

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1495th
MEETING**

Friday, 13 October 1967,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Opening statement by the Chairman	1
Election of the Vice-Chairman	1
Election of the Rapporteur	3
Order of discussion of agenda items	4

*Chairman: Mr. Ismail FAHMY
(United Arab Republic).*

Opening Statement by the Chairman

1. The CHAIRMAN: Before we consider the agenda for this meeting, I should like to say a few words to the members of the First Committee. It is customary for the new Chairman to do so at the beginning of the meetings of this important Committee, and it is because of this tradition, and not out of necessity, that I shall follow the example of my predecessors.

2. It is a great honour indeed that you have unanimously chosen a citizen of the United Arab Republic to preside over this Committee. It is a tribute to my country and its policy of non-alignment which has contributed, and will continue to contribute positively to issues of peace and justice. As a firm believer in this policy, my complete impartiality will reflect this policy of non-alignment which many countries have chosen as a guide for their international behaviour. If I divert from this cardinal position, it will be only to align myself strictly with the rules of procedure and their true application, for the benefit of all of you without any distinction or discrimination whatsoever, and for the orderly functioning of the Committee. Similarly, I will not hesitate to be receptive to any positive suggestions and ideas from any member of this Committee in dealing with the issues inscribed on its agenda.

3. I felt it necessary to speak to you in complete frankness because I believe the role of the Chairman, with the complete understanding and co-operation of the members of the Committee, is a role which transcends the mere function of applying the rules of procedure. With this in mind, I look forward to a real partnership between the members of the Committee and its Chairman, together with the members of the Bureau, in order to achieve the positive results which we all expect on the various important items entrusted to us. All I can do at this early stage is to offer you my hand so that we can work together to achieve concrete results. In so doing, I pledge complete impartiality and friendship.

4. Speaking of friendship, I wish to express my very deep gratitude to my friend and colleague Professor Benites, who we all know very well and admire for his dedication to the United Nations and the true application of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. I must thank him twice—first because he was kind enough to nominate my candidature and secondly because when I worked with him on the Bureau of this Committee during the twenty-first session of the General Assembly I learned a great deal from his sagacity and counsel.

5. With the same friendship and gratitude, I express my thanks to Mr. Tomorowicz of Poland and Mr. Nsanze of Burundi, who were kind enough to second my nomination, and I can assure them that I will always remember the kind words they said about me.

6. The members of the Committee will notice that the Secretary-General has honoured us today with his presence; despite his various obligations, he thought it appropriate to be with us in this Committee, the primary task of which is to deal with questions of peace and security. The Secretary-General's dedication to issues of peace and to the United Nations and its Charter, is very well known. I thank him on your behalf for his presence among us today.

Election of the Vice-Chairman

7. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): Mr. Chairman, may I begin by saying how pleased the delegation of India is at your unanimous election as Chairman of this Committee. Your wisdom, tact and discretion are so well known here that it is no exaggeration to say that the Committee has honoured itself by having you as its Chairman during the twenty-second session of the General Assembly. You are a true representative of your great country and, in view of the very close and friendly ties between the United Arab Republic and India, my delegation feels specially honoured to work under your leadership and guidance.

8. I have the privilege to propose the name of Mr. G. Tchernouchchenko, the Permanent Representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, for election as the Vice-Chairman of the First Committee. Mr. Tchernouchchenko is a well known and respected personality in the United Nations. He has been a member of the Byelorussian delegation to the General Assembly for eleven sessions, and in this period he has worked in the First, Fourth and Fifth Committees, as also in the Disarmament Commission. In addition, Mr. Tchernouchchenko has represented his country at a number of sessions of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and the Social Commission, as well as at seven sessions of the International Labour Conference.

9. Mr. Tchernouchtchenko was appointed Permanent Representative of his country to the United Nations in August 1964 and, as all of us know, he was elected Rapporteur of this Committee at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly. He is author of a number of publications on international affairs and the activities of international organizations. With such wide experience of international organizations and international affairs, my delegation is confident that his presence in the Bureau as Vice-Chairman will be an asset to our Committee.

10. The items allocated to the Committee this year are of supreme importance to political and security questions. I am certain that Mr. Tchernouchtchenko will be of great help to you, Mr. Chairman, in the performance of your multifarious tasks.

11. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) (*translated from Spanish*): It was my delegation, Mr. Chairman, that had the honour to nominate you for the high office you now hold; I will therefore only repeat today how deeply gratified are my delegation and myself to find you presiding over the difficult, complex and delicate tasks of this Committee.

12. I want to thank you for your generous words just now, and I hope you will allow me publicly to pay a debt of gratitude by supporting the candidate just nominated by the representative of India as Vice-Chairman of the Committee: Mr. Tchernouchtchenko.

13. I say a debt of gratitude because at the last session Mr. Tchernouchtchenko, as Rapporteur of this Committee, gave me most valuable assistance—intelligent, wise and honest—with the tasks subsequently entrusted to me by the Committee as its Chairman.

14. Being acquainted as I am with Mr. Tchernouchtchenko's great ability, I warmly endorse the proposal just made by the representative of India, and I do not think I need repeat the many qualifications he emphasized in referring to Mr. Tchernouchtchenko. I would merely assure the Committee that in appointing him, as I feel sure it will, it is appointing a first-class man of great ability to deal with the very delicate tasks that fall to the Vice-Chairman.

15. Mr. TOMOROWICZ (Poland): Today, I have two very pleasant duties to perform: the first is to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, upon your election to the Chairmanship of this Committee. It gives me particular pleasure to do so. We are happy to have you in the Chair and are deeply convinced that, under your chairmanship, backed with your profound experience and competence, the Committee will discharge its difficult task under the best possible guidance.

16. At this point, I wish to second the nomination by my colleague from India, Ambassador Parthasarathi, of Ambassador Tchernouchtchenko of Byelorussia for the post of Vice-Chairman of this Committee. Ambassador Tchernouchtchenko is a well-known diplomat, a veteran in the United Nations despite his youthfulness. He has held important posts in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Byelorussia as a member of the collegium in charge of political affairs; he has served in the Fourth and Fifth Committees of the General Assembly; he has also served in

the First and Special Political Committees; we all remember him as our Rapporteur during the last session of the General Assembly; we all know him, respect him and like him. His vast knowledge of United Nations problems, his great experience of its workings and procedures make Ambassador Tchernouchtchenko eminently suited for the responsible post for which he has been nominated. It gives me special pleasure, therefore, to second his nomination for the Vice-Chairmanship of the First Committee.

17. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria): Mr. Chairman, I should like to express to you our very warm congratulations upon your election to the Chairmanship of this Committee. We are indeed fortunate that we shall have the benefit of your long experience in the work of this Committee and in the work of the United Nations in general during the discussion of the complex and difficult problems that are on our agenda. I am convinced that with your guidance the Committee will be able to conclude successfully its deliberations.

