

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1546th
MEETING**

Monday, 11 December 1967,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda items 29, 30 and 31:

Question of general and complete disarmament
(continued):

(a) Report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation
Committee on Disarmament;

(b) Report of the Secretary-General on the effects of the
possible use of nuclear weapons and on the security
and economic implications for States of the acquisition
and further development of these weapons

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear
tests: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation
Committee on Disarmament (continued)

Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of
Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the Conference
of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament
(continued) 1

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

AGENDA ITEMS 29, 30 AND 31

**Question of general and complete disarmament
(continued):**

(a) **Report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation
Committee on Disarmament (A/6951-DC/229, A/C.1/
L.411; A/C.1/L.412);**

(b) **Report of the Secretary-General on the effects of the
possible use of nuclear weapons and on the security
and economic implications for States of the acquisition
and further development of these weapons (A/6858
and Corr.1; A/C.1/L.413)**

**Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear
tests: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation
Committee on Disarmament (continued) (A/6951-
DC/229)**

**Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of
Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the Conference
of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament
(continued) (A/6951-DC/229)**

1. The CHAIRMAN: I shall try to settle the procedural point which was raised at this morning's meeting. I would propose to the Committee that it take up on Friday morning item 28, together with the other three items. I appeal to the representative of Malaysia to agree to the proposal which I am making on the assumption that I will allow enough time, within the short remaining time at our disposal, to allow item 28 to be disposed of in the way the

Committee sees fit. If I hear no objection, and I refer mainly to the representative of Malaysia, then I shall take it that the Committee agrees to my proposal which, I repeat, is that on Friday morning the Committee will discuss item 28, together with its two sub-items, concurrently with items 29, 30 and 31.

2. I call upon the representative of Uganda, and I hope he will not oppose my proposal.

3. Mr. ALLIMADI (Uganda): Far from opposing it, I must first of all apologize for intervening since your question was directed more to the representative of Malaysia, whom I do not wish to obstruct; but I should like to stress the point that although the proposal in question was introduced by the representative of Malaysia, and supported by my delegation and others, we feel equally strongly that this is an item which we have to discuss. I do not wish to oppose the proposal that the Chair has just put forward, except that I should like to express some fear that Friday seems to be a little too close to the end of the session for the inclusion of this item.

4. One or two things might happen. My fear is that perhaps the time will be so limited by Friday that we will not be able to exchange all the views we could have exchanged if the item had been included in the agenda to be discussed simultaneously with the three other items on which we have already embarked. I am not opposing the proposal, but I have that reservation that perhaps there will be very little time left for discussion.

5. The CHAIRMAN: I should like to assure the representative of Uganda and others who feel strongly on this point that, in spite of that decision, they have every right in their statements on the three items—items 29, 30 and 31—to refer to any aspects whatsoever relating to disarmament. It is not my intention to curtail their freedom.

6. Not only that, but if the representative of Uganda and others would like formally to submit to the Secretariat or the Chair right away a draft resolution on item 28 (b), I shall accept it and it will be circulated. Therefore, I hope he will rest assured that I am not curtailing the freedom of any representative to comment on item 28 while he is speaking on the three items which we have already agreed to discuss.

7. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania): I do not think it is really a question of whether or not we will be allowed to comment on the subject, but it is simply a question of timing. If we assume that this session of the General Assembly will be closed next Tuesday, and that item 28 will be taken up on Friday, then, of course, we see the limitation of time between Friday and the closing date of the session. In that case, there might be a limitation. For

instance, if the item comes up on Friday and then thereafter you, Mr. Chairman, have to close the list of speakers, I do not know when that closure will take place. Then, of course, it would appear that most likely there will not be very much time for this matter to be thoroughly discussed. That is why when some delegations suggested this morning that this item be taken up simultaneously with the other three items, they took into consideration exactly what you said. If you are going to allow representatives to comment on all these matters generally, then definitely it appears as if there is no logic in saying it should not be taken up simultaneously with the other three items, but should be taken up on Friday. If, in your opinion, representatives even at this stage can comment on item 28, then surely the easiest way would have been to take up all these items simultaneously, rather than wait until Friday. After Friday, there will be Saturday and Monday, and on Tuesday this session of the General Assembly will be closed.

