strength of the adversaries confronting him. He was a giant in reasoning and in action, thus for us in Spain who love France he was like a Cartesian Don Quixote.

26. We choose our friends but not our neighbours. During his term of office as President, General de Gaulle contributed in an absolutely decisive manner first to restoring, then to drawing closer the ties of friendship between our two countries.

27. Finally we recall with sorrow that his last trip abroad only a few months ago this summer was to our country and he travelled through it from one end to another. Although my delegation has already expressed its condolences elsewhere, we now wish to express to the delegation of France in this Committee our most heartfelt and sorrowful sympathy.

28. My delegation has already explained its position with regard to the item on disarmament in previous debates. There is very little new to be added this year because actually there are very few specific points in regard to which any progress has been made and there are therefore few alternatives or choices open to countries like mine, which are only witnesses to the negotiations on disarmament.

29. However, on the threshold of the Disarmament Decade, my delegation wishes to reiterate with special emphasis its firm belief that without general and complete disarmament it will be impossible to build a truly just and lasting peace. History proves that the armaments race is a constant source of tension which destroys the conditions for coexistence on which peace should be based. At the same time, it gravely jeopardizes justice by consuming resources and energies which could have been channelled towards the development of the peoples who need it most.

30. This is particularly true today. Hence the need to put an end to and reverse the armaments race, a need that is more urgent than ever this year, 1970, because the tension created by rearmament not only deters coexistence and real peace, but also places humanity on the brink of its own destruction, and because injustice in the distribution of the goods of this earth has become unacceptable for the dispossessed peoples, who know that the nations which quibble over giving aid needed for development are devoting astronomical sums to increasing and improving their arsenals of death.

31. We are not unaware of the difficulties in the way of solving this tremendous problem, but the principal diffi-

culty, in the view of my delegation, continues to be the lack of political will to come to grips openly with the reality of disarmament. We realize that the great Powers need encouragement, understanding and time to solve the problem; but the responsibility for building and maintaining peace lies with us all, collectively and in solidarity. Thus, in our opinion, the United Nations has an obligation to continue its efforts aimed at having all countries, and particularly the nuclear Powers, decide to put an end to the armaments race and proceed to general and complete disarmament.

32. It is already 25 years since the world learned with astonishment and horror of the effects of the first nuclear explosion. Since then, the destructive capacity of these weapons has increased thousands of times, and the arsenals which exist in the world today could, in a few hours, wipe out all trace of life on earth. All of us are aware of this fearful reality, of which we have been reminded by several of the speakers who have preceded me during the past days. The danger is that by becoming so familiar with this reality we will gradually lose the sensitivity to fight against it. Moreover, an alleged "political realism", which no doubt would be discriminatory against ourselves, might lead us to the conclusion that the United Nations has no reason to deal—and, I correct myself, thoroughly, with something so essential as disarmament.

33. During the 25 years of the life of our Organization, not only have we been incapable of proceeding to disarmament, but we have been witnesses to an armaments race which accelerates from year to year, an armaments race which, if it is not arrested, will inevitably lead the world to disaster. There cannot possibly be any disarmament without a prior political decision to renounce rearmament. This seems obvious. In this regard, we hope that the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks which are being held between the United States and the Soviet Union will be a first step initially towards an end to the armaments race, to be followed by genuine disarmament.

34. In the meantime, the arsenals swell day after day, and the incongruous proportion of expenditure and even research and thinking, which countries—particularly the large ones—devote to their rearmament renders the solution of the problem ever more complicated and difficult, while, at the same time, risks of reaching a point of no return grow in the vain quest for the definitive weapon which would give total military supremacy to one Power or another. Thus, the decade of the 1960s regrettably became the rearmament decade, despite the efforts of the United Nations to prevent it. If the decade of the 1970s does not become the disarmament decade, as we intend it to be, the decade of the 1980s might witness the end of life on our planet.

35. In the heraldry of coats of arms, there is a motto for good knights which was engraved on Toledo swords. That motto is, "Unsheath me not without reason, nor sheath me without honour."

36. Conditions have radically changed. Who would be right today to unleash a nuclear holocaust and who would venture to seek his honour through a real Apocalypse?

37. Within this broad panorama of frustrations, my delegation is pleased to welcome the efforts made by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, as well as the valuable suggestions contained in the working documents submitted to that Conference which appear as annexes to its report [A/8059-DC/233]. We were particularly pleased to see the efforts made to put an end to nuclear tests, which is a prerequisite to halt the development and further improvement in the technology of weapons of mass destruction.

38. My delegation voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2604 A (XXIV). In this, Governments were requested to contribute to the international exchange of seismic data with a view to facilitating the recording of underground tests. The Government of Spain has submitted to the Secretary-General the information requested [see A/7967/Rev. I], thus contributing to this exchange of data as a first step which might lead to a general prohibition of nuclear tests. Along the same lines, my Government, which is a party to the Moscow Treaty of 1963,⁴ is in favour of the prohibition of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water. We support the appeal made in draft resolution A/C.1/L.530 to all countries to accede to that legal instrument. This Treaty constitutes not only a collateral measure aimed at general and complete disarmament, but also a means of preventing the pollution of the atmosphere and of the waters at a time when these levels of pollution are becoming intolerable.