18. I should also like to join those representatives who have already spoken in support of the nomination of Ambassador Tchernouchtchenko to the post of Vice-Chairman of our Committee. Ambassador Tchernouchtchenko is well known to us, due to his long association with the work of the United Nations in general and of the First Committee in particular. His high qualifications have been impressively outlined by the representatives of India, Ecuador and Poland; I therefore need not add anything to their statements. I am convinced that his great experience will be of much benefit to our Committee. It is therefore a pleasure for me to support his nomination for the Vice-Chairmanship.

19. Mr. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to extend to you the congratulations of the Mauritanian delegation on your sweeping election to head this important Committee.

20. The distinguished representatives who have preceded me have described Mr. Tchernouchtchenko's outstanding abilities to the Committee. He is not unknown here at the United Nations, for as has just been mentioned, he has held important posts in his country's Ministry of Foreign Affairs; he has represented his country at a number of United Nations sessions, and he has made a noteworthy contribution to the work of those sessions. We are convinced that his appointment as Vice-Chairman of the First Committee at the General Assembly's twenty-second session will definitely contribute to the success of our labours.

21. My delegation wholeheartedly supports his candidature and we feel sure that the members of the Committee will elect him unanimously.

22. The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other nominations? I hear none.

Mr. Tchernouchtchenko (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) was elected Vice-Chairman by acclamation.

23. The CHAIRMAN: I congratulate Mr. Tchernouchtchenko on his election and invite him to take his seat as Vice-Chairman.

24. Mr. TCHERNOUCHTENKO (Byelorussian SSR) (*translated from Russian*): May I first thank the representative of India who nominated me for the Vice-Chairmanship of the First Committee of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly. May I also thank the representatives of Ecuador, Poland, Austria and Mauritania who very kindly supported the nomination.

25. I should also like to express my thanks to the Committee for unanimously approving my nomination and electing me to this important office.

26. We wish to point out, however, that we consider this election of a representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic to the office of Vice-Chairman as a mark of respect for the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, which has taken part in the work of the United Nations since its creation. We should also like to note that it is a sign of respect for our Republic, which, this year, together with the other peoples of the Soviet Union, is celebrating its great anniversary, the fiftieth anniversary of the Great October Revolution.

27. At the same time I express the hope, like you, Mr. Chairman, that during the current session of the General Assembly we shall enjoy mutual understanding and co-operation and so be able to achieve considerable substantial success and attain the results which the peoples of the whole world expect of us.

Election of the Rapporteur

28. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take up the second item on its agenda, namely the election of its Rapporteur.

29. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, allow me first of all to extend to you my heartiest congratulations on your unanimous election to the Chairmanship of this main Committee. My delegation is especially happy that this year the Committee will be fortunate enough to have the full benefit of your vast diplomatic experience, your great ability, and of the finesse, tact and spirit of co-operation we associate with you. I should also like to extend my warm congratulations to the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. Tchernouchtchenko, who has just been unanimously elected to the office of Vice-Chairman of our Committee.

30. And now it is my honour and great pleasure to nominate Mr. Örn, First Secretary of the Swedish delegation, for the post of Rapporteur.

31. Although Mr. Örn is of a younger generation of diplomats, his outstanding qualifications and his profound knowledge of the issues of concern to this Committee make him especially suited for the office.

32. The candidate in question is a Doctor of Philosophy and Political Sciences of the University of Uppsala. He has been in the diplomatic service since 1956. After serving with distinction in the Swedish Embassies at Rome, New Delhi, Colombo and Katmandu, he served from 1964 to

1966 as Deputy Permanent Representative of Sweden at the Council of Europe.

33. Mr. Örn also served as Adviser to the Swedish delegation at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly, and since 1966 he has been First Secretary of his country's Permanent Mission to the United Nations.

34. Mr. Örn's zeal for study and political research, his objectivity and his impartiality qualify him still further for the post of Rapporteur. The results of his researches are to be found in the studies he has published on various aspects of present-day international relations.

35. In sponsoring this nomination, my delegation registers the great satisfaction it derives from the excellent and friendly relations that exist between Romania and Sweden, as well as from Sweden's substantial contribution to European and world understanding. I have no doubt that the candidature I have just proposed will receive the Committee's unanimous approval.

36. Mr. GHORBAL (United Arab Republic): If it is unbecoming for the United Arab Republic delegation to congratulate you on your election to the Chair, may I be allowed to say, however, that we appreciate the Committee's choice of you, Sir, a faithful son of the United Arab Republic and a devoted member of this Committee, to preside over its meetings.

37. We consider that your election at this particular session of this Assembly is a tribute paid by Members of the United Nations to the policy of peace and non-alignment which my country has followed and still follows, especially at this particular time in which unhappy events are inflicted upon us.

38. May I, Sir, take this opportunity to congratulate Ambassador Tchernouchtchenko upon his election to the post of Vice-Chairman. I am sure that his qualities and his experience will greatly assist the Committee in its work.

39. May I also join my colleague in seconding the nomination of Mr. Torsten Örn of Sweden to the post of Rapporteur of this Committee? I need not reiterate Mr. Örn's qualities nor his vast experience acquired not only in serving his country in Rome, New Delhi, Colombo and Katmandu but also in the Council of Europe and, last but not least, now as a member of the delegation of Sweden to the General Assembly and to the United Nations. I am sure the presence of Mr. Örn in the Bureau will be a tremendous help in achieving the results to which you, Sir, have asked this Committee to devote its attention and its tireless efforts. To that end, I second the nomination of Mr. Örn as Rapporteur of this Committee.

40. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): Since this is the first time I have spoken in the debate during the present session, allow me first of all, Mr. Chairman, to offer you my warmest congratulations on behalf of my delegation. Those who like myself have had occasion to appreciate at close quarters your work last year as Vice-Chairman, and the previous year as Rapporteur, of this Committee cannot help but feel that in addition to congratulating you we have to congratulate ourselves on

having you in the Chair to which you were unanimously elected.

41. My very sincere congratulations go out also to Mr. Tchernouchchenko, this year's Vice-Chairman who, we are confident, will contribute as much as or even more than he did last year as Rapporteur.

42. In conclusion, I have great pleasure, on behalf of my delegation, in seconding the proposal that Mr. Torsten Örn of Sweden, who is already well known to all of us here, having served in his country's delegation to this Committee last year, should be appointed Rapporteur of the Committee.

43. The CHAIRMAN: Are there any more nominations? There are none.

Mr. Örn (Sweden) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.

44. The CHAIRMAN: I congratulate Mr. Örn on his election and invite him to take his seat as Rapporteur.

45. Mr. ÖRN (Sweden) (*translated from French*): Mr. Secretary-General, fellow representatives, I should like to offer you my heartfelt thanks for the honour you have just done to my country and for the confidence you have shown in me by electing me as Rapporteur of this Committee. I would particularly like to thank the distinguished representatives of Romania, the United Arab Republic and Mexico, who put forward my nomination in such cordial terms.

46. Let me at the same time assure you that I shall do all I can to carry out satisfactorily the task you have just entrusted to me.

47. The CHAIRMAN: Now that the Committee has completed the election of a Vice-Chairman and a Rapporteur and before we proceed to take up today's third agenda item, I should like to introduce to the Committee Mr. Nesterenko, the Under-Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs, whom we all know, and Mr. Vellodi, the able Secretary of this Committee for quite a long time now, and with whom I enjoyed close co-operation when I was the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur of this Committee.