8. These are the few comments I wish to make, although my delegation will not insist upon them, but we had hoped that, after this morning, the consultations you, Mr. Chairman, held after the meeting would have produced more agreeable results than the one you have announced this afternoon.

9. The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objection to the proposal I have made, I shall take it that it is approved by the Committee.

It was so decided.

10. The CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the Committee that I intend to close the list of speakers on items 29, 30 and 31 at 1 p.m. tomorrow. Moreover, members of the Committee may have noticed that three draft resolutions have been circulated in connexion with these items. The first, contained in document A/C.1/L.411 dated 7 December, is sponsored by Malta; the second, contained in document A/C.1/L.412, is sponsored by Hungary; and the third, contained in document A/C.1/L.413, is sponsored by Canada, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Poland and Sweden.

11. Mr. DE LAIGLESIA (Spain) (*translated from Spanish*): The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament has transmitted to the General Assembly an interim report on the results of its work during the 1967 session [A/6951-DC/229]. In accordance with the decision of the First Committee, only the problems covered by items 28(b), 29, 30 and 31 of the agenda are to be discussed in this general debate. As is logical, item 28(a) will remain pending until the Committee meeting at Geneva finishes drawing up a draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

12. At present, although we have little time at our disposal and it would be difficult to engage in a detailed discussion of such comprehensive subjects as general and complete disarmament, the need to suspend nuclear tests and the elimination of foreign bases, I think we can state our views on some questions connected with these important problems. However, I should like to make it quite clear that the Spanish delegation regards this debate as entirely independent of the exhaustive discussion which we must

necessarily have in the General Assembly when the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is ripe, and the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament has been crystallized in specific proposals which express the views of the great Powers, on the one hand, and, on the other, take into account the views expressed at Geneva by the non-nuclear members of the Committee. At that time we shall fully state our views on item 28(a).

13. As regards the three items which are the subject of our present debate, the Spanish delegation wishes to stress once more the importance of reaching an agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control, compared to which all other measures are really secondary. The Spanish delegation considers it essential that we should never lose sight of this objective, and that any decision we may adopt should at all times be related to general and complete disarmament. We believe that only when it is possible to foresee real progress in this direction will we have reason to contemplate the future of mankind with optimism and confidence.

14. Since the end of the twenty-first regular session, very little progress has been made on the three items before us. Nevertheless, independently of the work being done by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva, the Organization has accomplished remarkably important work. I refer to the report of the Secretary-General on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons [A/6858].

15. Apart from the intrinsic interest of the study made by the experts appointed by the Secretary-General, this report demonstrates the usefulness of completely objective study by the Organization of certain problems on which the Members have so far only received views that were inevitably biased, since they were presented by national experts of countries whose attitudes were naturally reflected in the work done by their own technicians. Disarmament problems raise many thoroughly scientific questions which, therefore, call for examination by specialists capable of explaining to all the Members of the Organization questions on which we have so far had only the information supplied by certain countries. I am convinced that document A/6858 will be extremely useful; although it was circulated only on 10 October of this year, its effects could already be judged in the debate on item 96, during which many delegations referred extensively to various of its paragraphs.

16. In connexion with item 30, for example, the Spanish delegation considers that a report by the Secretary-General prepared in the same way as the one previously mentioned, on the possibilities of differentiating between seismic movements and underground explosions could certainly be of great importance.

17. The Spanish delegation wishes to take the opportunity offered in the debate to express to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament its appreciation of the efforts that Committee is making to achieve constructive results in these matters. We must never forget the extraordinary difficulties of its assignment, in the light of which the drafts submitted on 24 August of this year¹ by the co-Chairmen

¹ Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1967 and 1968, documents DC/230 and Add.1, annex IV, sections 6 and 8.

of the Committee represent an achievement which amply justifies its existence.