39. With regard to chemical and bacteriological weapons, the delegation of Spain is in favour of strengthening and bringing up to date the Geneva Protocol of 1925,⁵ which was signed and ratified by my Government, in order that it might become a generally acceptable instrument which would include the prohibition of the use, stockpiling and manufacture of all chemical and biological weapons, under adequate international control. In connexion with this item, my delegation has read with great interest the joint memorandum presented by the 12 non-aligned countries represented on the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [A/8059-DC/233, annex C, sect. 39].

40. General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV) drew attention to the diversion to the manufacture and improvement of weapons of enormous resources and energy which should have been devoted to social and economic development. The Romanian delegation, responding to that concern, has submitted a new item to the General Assembly on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race [A/7994]. My country, which is making a great development effort, fully shares the anxiety felt by the Romanian delegation. And although our military expenditure is at present \$17 per person per year—the lowest in Europe, together with that of Turkey, and one of the lowest in the world, according to the statistical table published in the October 1969 issue of the review *The Military Balance*—my country firmly supports any initiative which would lead us forward in that direction. My delegation is convinced that disarmament and economic

development are closely related tasks and constitute the necessary prerequisites to build and maintain a real peace.

41. President Nixon, in the speech he made before the General Assembly at the previous session [1755th plenary meeting], announced that satellites were being perfected which would help to locate mineral deposits, to tracking schools of fish and to determine more accurately the meteorological phenomena which might directly influence harvests. That is the only just war which mankind has to wage at present: the struggle of man against nature to obtain more abundant fruits for the benefit of all. Nuclear technology offers infinite possibilities in the service of this fight for peace and my delegation will support any initiatives intended to achieve that end.

42. Lastly, my delegation once again wishes to congratulate the brother countries of Latin America which have been capable of giving a lesson in political maturity and co-operation, on a regional level, by signing the Treaty of Tlatelolco,⁶ a fruitful reality which sheds a ray of hope on the sombre disarmament scene. We support draft resolution A/C.1/L.522 and we hope that all States which have nuclear weapons will be able to adhere to the Treaty as soon as possible.

43. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of the other officers of the Committee and on my own behalf, I should like to express our gratitude to the representative of Spain for his very kind words of congratulations. For my part, I am particularly grateful to him for the references he has made to my country and to me; these are no doubt the result of the brotherhood and the very cordial relations existing between Spain and Venezuela, which were reaffirmed during the recent days of commemoration in honour of Bolívar.

44. Furthermore, I should like to ask members of the Committee to take note of the fact that the delegations of Cyprus, Ecuador, Indonesia, Italy and Nepal have been added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.529.

45. As I reported to members of the Committee at the previous meeting, 16 delegations remained on the list of speakers in the general debate on the various disarmament items. In spite of the fact that we cancelled the meeting this morning, only two delegations were ready to speak this afternoon, and, therefore, there still remain 14 speakers on the list for the general debate on these disarmament items. As I understand it, only two delegations have indicated that they would be ready to speak in the meeting scheduled for tomorrow, Saturday. That being so, I intend to cancel that meeting. I believe it would be more worthwhile to give everyone an opportunity to have a rest and to give all delegations which have not yet participated in the debate an additional chance to complete their statements.

46. However, we will have to take a decision regarding the end of the general debate. I intend to set as a deadline for the conclusion of the general debate on this item, the meetings to be held on Monday morning and afternoon. If

⁴ *Idem*.

⁵ Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138).

⁶ Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068).

there are no objections, I shall consider that the Committee endorses the idea of concluding the general debate on these items at the meetings on Monday.

It was so decided.

47. Accordingly, those delegations on the list of speakers to participate in the general debate on these items must, definitely and necessarily, make their statements during the morning and afternoon meetings next Monday. Two meetings have been scheduled at 10.30 a.m. and at 3 p.m. on Monday. I believe that during those two meetings we will be able to hear the 14 remaining speakers who have either not yet spoken or wish to speak again in this debate.

48. For the information of members of the Committee, I should like to indicate the next stages of our work. When we have concluded the general debate on Monday next, in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee, the First Committee will take up the various draft resolutions,

starting with the one relating to the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof, which is included in the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and the draft resolutions and amendments in connexion with that draft treaty.

49. Then we shall have to decide the order in which to take up the draft resolutions relating to this first item on disarmament and the remaining items. At this point I would not wish to take up the time of the Committee and start a debate on the order of priorities. I would prefer to have an opportunity to discuss this with the various co-sponsors and the members of the Committee in general so as to make a specific proposal at the end of our meeting on Monday afternoon or on Tuesday morning.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.