*Order of discussion of agenda items
(A/C.1/945 and Add.1 and 2)*

48. The CHAIRMAN: Normally this particular point takes up a great deal of time. In my opinion, there is no justification for repeating the same procedure at this session. So as to facilitate discussion of this particular matter, and for that purpose alone, I felt that it may be appropriate for the Chair to help in guiding the Committee to reach a speedy solution. This solution may not be perfect. I am sure that in taking this step the Chair may not be able to satisfy every delegation in this hall. However, I sincerely believe that the suggestion which I intend to make is adequate for our purpose at this stage in the light of the lack of progress regarding the disarmament questions now being discussed in Geneva. For that purpose, I suggest to the Committee that it consider the following order.

49. First, let us take up item 32 of the General Assembly agenda: International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

50. Second, let us take up item 91, namely, Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

51. Third, I propose that we take up item 96 entitled: Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

52. Fourth, I propose that we take up item 92 entitled: Examination of the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind.

53. And, fifth, I propose that we take up item 33, The Korean question, with its three sub-items: (a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea; (b) Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations; (c) Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

54. These are merely suggestions by the Chair which are placed before the Committee for comments.

55. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): Before proceeding to discussion of the present order of business, I should like to add my voice to those who have already spoken today in congratulating you, Mr. Chairman, on your election to the post of Chairman of our Committee. We fully supported your election. We think that your long experience with us in the United Nations, and particularly your service as an officer in previous sessions of the Committee, will permit you to add wise advice and counsel to our deliberations.

56. Turning now to the item of business which you have proposed, I should like to point out that, while my delegation appreciates your efforts to contribute to an easy and expeditious ordering of items for this year's work, we must respectfully dissent from the particular order of subjects which you have suggested to us. I say this for the following reasons.

57. It has been historically true, I believe, in the First Committee, for disarmament items to be treated together, whether early or late and whether listed individually or seriatim. Moreover, disarmament has traditionally been treated very early in the Committee's deliberations because of its importance and urgency, on which we are all agreed, and which make it a topic of the greatest importance for all of our countries.

58. But this year I think that members of the Committee will agree that we face a somewhat different situation in that a group of negotiators in the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament in Geneva is still continuing its efforts to reach agreement on a non-proliferation treaty.

59. This is a work that none of us would wish to interfere in. We are all looking forward to a relatively early submission of the report from these representatives in Geneva, and we trust that before too many more weeks pass we can expect a full accounting of the records of those deliberations, agreements arrived at, and disagreements remaining. Once we reach that stage, there is no doubt that this Committee will need to engage in a full-blown review of all of the facets of disarmament, because it seems to us it is exceptionally difficult to treat one aspect of this problem without raising related aspects which have been the subject of discussion in Geneva.

60. I think in this connexion, Mr. Chairman, of one item which you have proposed to us for fairly early consideration, which is the Soviet-sponsored item on the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. This is surely a subject which we all intend to discuss, have agreed should be inscribed and discussed, but one which we do not, for our part, conceive of being considered except in the context of a broader consideration of a possible agreement on general and complete disarmament.

61. These talks in Geneva, as we understand it, are now at a crucial stage; we do think they should have an opportunity to be completed, to hear their report, and for our part we would prefer that all of the items on our agenda relating to the field of disarmament should be considered at a later point once we have a report from our Geneva collaborators. This is true not only because we think this is a more orderly and efficient way of conducting our business, but in many instances because it will permit the experts, from the countries represented there in particular, to join us and give us the benefit of their views and their deliberations over the last year.

62. For these reasons, while the United States would agree that outer space should be the initial topic debated, it would be our judgement that the course of wisdom would be for this Committee to defer until a later stage consideration of all of those topics which bear directly on the disarmament field. There are other subjects on our agenda, of course, which can be taken up before we reach that point, and we are flexible on that; but we would think that the most productive and congenial use of our time would be to start with subjects such as outer space, Korea, and the ocean floor. After that, my delegation would suggest that we could then more intelligently consider in precisely what order it would be fruitful to take up the individual disarmament items.

63. These are the reasons, Mr. Chairman, why I regret to say that the United States is not in a position to accept the order of items which you have proposed and would respectfully request that the members of the Committee consider the wisdom of deciding now on an order of items relating to the non-disarmament issues, and defer until a later date a decision on the disposition of the latter group of items.

64. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, permit me, on behalf of my delegation, to congratulate you on your election as our Chairman, and to express our pleasure at your being there, and our full confidence in your execution of your duties.

65. I just wish to say briefly that, while we very much appreciate your effort to expedite our business by giving us a lead, we also have, in my delegation, reservations about the order suggested. Our reasons are quite short and simple. We believe that all aspects of disarmament are closely related, that it is very difficult to discuss one without going over into another one; we believe also that it would greatly help the deliberations of this Committee if we had with us the experts now in Geneva.

66. It has always been the practice, I believe, Sir, in this Committee, to take disarmament items together, and I think the reason is very obvious: it is common sense, and it would help the efficiency of our business if we follow that practice.

67. As for the order of the other items, our delegation has no particular preferences.

68. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): First of all, on behalf of the delegation of the Soviet Union, may I share in the warm congratulations addressed to you, Mr. Chairman, on the occasion of your election to the important, responsible and difficult office of Chairman of the First Committee—an office that certainly requires much work. We also congratulate the representatives of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and Sweden, who have been unanimously elected Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur of our Committee.

69. The representative of Poland, Mr. Tomorowicz, at the beginning of his statement today said that we had "two very pleasant duties to perform". Well, I have performed one duty that was very pleasant for the Soviet delegation by congratulating the officers of the Committee, but unfortunately I cannot say that the second matter about which I intend to speak is altogether pleasant.

70. Mr. Chairman, we duly recognize your desire to find the best solution to the problem of the organization of the Committee's work. This, indeed, is our common task, on the solution of which the success of our joint efforts, the success of our combined diplomatic thinking on questions of international peace and security, will largely depend. We fully sympathize with and understand your intention to find a solution to this problem of the organization of the Committee's work, which would enable us to avoid lengthy procedural debates. This would be a good start for the work of the Committee, and may I assure you that the Soviet delegation will do its utmost to avoid the procedural wrangles which, more than once in the past, took up much of the Committee's valuable time and prevented it from dealing with more rewarding business.

71. However, the Soviet delegation, while appreciating your initiative, cannot say it is fully satisfied with the organization of the work which you have proposed. We have no objection to some of your proposals, for instance, to taking up as item 2 of the agenda the question of the "Treaty for the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America". Nor have we any comments to make regarding some of the other items, although we might have preferred that some of them should be considered somewhat earlier. Nevertheless, we feel that your proposal to take up the item "Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use

of nuclear weapons” as item 3 of our agenda would unduly postpone its consideration.

72. The fact is that the Soviet delegation thinks it would be most important and useful if the Committee could start its work with an important item directly related to the most important problems confronting mankind—the problems of maintaining peace and security among nations. The conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons is one such item.