18. Nevertheless, the Spanish delegation considers it advisable to work out a formula to enable the countries not participating in the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to maintain some form of contact with its activities. I think it is important, however, to stress that, whatever method may be used to improve such contact, it should in no way interfere with that Committee's work. In fact, the restricted nature and balanced membership of the Committee, as well as its methods of work, are the determining factors in its effectiveness.

19. If all Member States were to feel that the work being done at Geneva was not being done behind their backs, and that they were represented—even indirectly—in the debates there, I think it would remove the feeling of frustration which may often be observed in many sectors of international public opinion with regard to the Geneva negotiations. In this way, the impatience with which everybody awaited the Committee's report [A/6951-DC/229] and the disappointment of the members of the First Committee on finding its contents so meagre would surely have been avoided, since all countries would have been well aware of the strong reasons underlying the character of the interim report.

20. At the same time, and despite the fact that the attention given by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to item 31 probably does not warrant extensive discussion, I should like to stress the interest this problem holds for Spain, an interest which was expressed at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly by the head of our delegation, Ambassador Aznar, in his speech before the First Committee on 1 December 1966 [1470th meeting, paras. 5-12].

21. In conclusion, I should like to express the confidence of the Spanish delegation that progress will be made in the negotiations to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control. We should therefore face the future with optimism, although without ever forgetting that multilateral international co-operation always requires long and painstaking efforts, the results of which seldom completely satisfy the hopes placed in them. What matters is that progress, however slight it may seem, may constitute a decisive step forward on the path towards permanent peace among nations.

22. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet Government has always attached the utmost importance to the problem of disarmament. It considers the achievement of disarmament to be the most important factor in ensuring world peace. In its statement today the Soviet delegation intends to dwell primarily on the question of general and complete disarmament.

23. In 1959 the General Assembly declared that general and complete disarmament was the most important question facing the world and called upon Governments to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution, expressing the hope that measures leading towards the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective

international control would be worked out in detail and agreed upon in the shortest possible time.

24. This decision of the General Assembly, which was adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union, was intended to encourage States to put an end to the arms race, to stop squandering immense amounts of money in manufacturing weapons of mass destruction, to reduce progressively their existing armed forces and ultimately to do away with them altogether, to scrap the stockpiles of all weapons, including nuclear weapons. Millions of human beings, at all times, have earnestly wished to bring this about and today, when the threat of a nuclear war of annihilation is more than ever possible, they want disarmament more consciously and actively than ever. The peoples of the world who have experienced war, particularly a world war, and the suffering and destruction that it brings, are hoping for lasting peace and therefore want disarmament.

25. However, although eight years have passed since the United Nations declared that the question of general and complete disarmament was the most important question facing the world, we have come no nearer to the practical solution of that problem. It is true that in 1961, 1962, 1963, 1965 and 1966 the General Assembly emphasized again and again the immense importance of the question of general and complete disarmament and the need to find a speedy solution to that problem. Throughout those eight years the question of general and complete disarmament has been a subject of negotiations among States, but no agreement has as yet been reached.

26. According to the interim report of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, which we received a few days ago, we all know that this year, in accordance with a decision of the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, that Committee has dealt primarily with the drafting of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as being the most pressing and urgent task. Taking into account the present situation in the world, and in particular the threat that nuclear weapons might fall into the hands of certain groups which follow policies that are particularly dangerous to peace, it was quite logical for the Eighteen-Nation Committee to concentrate its efforts on the problem of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Accordingly we note with satisfaction that in its interim report the Committee says that considerable progress has already been made towards achieving a treaty on non-proliferation, although a final draft has not yet been completed. It would seemingly be appropriate for this twenty-second session of the General Assembly, after taking note of the work already done, to call on the Eighteen-Nation Committee to reach agreement as soon as possible on the text of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

27. In view of the fact that it has been dealing primarily with the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons this year, the Eighteen-Nation Committee, as can be seen from its report, has not been able to devote sufficient time to examining the question of general and complete disarmament. That fact emphasizes even more that we should remember, here in the General Assembly, that strenuous efforts must be made in the future to solve the problem of general and complete disarmament.

28. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it has systematically bent every effort to achieve progress in negotiations on general and complete disarmament. Our country is sincerely striving for a solution to this problem and for it this is not a circumstantial or tactical move in the international arena but the expression of the very nature of the socialist society and the socialist State. In our country there are no social groups which pursue goals of conquest or which seek any material or other interests in the armaments race and in militaristic policies. If we seek to strengthen our defences in conditions when no progress is being achieved in disarmament negotiations, and when certain Powers are constantly extending the armaments race and pursuing a policy of aggression in the international arena, we do so solely in order to ensure the security of our country and that of our friends and allies.

29. May I remind the Committee of the main facts of the struggle of the Soviet Union for general and complete disarmament in recent years.

30. On 19 December 1959 the Soviet delegation to the fourteenth session of the General Assembly submitted a Declaration on General and Complete Disarmament,² which gave a comprehensive review of the reasons for which such a radical measure was needed, and presented to all Members of the United Nations the first draft of a programme of general and complete disarmament.³

31. In 1960, the Soviet Government worked out and presented first in the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament and then at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly, the fundamental provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament. These proposals offered a more specific plan for general and complete disarmament, which had been drawn up in the light of the views of many other States expressed after the adoption at the fourteenth session of the General Assembly of a resolution on general and complete disarmament.

32. The main characteristic of our plan for general and complete disarmament from the very beginning consisted in carrying out from the very first stage of disarmament measures of such importance that they would in effect immediately deprive States of the possibility of waging large-scale war, especially a nuclear war. We are convinced that only such an approach can ensure true security for all States during the actual process of disarmament, when there is a progressive liquidation of armed forces.

33. In conformity with that approach, which we have been advocating during the whole course of negotiations on general and complete disarmament, the Soviet Union, already in its proposals of 1960, put forward as a most important measure during the first stage of disarmament the elimination of the means of delivery of nuclear weapons, that is to say, of military rockets, military aircraft and submarines that were capable of carrying rockets with nuclear warheads, as well as all other means of delivery on the target of nuclear charges, bombs and shells.

34. Having put forward those proposals, the Soviet Union took up a firm line so that an agreement on general and complete disarmament acceptable to all parties could be worked out through negotiations.

35. In 1961, at our initiative, bilateral Soviet-American negotiations took place and led to an agreement on certain principles for disarmament negotiations that were presented to the sixteenth session of the General Assembly.⁴ The question of the creation of a new negotiating organ, the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, to be composed of representatives of socialist countries, States members of Western military blocs and non-aligned countries, was then decided on. In a resolution adopted at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly [resolution 1660 (XVI)], again on our initiative, a provision was included that the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee should immediately start negotiations in order to reach agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

36. As soon as the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee met on 15 March 1962, the Soviet delegation submitted a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament.⁵ That draft contained a detailed programme for carrying out general and complete disarmament in three stages over a period of three or four years.

37. Our draft was presented as a basis for negotiations. Later on we demonstrated in practice that we wanted to find agreed solutions for all concrete questions arising during the negotiations on general and complete disarmament. In subsequent months, at the first meetings of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, the Soviet Union, in order to narrow the gap between various positions, declared its readiness to accept the proposal of Western countries concerning the order for the reduction of conventional weapons, made concessions as regards the levels of armed forces at various stages of general and complete disarmament, and agreed to prolong somewhat, if necessary, the time limit for the carrying out of the disarmament programme.

38. During the negotiations, the United States and other Western Powers proposed that a certain quantity of nuclear weapons and means of delivery should be retained until the very end of the disarmament process. The Soviet Union decided again to meet its partners halfway on this important question. It declared itself ready to agree to allowing the nuclear Powers to keep a kind of "nuclear umbrella" until the very end of the disarmament process if the other party considered it necessary to keep it during the disarmament process.

39. That action was universally greeted as an expression of the goodwill of the Soviet Union and of its interest in seeing the negotiations succeed, and led to a widespread favourable reaction from the overwhelming majority of States, including members of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee. Many of the participating States, in the

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 70, document A/4219.

³ *Ibid.*, *Fifteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda items 67, 69, 73, 86, document A/4373/Rev.1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Sixteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 19, document A/4879.