73. Further, we think that it would be most important and useful for the Committee to start its work with the examination of an item which is particularly urgent when compared with the other items, bearing in mind developments in international relations, which are characterized by a number of sharp conflicts, including military conflicts, in different parts of the world, and I do not wish to speak now about the origin of these conflicts. We consider that one such urgent problem on the agenda of the First Committee is the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

74. Finally, this is a question with which we are all well acquainted, since it has more than once been considered in its various aspects and at different stages in the progress of the United Nations towards its solution, namely, in 1961 and, as will be remembered, in 1966, at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly. This is a question the substance of which all of us know quite well. It would be natural to start with something that does not require further deep study and could perhaps be successfully dealt with at the beginning of the Committee's work.

75. Proposals have been made in the Committee which would not, I think, lead to the most sensible and effective organization of the Committee's work, namely, that all disarmament questions should be grouped together and that they should be discussed separately as the Committee may subsequently decide. But to combine all questions which in one way or another concern armaments, and more particularly nuclear armaments, into one item of the agenda (as I understand it, not into one single question but into one item of the agenda) would, I think, be a formalistic approach. Furthermore, the delegation that made this proposal offered, to my mind, somewhat contradictory arguments. The United States delegation referred to the fact that our Committee traditionally starts with disarmament matters and then, bearing in mind that some disarmament questions could not be discussed by us now since they are the subject of debate and negotiation in the ENDC in Geneva, proposed that not only this part should be placed in the second half of the agenda but also the questions that can be discussed now, since they are not connected with the discussions being held in Geneva and have a completely separate importance. What are the reasons given for this? On the one hand, it is traditional to start with disarmament matters; on the other, there are other disarmament items such as the “Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons” and the “Treaty for the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America”. But we are told that they need not be discussed at the beginning. Either we follow tradition or we do not; we cannot do both at the same time.

76. Furthermore the argument that discussion of the prohibition of the nuclear weapons would be facilitated if it were added to or put somewhere in the middle of the items being debated in Geneva is hardly convincing because the nature of the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons is different from that of the matters being debated in Geneva. It is more of a purely political matter, having no material content in the sense of the liquidation of certain kinds of nuclear weapons or of specific control measures, whether national or international. It is concerned with the good will of States, and, as such, it can be debated separately from the other items.

77. Finally, the arguments put forward here to the effect that some disarmament experts are now in Geneva seem hardly relevant, since there are in Geneva experts from only a small group of States represented here, and most, if not all, of the States with experts in Geneva have highly qualified experts here in their delegations—including, of course, the delegation of the United States of America, which has among its members Mr. Adrian Fisher, the deputy head of the Disarmament and Arms Limitation Agency.

78. Finally, we thought it hardly appropriate and conducive to a harmonious atmosphere in the Committee that the United States representative based his procedural proposal on his political conception of the substance of the question. He declared that the United States delegation and Government were prepared to examine the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons only in the context of general and complete disarmament, and in no other.

79. First of all, the United States is not the only country represented in this Committee. Secondly, such an attempt to justify a procedural proposal by one's own political position in the matter has as its aim the satisfaction of one's own wants, and not the promotion of the general interests of the Committee. Finally, we still hope that, as a result of further work, the United Nations, which has on more than one occasion expressed its desire for a solution of the question of the prohibition of nuclear weapons, will perhaps at this session be able to find arguments and reasons that might change the position of the Government of the United States. I mention this aspect of the matter only because the representative of the United States referred to it.

80. To sum up, the Soviet delegation would prefer the work of the Committee to begin with the important and urgent item, and one with which the United Nations is familiar, namely the “Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons”, which is a matter of interest to a large number of States Members of the United Nations. Then, as our Chairman suggested, it would take up the “Treaty for the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America”, then outer space, and the rest as the Chairman proposed, if the Committee agrees.

81. I would make one reservation here, and that is that we should have preferred to see the Korean question discussed earlier.

82. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, I should like first of all to congratulate you

on your election as Chairman of the Committee. As previous speakers have already pointed out, your career in this Committee, first as its Rapporteur, then as Vice-Chairman, is crowned today by your election as Chairman. I myself had the honour to work with you last year and the opportunity to appreciate your abilities as a negotiator and an able diplomat.

83. I should also like, on behalf of my delegation, to congratulate the Vice-Chairman on his unanimous election. He too was a colleague last year and a fellow-officer of the Committee.

84. Finally, I should like to express my congratulations to the Rapporteur, the representative of Sweden, on his election.

85. With regard to the topic raised by the Chairman—organization of work—my delegation would like to make a proposal that might perhaps lead to agreement, if all delegations make an effort. I say this in the light of the experience last year and the year before, when we were able to reach agreement on the basis of the views of all delegations. After listening carefully to the proposal you made a few minutes ago, Mr. Chairman, and to what previous speakers have had to say, it seems to me that we might try to reach agreement about items on which there does not appear to be any great difference of opinion, and to ask the Chairman, in co-operation with the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur, to contact all the delegations in order if possible to establish what ground there is in common.

86. From what I have heard so far and in the view of my delegation, it would appear that we could start with item 32, "International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space", and then take up an item which, although related to other questions, basically ought not to arouse a great deal of controversy, namely item 91, "Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America".

87. To recapitulate: our proposal is that the officers of the Committee contact all the delegations and try to put before us the views held in common by all delegations concerning the other items. The Chairman has implied, and some delegations have argued, that before we take up certain items on our agenda (items 28, 29, 30 and 31 in particular) we should await the outcome of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

88. I therefore propose, on behalf of my delegation, that we should try with the utmost speed, if possible today, to agree to take up first the two items I have mentioned and ask the officers of the Committee to consult with delegations and then make suggestions for dealing with the other items.

89. Mr. NABWERA (Kenya): My delegation would like to join with those representatives who have spoken before me in congratulating the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur on their election.

90. I should like to state on behalf of my delegation that it is our view that a procedural debate has become a major problem in this Committee. Every year we come here,

instead of adopting some systematic manner of conducting our business, delegations, especially those of the super-Powers, usually take the floor and involve the Committee in a procedural debate that consumes much of our time. I should like, on behalf of our delegation, to appeal to the whole Committee, but especially to the delegations of the major Powers, to allow us to proceed in an orderly manner. After all, we are going to discuss all items on our agenda. The order in which we discuss these items may be of importance to certain delegations, but my delegation feels that they are all important items and recognizes that some delegations may like to discuss some items in greater detail than others.

91. Having said this, my delegation feels that we in this Committee should either select the order of items, one by one, or, if this proves too difficult, we should let the Bureau take another look at the items on the agenda and, in the light of this afternoon's debate, propose an order for their discussion so that we can get down to the serious business of this Committee.

92. May I repeat that my delegation is not particularly interested in listening to ideological debates in this Committee. We have very serious problems to discuss. We realize that the major Powers have some very important things to say, but we should like to appeal to the entire Committee to say these things when we arrive at the proper stage in our work, when we discuss these matters item by item.

93. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) (*translated from Spanish*): At the beginning of this procedural debate, which we all hope will be very brief, a problem arose which calls for prior clarification, whatever the ultimate solution—the problem of item 91: the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

94. I should like to recall that in the First Committee's debates this item has never been linked with the general question of disarmament. The item, as we all know, was first put forward in 1961 on the initiative of Brazil, whose draft resolution on the subject¹ had my delegation's immediate support. The item did not reach the voting stage in that year, but subsequently, on the initiative of the President of Mexico, Adolfo López Mateos, a whole series of consultations began among the Latin American countries, and the item was referred back to the First Committee, without being in any way linked to the general question of disarmament.

95. This was how the resolution on the so-called denuclearization of Latin America came to be adopted (General Assembly resolution 1911 (XVIII)). This how things still stand today; and now that we have a treaty,² duly signed and in force, it is proposed that it should be linked with the general question of disarmament. It has no connexion, either historical in the way it has evolved, or intrinsic in regard to its subject-matter, with the matters being discussed at Geneva. It is a Latin American issue, which has been discussed in the context of Latin America and has no intimate or direct relationship with matters of disarma-

¹ *General Assembly Official Records, seventeenth session, annexes*, agenda item 90 (A/C.1/L.312 and Add.1).

² Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, signed at Mexico City on 14 February 1967 (A/C.1/946).

ment. There is one logical reason for saying that it has none: the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America concerns an area that has no nuclear weapons; it is not an armed region prepared for nuclear war, but a region which is trying, and specifically through an agreement between States, to avoid the importation, manufacture or stockpiling of such weapons.

96. It is not a disarmament item; the aim is to prevent the arming of Latin America. Clearly, some aspects of the subject may have a connexion with the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in general, but this is a particular case bound up with Latin America, and it is not closely related, historically or logically, with disarmament.

97. I hope that these arguments may help to persuade the representatives on the Committee that the location indicated by the Chairman for this item as second in order on our agenda is the appropriate one and should be endorsed, first of all because the item is not controversial and secondly because it has no connexion with the complex issues being discussed at Geneva.

98. All I am concerned with is that this clarification should serve as historical background in discussing the item.

99. Mr. PARDO (Malta): I should like to associate myself with the appeal made just now by the representative of Kenya. I think it would be rather unfortunate to have a long debate on procedure.

100. I listened with great interest to the proposals made by the representative of Chile. In general, we share the same views, I think. We feel that the work of this Committee would be facilitated if we take first items which are not controversial. We could discuss these items and dispose of them first, with a considerable saving of time. I would agree with the representative of Chile that item 32, on outer space, could be taken first, followed by item 91, Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

101. There is, however, a third item which should be non-controversial—item 92, on the sea-bed and the ocean floor. This is a new item and perhaps an early opportunity could be taken to have general statements in this Committee on this item. This would enable delegations to consider in detail the general statements and perhaps afterwards the Committee could come back to this item at the conclusion of its work if a resolution is necessary.

102. When we have disposed of these three items, we could decide, bearing in mind the progress of the work in Geneva, in what order the other items should be taken.

103. Mr. BEAULIEU (Canada) (*translated from French*): First of all, Mr. Chairman, allow me to congratulate you on your election to the high office of Chairman of the First Committee. I should also like to extend my congratulations to the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur. With such officers, we have every reason to believe that we can accomplish the very considerable tasks with which this Committee is entrusted.

104. My delegation listened with great interest to the agenda you have just proposed. Before I comment on it as

outlined by you, I should like to say how greatly we appreciate the efforts you have made to provide us with a working method. The initiative you have taken is of course a prerogative of the Chairman, and it will assist us in carrying out our work in an orderly fashion. However, my delegation would have preferred that a clear distinction be made between the items relating to disarmament and the other items of the agenda. We agree that it is advisable to give the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament enough time to complete its important work, especially the preparation of a draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

105. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, in examining your proposal, we find that one aspect of it creates serious difficulties for the Canadian delegation. Agenda item 96, Conclusion of a Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons, is in our opinion a matter closely linked to disarmament problems and one that should logically be examined along with the other disarmament items. That would enable us to approach our work in a practical and realistic way and, in particular, would give us time to examine the item with all the attention it deserves. Another argument in favour of this view is that the presence of experts is essential for the smaller delegations. I believe that a number of delegations think as I do that it would be wise to await the arrival in New York of experts on disarmament.

106. My delegation has listened attentively to the various statements made in this Committee, and we feel that there are sound arguments on both sides in favour of a particular agenda. On the other hand, it seems clear that we could easily become bogged down in a futile procedural discussion.

107. With his customary judgement and common sense, the representative of Chile has just proposed a middle way of approaching the First Committee's work. His suggestion seems to us the method best calculated to enable us first of all to settle down to our work immediately and thus to avoid wasting time trying to find common ground on all the other items of our agenda.

108. For all these reasons, my delegation is happy to support the proposal of the Chilean representative to take up the two items on our agenda as suggested.

109. The CHAIRMAN: Since there are no speakers, I should like to comment briefly on the suggestion made by the representative of Chile. My concern is mainly with the second part of his proposal—namely, that the Bureau should be entrusted with the task of commencing negotiations or consultations on the remaining items on our agenda, if the Committee agrees to start with item 32 concerning outer space, and then take up item 91 on the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America.

110. I am sure my friend and colleague from Chile knows very well that I am most eager to respond to any suggestions emanating from him but, with all due respect, I feel unable to do so at this stage, especially since I suggested a certain order for the consideration of the items on our agenda. In introducing the suggestions which I had made, I did not feel it necessary to elaborate on the reasons

behind the order I had suggested for the first five items. My aim was to facilitate our task; I acted in full awareness of the various points of view and with the conviction that, if the Committee accepted my suggestions without serious objection, after listening to the various statements which are recorded in the verbatim records, it could overcome the situation in which we find ourselves now. I am afraid that, if we continue like this, the procedural debate will start again at the next meeting and will take up too much of the Committee's time. Here I should remind the members of the Committee that the Chair and the Bureau have certain responsibilities towards the President to see that our work is finished on time, after a thorough discussion to accommodate all the views and desires of members.

111. For this reason, I am afraid that I am not in a position to accept the task which the representative of Chile wanted the Bureau and me to undertake.

112. Now, to sum up the situation: I do not consider that the suggestions made by various delegations are formal proposals before the Committee. Unless anyone indicates that he is making a formal proposal, I take it that these were only suggestions to help the Committee out of its difficulties.

113. There are two ways to proceed. We can adjourn until Monday at 10.30 a.m. or we can listen to more delegations so as to be better able to evaluate the feeling of the Committee about the suggestions made up to now, particularly the suggestions made by the Chair.

114. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The discussion we have just held has shown, on the one hand, the desire of many representatives to avoid procedural debates and, on the other, the persistence of differing viewpoints on how to organize our work.

115. The Chair sees two ways in which the Committee can proceed. May I suggest that there might be a third way, which the Chairman may like to consider.