⁵ *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission*, Supplement for January 1961–December 1962, document DC/203, annex 1, section C.

negotiations made constant efforts to utilize to the utmost the new favourable possibilities resulting from that proposal of the Soviet Union.

40. Unfortunately, all that was in vain. If the question is asked why the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee has not moved forward in recent years in negotiations on general and complete disarmament, we can say with a clear conscience that the Soviet Union is not responsible for the sterility of those negotiations.

41. If we want to know who places obstacles in the way of progress in those negotiations, we must look at the facts, which show that the responsibility for the absence of progress in negotiations on general and complete disarmament must be laid at the door of the Western Powers, and especially of the United States. From the very beginning of those negotiations it proclaimed that general and complete disarmament meant general and complete chaos. Under the pressure of public opinion, it has been obliged to recognize in words that general and complete disarmament would be a desirable goal, but in its deeds it has always looked for pretexts in order to evade an agreement, even when the other party tried to meet its own proposals. Over and over again it put forward new proposals which would certainly not lead to disarmament, but which would perpetuate nuclear weapons, and the means of their delivery, and would legalize the maintenance of bases in foreign countries.

42. In point of fact, our Western partners in the disarmament negotiations do not start from the premise that there will be agreement on general and complete disarmament, but rather that there will be an increase in the armaments race. The United States alone during the past two or three years has increased its military expenditures by more than \$30,000 million. It is now waging on an ever-larger scale an aggressive war in Viet-Nam, using even such means of mass destruction as gas and chemical weapons, which are prohibited by the Geneva Protocol of 1925. It encourages Israeli aggression against the Arab States, threatens the security of socialist Cuba and supports in various parts of the world military-reactionary régimes which oppress the popular movements for freedom and independence.

43. All this leads to a worsening of the international situation, increases the danger of a world conflict and, of course, cannot but compel peace-loving States to take measures to ensure their security.

44. It must be said that there are not only States obstructing agreement on general and complete disarmament in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, but more such States outside that Committee. We have particularly in mind the Federal Republic of Germany.

45. The political situation in that State can now be described as one of unbridled revanchism and militarism. Tens of millions of marks are again being spent on armaments, and divisions of the Bundeswehr, differing from the Wehrmacht only in that their armaments and equipment are more up-to-date, are again on the march. In West Germany we hear ever more arrogant voices demanding changes in boundaries established as a result of the Second World War in Europe, and revanchist threats are proffered

against neighbouring States. In this connexion, we wish to draw attention to the note of the Soviet Government to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, dated 8 December 1967.

46. Of course, there are now forces in the world which will not allow West German revanchists to carry out their criminal plans. But that does not diminish the danger to peace emanating from West Germany. There is no question linked to disarmament which the men in Bonn would not try to sabotage and there is no proposal to strengthen peace which the revanchists of West Germany would not try to undermine.

47. The absence of progress in negotiations for general and complete disarmament cannot but cause alarm among all those States that want a lasting peace and among all peace-loving forces. The Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the Effects of the Possible Use of Nuclear Weapons—which was drafted by a group of leading scientists and experts from Poland, Mexico, the Soviet Union, Sweden, France, Canada, Japan, Nigeria, the United States of America, Norway, India and the United Kingdom—is imbued with this sense of alarm.

48. Examining the question of a convention prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons, the Soviet and other delegations have already quoted some passages from the report of the Secretary-General put forward in order to justify the need for urgent measures to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons, the cessation of the nuclear armaments race and disarmament. We should now like to draw the attention of representatives of States Members of the United Nations to the conclusions reached in that report.

49. These conclusions are most eloquent and specific. The report emphasizes that:

“The solution of the problem of ensuring security cannot be found in an increase in the number of States possessing nuclear weapons or, indeed, in the retention of nuclear weapons by the Powers currently possessing them. . . . Security for all countries of the world must be sought through the elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear weapons and the banning of their use, by way of general and complete disarmament” [*A/6858, para. 91*].