116. The Soviet delegation, in expressing its views on the order of work which would yield the most productive results, wanted of course to help the Committee. At the same time, it appears that there are other viewpoints and we are threatened with a lengthy procedural discussion. Accordingly, if this would promote speedy general agreement and if we could expect our example to be followed by other delegations which presented their own views on the order of priority, the Soviet delegation would consider not insisting on its proposals which have in fact not yet been formally presented, although in certain circumstances it might have to do so. However, as I say, in order to avoid a procedural discussion, we may not insist on our proposals and may follow the wisdom of the Chairman, who suggested an order which partly meets our views and partly does not. If this order is acceptable to the Committee as a whole, the Soviet delegation will not object to its adoption.

117. In taking this step, the Soviet delegation wishes to say that it listened with attention to the statement of the representative of Kenya, who said that it would be best to avoid procedural debates which are not in the interest of

our work. We are ready to do so, if others are ready. I repeat, we are prepared not to object to the Chairman's suggestion, if others are also prepared not to do so.

118. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, in the light of the very judicious remarks you made at the beginning of this meeting and again just now, I should like to explain the spirit in which my delegation made this proposal, in its concern to find some device that will allow us to proceed in our work as efficiently as possible, while not interfering with the indispensable exchange of views among delegations.

119. You put forward, logically and in full detail, in the form of a suggestion by the Chair—and we appreciated that—an order of procedure in which, if I am not mistaken, the first item was "International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space". As our second item, you suggested that we take up the item "Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America"; and as the third, a question of interest to all of us: "Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons". Finally, as fourth and fifth items you proposed: "Examination of the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor", and the "Question of Korea".

120. My delegation would like at this point to repeat what we said earlier—with due appreciation of your friendly and understanding words, which you know we reciprocate, and having heard other speakers—and to propose that we begin the debate with the order you suggested. In other words, we would start with the first two items, and hold consultations—with you, as Chairman, taking the lead—on the remaining items of the agenda. My delegation was particularly careful not to comment on the other points, with the sole exception of those items you did not mention—items 28, 29, 30 and 31—on which there appears to be agreement that we should await the results of the important labours of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

121. Thus it seemed to me that my proposal did not in any way conflict, in either spirit or language or intention, with the proposal you made at the beginning of the session, but by maintaining the order you suggested, it would give us some time, while discussing the first two items: "International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space" and "Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America", to take your suggestion to heart and see whether we could reach agreement.

122. My delegation does not believe that the fact that, in a generous spirit of co-operation and guidance such as befits the Chair you suggested a certain order of items, in any way inhibits you. Far from that; it enables you to continue these consultations with a clearer picture before you, and with the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur to advise you, so as to try to find common ground.

123. You ask whether this is a formal proposal. My delegation has no desire to press for a hurried decision today. But since there might be agreement on these items, and since some delegations (I have in mind Malta and Canada) have also intimated that the Chilean proposal

might perhaps be useful, I venture to reiterate my delegation's views, bearing in mind your pertinent suggestions the second time you spoke, in case this may be helpful to us in fixing our work schedule.

124. Miss BROOKS (Liberia): Mr. Chairman, first allow me to congratulate you, the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur, on your election to the Bureau of this important Committee.

125. I hesitated to speak on the question because I share the view of the representative of Kenya that we should not consume time, especially in view of the nature of the subjects we have to discuss, on procedural discussion. As far as my delegation is concerned, we are ready to accept the outline which you gave for commencing our work. However, there have been some reservations about your proposal and there is a divergence of views. There it is necessary for a compromise to be made in order for us to begin our work.

126. I listened to your proposal of either an adjournment or further discussion to arrive at a decision. I share your view that we could adjourn until Monday. But I feel that over the weekend those representatives who have reservations about your proposal might get in touch with you and take into consideration the views which have been expressed in the Committee. In that way the Bureau would be able to formulate an outline which would meet with the approval of the majority of the Committee. We could then perhaps begin our work on Monday.

127. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I share the view of the delegates who are reluctant to see our proceedings taken up with a long drawn-out procedural debate. I think it would be worth while, in order to proceed with the work of the Committee expeditiously, if we could decide today on at least an initial step towards resolving this problem. It seems to me that the representative of Chile has made a proposal which deserves our serious consideration. The representative of Ecuador has explained to us why the Latin American treaty on a nuclear-free zone is somewhat different and apart from all the other items relating to disarmament. It is true that this group is reporting to us on an agreement which has already been reached. We do not need to face the same kind of contentious debate, the same need for a full examination of technical aspects which will be involved in all matters relating to non-proliferation treaties and general complete disarmament.

128. It is also true, as the representative of the Soviet Union has said, that the Deputy Director of our disarmament agency, Mr. Fisher, is a member of our delegation and will be handling these items in this Committee. But I think it has perhaps escaped his attention that Mr. Fisher is still in Geneva with the other experts who are dealing with this subject. I take it that several other delegations have experienced the same difficulty.

129. But that being so, and since the representative of the Soviet Union has indicated that he is prepared to accommodate the members of the Committee in proceeding with items other than his own, and has suggested taking up several, which include outer space and the Latin American

nuclear-free zone if I understood him correctly, at the beginning of the debate, perhaps the course of wisdom for us today would be for us to agree, as recommended by the representative of Chile—since this appears to have removed most of the contention on these two points—that we should start the Committee's deliberations with those two subjects, deferring for further consultation and agreement a decision on how we would proceed with the balance of the items. I do wish to repeat that, as far as my delegation is concerned, the remaining items which relate to disarmament do belong together at a later stage of our consideration. Therefore, though taking up the Latin-American nuclear-free zone at quite such an early stage of our proceedings does not fully coincide with our original preference, in a spirit of compromise my delegation would be prepared to support that suggestion in the hope that we can agree on the first two items of business immediately today without further controversy and without any vote.

130. Mr. M'BAYE (Guinea) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, I should like to begin by making an appeal, but before doing so, I should like to say that the delegation of Guinea regards your election as though its own country and people had been chosen. The many kinds of relations between our two countries and our two peoples makes it easy for us to identify, as it were, with the United Arab Republic delegation and to regard any triumph of the United Arab Republic as a triumph for Guinea. My delegation likewise takes pleasure in congratulating on his election our comrade Tchernouchchenko, with whom we are all acquainted, and whose personality has so often been associated with the work of this Committee. We also congratulate our friend from Sweden.

131. Since there is a certain abundance of proposals, we feel that at this point in our discussions the Committee should turn back a little and reconsider your suggestions, Mr. Chairman, the fruit of careful thought, in the light of certain specific factors. On examination, it is clear that they are well balanced in both form and content. We feel that the suggestions are relevant, and we appeal to the Committee to approve them so as to break the deadlock and allow us to begin our work as quickly as possible.

132. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): Mr. Chairman, allow me first of all to congratulate you in the name of my delegation on your election as Chairman of our Committee. From our past experience, we are certain that under your able and wise guidance this Committee will work successfully. At the same time I wish to congratulate also our Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

133. We are engaged in the usual initial debates of our Committee, dealing with the priority of items on our agenda. I think it is very important that the work of our Committee should be organized in the best way, so that our work is successful, and I fully share the concern of those delegations which have spoken before and said that we should not waste our precious time with procedural debates.

134. I submit that if we go over the whole agenda and decide upon it in one session that will be the wisest way of dealing with our work and we shall save much time. The less issues are left pending till a later stage, the less

procedural debate we shall have later on. That is why the Hungarian delegation is of the opinion that we should try to agree on the priorities of all the items on our agenda, or as many of them as possible, today.

135. If we follow certain suggestions, and tackle the problem of priority item by item, or two by two, we shall each time spend a meeting or two on procedural debate. I do not think I have to remind the Committee—because everyone knows it very well—that in the past, when we have had to decide upon several groups of items at different times, we spent much time in procedural debate—or, one might say, procedural wrangling.

136. Therefore, my delegation would have been very much in favour of considering the items on their merits—whether they are responses to actual needs arising out of the international situation or whether they are dealing with some outstanding problems, placing them in a certain order according to those considerations. Certainly, that would not prejudice other items, which would be listed for later discussion.

137. My delegation had in mind as the first item of the agenda item 96, on the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. The reason we thought it should come first in our discussion was that there are wars going on in the world, and there is a very serious war ravaging the countries of South-East Asia. In connexion with that war, quite recently we heard statements from responsible statesmen that, in the course of the escalation of that war, new types of weapons might be used. When a saturation is achieved in the use of conventional weapons, they might refer to other weapons. What are the other weapons? Everyone knows they are nuclear weapons. Even if they are of the conventional type, they are very dangerous and are creating a dangerous situation for all mankind.

138. This is not without any foundation. We read an interview with the United States Secretary of Defence to this effect, and we are very much concerned about it.

139. I do not want to enter into the substance of the matter. The Foreign Minister of Hungary has already referred to this problem in his statement in the general debate of the plenary session. But we think that a step in the direction of the prohibition of nuclear weapons would relieve a little of the tension caused by such declarations and by the possible consequences of the further escalation of this dangerous war.

140. However, since the sponsor of this item—the representative of the Soviet Union—to which I have just referred, led by a spirit of compromise, is willing to heed the appeal to facilitate the procedural debate in our Committee and to agree to accord priority to other items, my delegation will not insist on giving priority to this item—without ignoring its importance—and it wishes to draw the Committee's attention to the problems involved in this matter.

141. We can support the order of the items proposed by you, Mr. Chairman, for the sake of expediting the work of our Committee. We also agree with your remark that, since we have not yet received the reports of the Conference of

the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and the disarmament experts are still dealing with the question at Geneva, it would be advisable to take up that conference's reports at a later stage. If this view could be shared by the majority in this Committee, we could end our procedural debate immediately.

142. A few minutes ago, the representative of the United States very wisely made a certain distinction when he agreed that other items which are not before the Geneva conference on disarmament could be considered separately; they have a different character and they can be examined in a different context. My delegation could share the view he expressed in connexion with item 91: Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

143. At the same time, I think we should also take into account the considerations very well explained by the representative of the Soviet Union, who emphasized that the convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons is in fact not a technical disarmament problem; it needs a political decision. When we consider this item we shall not discuss the different types of nuclear weapons for which we would most certainly need the co-operation of experts and specialists—I do not think that most of the representatives present here have a complete understanding of the technical problems involved. Since we are not taking up the technical aspects of this issue, I think we could very well take political decisions. And since this political decision would correspond to the general wish and aspiration of all mankind, of all nations, whether they are in the East or in the West, in the North or in the South, I think that we should not link the discussion of this item with the consideration of any other problem. It should be considered separately, at the earliest possible time.

144. In the light of the Chairman's proposal and the agreement of the sponsor of item 96, my delegation thinks that this question should be taken up right after the first two items. I fail to see any reason why we cannot agree on this problem if we set aside all subjective considerations. And if we bear in mind expeditious working methods in our Committee, we could immediately agree to this compromise proposal that you, Mr. Chairman, have suggested to us.

145. I should like to add that whenever we need interested parties in connexion with any item on our agenda, we should have them as the need arises and they should be available to our Committee; they would also be welcomed to come to the Committee and assist us in our deliberations with their presence and their advice.

146. Mr. LYG (Norway): Mr. Chairman, permit me, on behalf of the Norwegian delegation, first to convey our warm congratulations on your unanimous election to the chairmanship of this Committee.

147. We also share your wish, Mr. Chairman, to finish all items within the allotted time.

148. Having listened to this debate until now, I see we are dealing with a controversial question. I share the wish of a number of delegations not to waste time on a debate of this nature. I think the most convenient way to settle the

problem would be to support the proposal made by the representative of Chile. If we do so, in my opinion, we shall have enough to occupy us for at least a week. If we adopt this proposal, we would also have time to consider what items we should take up next.

149. I should therefore like to ask my colleague from Chile to make a formal proposal of his suggestion.

150. Mr. OHIN (Togo) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, allow me to extend to you my delegation's heartiest congratulations on your election to the Chairmanship of this Committee. As Africans, we are proud to see an experienced diplomat like yourself occupying the office. I should also like to congratulate the new Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur, who have just been unanimously elected.

151. I note that we are now on familiar ground, and I have nothing new to add.

152. I should like to support what has been said by some of the representatives who have preceded me, namely that, as we are all aware, procedural discussions are occasionally important as providing us with a definite order of procedure and enabling us to organize our work.

153. Nevertheless, it is a waste of time when procedural discussions drag on indefinitely; and time is of course precious in this organ.

154. Next, I should like to stress the matter of order of priority. This varies from individual to individual and from State to State. Very often, however, the idea of priority differs because the subject is in itself a controversial one. Thus, it would be well to set aside anything that might involve matters on which the opinions of various delegations are too divergent.

155. It would be well at the outset to consider the first two items, because the subjects involved give rise to no problem and no controversy; these then, should be the first items to be examined. Next, it would seem logical to examine certain related items. If today we take up an important item, after having discussed it for a week or two weeks, we shall arrive at an item that is related to it and our work will have some continuity. Hence, I would like to say that in my opinion, two items such as disarmament and nuclear weapons should be discussed together, the Assembly deciding what priority should be given to the two items.

156. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines): May I be permitted to dispense with the usual congratulatory remarks and instead request the high privilege of shaking hands with all the members of the Bureau at the end of the meeting.

157. I think we are all agreed that our discussion on the order of the items has been greatly advanced by the mutual concessions that have been made by the representatives of the Soviet Union and of the United States. I take it that the Soviet representative has now agreed not to insist on giving first priority to the item sponsored by his delegation, namely item 96 on the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. The representative of the United States has also agreed not to link item 91

on the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America with the other disarmament items.

158. In this situation, I think we are approaching possible agreement along the lines of the suggestion made by the representative of Chile. As I understand it, his proposal was that we now agree to discuss forthwith two items which are non-controversial in nature, namely item 32, concerning co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space, and item 91 on the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America, leaving for subsequent decision the order of all the other items. I think that this is a very wise proposal. As we all know, the meetings of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament are proceeding, we all hope, with a good chance of ultimate success. Who knows, perhaps by the time we consider the third item the results of the discussions in Geneva might be of such a nature as to clarify—if not modify—the views of the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of the United States in regard to the priority of the disarmament items. Who knows, by that time they might even agree to discuss all the disarmament items together, although now one of them says that it is not prepared to do that. So, in this hope, could we not agree on the proposal of the representative of Chile and adopt as the first two items on our agenda the item on outer space and the item on the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America?