The Secretary-General goes on to say:

“... whatever the path to national and international security in the future, it is certainly not to be found in the further spread and elaboration of nuclear weapons. The threat of the immeasurable disaster which could befall mankind were nuclear war ever to erupt, whether by miscalculation or by mad intent, is so real that informed people the world over understandably become impatient for measures of disarmament additional to the few measures of arms limitation that have already been agreed to. . . . International agreement against the further proliferation of nuclear weapons and agreements on measures of arms control and disarmament will promote the security of all countries. The United Nations has the overriding responsibility in this field; the more effective it becomes in action, the more powerful its authority, the greater becomes the assurance of man's future. And the longer the world waits, the more nuclear arsenals grow, the greater and more difficult becomes the eventual task.” [*Ibid., para. 94*].

50. These quotations, speak for themselves. Disarmament questions, the problem of general and complete disarmament, must be settled in a practical manner. All the peoples of the world have an interest in this. This is in the true national interest of all States, nuclear and non-nuclear, large or small, economically developed or developing. This is in the common interest of all mankind.

51. That is why the Soviet Union, which is constantly pursuing a policy of peace in the international arena, a policy of repelling aggression and decreasing international tension, considers that efforts must now be intensified in the fight for general and complete disarmament.

52. We do not consider that disarmament negotiations have no future. We cannot agree to the assertion that the world is unable to cope with the armaments race. Such an approach is convenient only for those who wish to conceal their policy of promoting the armaments race. Our country is guided by the fact that the united efforts of all peace-loving forces can also lead to success in this complex area of international relations. Further, we consider that the measures which have already been achieved in the field of limiting the armaments race, that is to say, the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, exert a favourable influence on armaments negotiations. We note with satisfaction the constructive decision of the present session of the General Assembly on the question of the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. We attach special importance to negotiations on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, which have now reached a decisive stage.

53. The Soviet delegation would therefore like to appeal all the more forcibly and with all the confidence it feels in the justice of the common struggle for disarmament, to all delegations to make their contribution to ensuring progress in the negotiations on general and complete disarmament. If we all join together, we can set things in motion. To achieve this, the Soviet Union is prepared to go on co-operating most actively with all States. It will examine any constructive proposals for expediting the settlement of the problem of general and complete disarmament.

54. In his recent report on the fiftieth anniversary of the Great October Revolution, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev, stressed:

“Now, when the Soviet Union has achieved unprecedented power, it is still in favour of refraining from any

attempts to settle relations between two social systems by military means.

“We appeal to the Governments of the bourgeois countries to heed the voice of the peoples demanding peace and lasting security.

“The Soviet Union deems it its duty to do anything in its power to translate into deeds these aspirations of the peoples of the world. That is why it will continue, with unflagging energy, to strive for general and complete disarmament. We also regard as useful such partial measures towards this objective as an agreement on the prohibition of tests of nuclear weapons, on the inadmissibility of their further proliferation, or on the prohibition of their use.”

55. In setting out its position on general and complete disarmament, the Soviet delegation reserves its right at subsequent stages of this discussion to speak out also on other items which are now under consideration in the First Committee: the question of the elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the prohibition of underground nuclear tests, and other questions relating to partial measures which would limit the armaments race.

56. The CHAIRMAN: I have no further speakers for this afternoon. Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to make the following announcements. First, India and the United Arab Republic have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.413. The number of sponsors is now nine.

57. Secondly, as of now, I have only four speakers for tomorrow. I hope that we will have more speakers. But in the light of this very limited number of speakers, I shall cancel tomorrow's night meeting. We shall therefore have one meeting tomorrow at 3 p.m.

58. Thirdly, I should like to remind representatives that, beginning the day after tomorrow, we will be having two meetings every day and, if necessary, two meetings on Saturday, so that we can dispose of the remaining items on our agenda. I hope that representatives will be good enough to inscribe their names on the list of speakers and will be ready to take the floor in the order in which their names are inscribed. The list of speakers on the three items will be closed at 1 p.m. tomorrow. In the meantime, I hope that representatives will be kind enough to offer their comments on the draft resolutions already circulated, so that we may avoid a separate debate on the draft resolutions after we finish the general debate.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.