159. Perhaps two or three days before the conclusion of our consideration of the second item we could proceed to consider the order of the balance of the items.

160. Mr. BELOKOLOS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure to me to congratulate you on behalf of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic on your election to this important, difficult and exacting position and to welcome and congratulate the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur on their election and wish that you may all work well together in directing the work of our Committee.

161. The First Committee has many items on its agenda. All of them are very complex and all require much time if they are to be examined thoroughly and carefully. Undoubtedly the most urgent ones are the items on the various aspects of disarmament. These items were referred by the twenty-first session of the Assembly to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee with the request for a report to the present session of the Assembly.

162. Unfortunately, we cannot now start our work by considering this most important of items entrusted to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee. The Committee must therefore ask itself what group of questions should be discussed first.

163. All those who congratulated the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur expressed reliance on the wisdom and experience of these representatives who are guiding our work. I think that our approach in relying on their experience and good sense is a very good way to solve this question which has given rise to much debate.

164. I think the proposal of the Chairman of our Committee deserves attention and the Ukrainian delegation,

having examined it, concludes that it might give it favourable consideration if given adequate time.

165. I fully agree with the representative of the Soviet Union and the representative of the Hungarian People's Republic that the suggestion of the Chairman, made at the beginning of the work of our Committee, should be examined and carefully considered and that we might deal with our work in the order that he suggests.

166. Some representatives tell us that the most reasonable proposal is the one put forward by the representative of Chile, but I do not think that this proposal would settle our difficulties, for after discussing the two items he proposes should come first, we should still come up against the same problems: what do we take up after those two items?

167. Therefore, I think that the best course would be to examine the items not related to the work of the Committee of Eighteen, allotting a certain period of time to that examination.

168. On behalf of my delegation, I now propose that we conclude our work for today so that we may think about the proposal put forward by the Chairman on behalf of the officers of the Committee; then on Monday we would be able to take a final decision on the order of priority of items.

169. That would be the best and most objective way, I think, to solve the problem, which is now developing into a procedural debate.

170. Mr. MISHRA (India): Despite the fact that the delegation of India has already congratulated you, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the Bureau, I shall also wait outside to shake your hand at the end of this meeting.

171. Any representative who has witnessed a procedural debate in the past will vouch for the fact that when one is in the midst of a procedural debate one finds oneself in partial agreement with almost everyone who has spoken, and the procedural debate in which we are engaged today is no exception.

172. Despite the fact that my delegation has a few points of detail on which it felt that it could not wholeheartedly support the Chair's informal suggestions, nevertheless we were prepared to go along with them and we would have accepted them if there had been a measure of agreement in this Committee. Unfortunately for us, we do not find any such agreement today.

173. My delegation is one of those which would like to benefit from the presence of disarmament experts when the Committee discusses any item connected with disarmament. Nevertheless, we realize that we cannot wait indefinitely for the work of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to conclude to enable our disarmament experts to be here.

174. We, ourselves, would have preferred to take up all the items connected with disarmament one after the other. I do not know whether, even at this stage, this would not be

possible, given a measure of compromise. Our preference is of course to start off with the item on outer space, as you, Mr. Chairman, have already suggested. But we are not very much in favour of going on to the second item, deciding that for the present, and then coming back again after three, four, five, or six meetings to engage in another procedural debate. To that extent we find some difficulty in accepting the proposal made by the representative of Chile.

175. We would agree, for the consideration of this Committee, to begin with item 32, on outer space, as you suggested, Mr. Chairman, and then go on to item 33 the Korean question, next. We have all of us dealt with that item at some time or other in this Committee. We know its ramifications. The third item could then be item 91: Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. The fourth might be item 96: Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. I hope that by the time we come to that item, we will have available to us the report of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and that we could then go on to items 28, 29, 30 and 31. However, if the report of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament is not available when we have finished item 96, then we could take up item 92, on the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and go on to the items concerning the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament later on. I feel that this should meet the objections of many of the delegations who would like to deal with the disarmament items one after another as they come up and also avail themselves of the benefit of the guidance of the disarmament experts. At the same time, we would be disposing of some of the important items which have been allocated to this Committee.

176. Mr. PARDO (Malta): I am very glad that near-unanimity seems to have been reached on the proposal made by the representative of Chile with regard to the order of items, that is to say, that we should take up first item 32, on the peaceful uses of outer space and second item 91 on the treaty for the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America.

177. The representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and, just now, the representative of India have very aptly pointed out that this, however, does not solve our problem; for after having disposed of the first two items we would necessarily have to discuss and to decide the priority of the other items. I wonder, therefore, whether a similar near-unanimity could not be obtained now with regard to considering as the third item, item 92 on the sea-bed. This should be a non-controversial item, at least at this stage. Furthermore, it is a new item also and I would urge that it might be useful for us to take it up as early as possible in our work, if only to listen to general statements and then, should this be considered necessary, to revert to it after all other items have been considered. This would not materially delay discussion of the other items and I think would probably facilitate the work of delegations.

178. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. Chairman, I join those who have preceded me in offering my sincere congratulations upon your election as Chairman of this most important Committee. Needless to say, the brotherly relations which exist between your

country and my own make us particularly happy at your elevation to this post. I have no doubt that with your immense experience and dedication the work of the First Committee will be facilitated and will be concluded successfully. My congratulations also go to our colleague Ambassador Tchernouchchenko of the Byelorussian SSR, as the Vice-Chairman of our Committee. The election of the representative of Sweden to the post of Rapporteur gives us particular pleasure, as we are conscious of the friendly relations existing between Sweden and my own country. My delegation therefore extends to him our sincere congratulations.

179. We have listened carefully to the observations of the various delegations regarding the order of business of our Committee. At the outset I should like to say that my delegation is rather flexible on this and does not hesitate to support wholeheartedly the proposal made by the Chair. In our opinion, that proposal could have very much facilitated the smooth functioning of our work. Yet it appears that there are reservations by some delegations to that proposal.

180. After careful consideration of the various points raised, my delegation is of the opinion that it is possible

and desirable to harmonize the various viewpoints. We feel that if we continue with procedural debate there will be no possibility of our ending with anything concrete this evening. The more we speak, the more new proposals are made. It is therefore my opinion that, in order to begin our work in a noble spirit and to avoid controversy, we must support the proposal made by the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic that we adjourn this meeting until Monday. We hope that between now and Monday the various delegations will be in touch with the Chair and their views will be harmonized.

181. Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I ask pardon for taking the floor a second time, but I should like to refer very briefly to a portion of the proposal made by the representative of Malta. I should like to draw the Committee's attention to one fact before it arrives at its decision. When an item is discussed and not completed and the Committee reverts to it, this usually involves two debates on the same subject. I should like this to be taken into consideration.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.