

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1533rd  
MEETING**

Tuesday, 21 November 1967,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 91:

Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America ( <i>continued</i> )	
Consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2 ( <i>continued</i> )	1
Organization of work	2

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

**AGENDA ITEM 91**

**Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (*continued*)\* (A/6663, A/6676 and Add.1-4, A/C.1/946, A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION  
A/C.1/L.406/REV.2 (*continued*)**

1. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): At the 1531st meeting, the delegation of Guyana requested that consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.406/Rev.1 should be postponed until today. The Committee, together with all the sponsors of the draft, agreed that this should be done and that, as appears in the verbatim record, we should proceed today, as proposed by the Chairman, to explanations of vote in accordance with the last revision which was to be submitted to the Committee on 21 November.

2. The sponsors of the draft resolution succeeded in meeting the requirements decided by the Committee, and this morning gave the Secretariat the text appearing in document A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2. They have asked me to formally submit this text on their behalf.

3. I need only a few words to fulfil that honourable assignment, since I feel that whatever could be said both about the Treaty of Tlatelolco<sup>1</sup> and the draft resolution has already been said. Consequently, I shall confine myself to highlighting the two following points.

4. Firstly, we believe that of the many items comprising the agenda of the General Assembly none has been in just a few days, so patiently and thoroughly discussed and studied as the item before us has been by the representatives of the

States sponsoring the joint draft, with the valuable participation of the representatives of Guyana and Jamaica in most cases and, in one case, that of Barbados as well.

5. We also feel that there have been few occasions when delegations sponsoring a draft resolution have shown greater understanding of the views of other delegations or greater receptivity to them, although necessarily within the limitations imposed upon us by the fact that we are dealing with the text of a Treaty signed by the plenipotentiaries of sovereign States, the amendment of which is outside the competence not only of those delegations but of the General Assembly itself.

6. It was that spirit of complete understanding and receptivity which made possible the inclusion in the revised text of a new paragraph, now the penultimate paragraph of the preamble, which reads as follows: "Noting that it is the intention of the signatory States that all"—I stress "all"—"existing States within the zone defined in the Treaty may become parties to the Treaty without any restriction."—I repeat, "without any restriction". We venture to hope that the representative of Guyana, who will undoubtedly not allow the limitations to which I referred to escape him, may find this text satisfactory.

7. Secondly, the other point we consider worth reiterating is that, as the well-known proverb commends, we should not be prevented from seeing the wood for the trees.

8. No doubt the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America is not a perfect instrument. But we must always remember that perfection is unattainable in human affairs. The Treaty is the result of the persevering efforts and good faith of a large group of sovereign States which have worked persistently and tirelessly for three years to make it possible for Latin America to be free of nuclear weapons for ever. Like any treaty, it is a legal and political instrument in whose preparation and adoption each and every one of the signatory States have had to make concessions and give proof of a genuine spirit of conciliation. We are sure that there is not a single signatory State which would not have preferred a text different from that in the Treaty, at least with regard to some of its provisions. For that matter, we are equally certain that the same may be said of the supreme international instrument now in existence: the Charter of the United Nations.

9. Nevertheless—and it is essential that we never forget this—the Treaty as a whole is one of the most valuable international instruments ever concluded in the field of disarmament. As the Secretary-General of the United Nations declared at the time, and as has been echoed here by the representatives of almost all of the forty-six States

\* Resumed from the 1531st meeting.

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

which participated in the Committee's general debate on this question, the Treaty of Tlatelolco is the first example of unqualified prohibition of nuclear weapons in lands inhabited by man; it constitutes an event of historic significance in the world-wide effort to prevent the proliferation of and to call a halt to the nuclear weapons race; it marks an important milestone in the long and difficult search for disarmament; it is the first international instrument in this field to establish an effective control system under a permanent supervisory organ; and at the same time it sanctions the right to use atomic energy for proved peaceful purposes in order to speed up the economic and social development of the peoples of the contracting parties.

10. It is this broad view, rather than that of imperfect details which, I repeat, also abound in the United Nations Charter, that the sponsors of the revised Latin American draft resolution hope will inspire the action of all the members of this Committee and of the General Assembly on the item before us.

11. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has heard the statement of the representative of Mexico, submitting the revised text on behalf of the co-sponsors. Does any representative wish to comment on it?

12. Mr. NABWERA (Kenya): My delegation is very grateful to the representative of Mexico, and to the Latin American group in general, for submitting the revised text. I should like to assure them that, as we have said from the beginning, my delegation supports the spirit that motivated their signing of this Treaty, and we should be very happy to associate ourselves, and indeed the whole Committee, in doing so. But my delegation feels that at this stage we need a little more time. We should like to request you formally, Mr. Chairman, to adjourn the Committee for some time so that we can consult amongst ourselves to see what we can do about the revised draft, in the light of the points that were raised by the delegation of Guyana last week.

13. Mr. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) (*translated from French*): My delegation listened with the utmost interest to what Mr. García Robles had to say about the draft resolution, and we give credit to the efforts that have brought about this second revision of the text submitted to us.

14. Nevertheless, in the light of the remarks made last Friday by the representative of Guyana [*1531st meeting*], it transpires that a very important problem has been raised, and the revised text before us unfortunately does not seem to us to answer the question fully and satisfactorily.

15. My delegation, while acknowledging the effort made by the Latin American delegations to improve the text, would therefore like to associate itself with what the representative of Kenya has just said and request you to give us a little more time in the hope that the consultations under way will lead to a solution that will be more equitable and more in line with what the United Nations can and should do.

16. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by the representa-

tives of Kenya and Mauritania. However, in paying tribute to the efforts made by our Latin American colleagues, and particularly to Mr. García Robles of Mexico, my delegation fully appreciates the spirit in which the co-sponsors of the draft resolution are considering the views which have been expressed by certain delegations. I think it is only fitting, in that spirit, that further consultations should be allowed. The Committee is aware of the presentation which was made by the representative of Guyana at our last meeting. I think that with the presentation of this revised draft it is reasonable to give us more time, and to provide time for private and informal consultations to be carried on. I therefore support the proposal made by the representative of Kenya.

17. Mr. Hady TOURE (Guinea) (*translated from French*): My delegation would like to join with the preceding speakers not only to support the request for a postponement of the vote to a later date, but also to specify, if there is really any need to do so, that the vote should be postponed to our meeting scheduled for Thursday morning, or at any rate some time on Thursday. My point is that in our attempt to make the draft resolution an instrument of agreement within the Organization, it would be altogether appropriate that there should be as much consultation as possible; in other words, delegations should consult extensively amongst themselves in order to come to a general agreement on the resolution now before us in draft form. My delegation is thus formally requesting that the vote be postponed until our Thursday morning meeting.

18. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Kenya has proposed that we adjourn consideration and action on the revised text contained in document A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2. Since I do not hear any objection to that proposal, I take it that the Committee agrees.

*It was so decided.*

### *Organization of work*

19. The CHAIRMAN: Are there any speakers on the second item on our agenda: Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons?

20. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): As I understood it, the Chairman would inform us of the date on which consideration and action on item 91 are to be resumed and, from what I heard, the representative of Guinea proposed that it be set for the morning of 23 November.

21. The CHAIRMAN: I intend to do so in a few minutes. However, since no delegation wishes to make a statement on item 96, I should like to inform the Committee of our programme for the next three days. I have scheduled a meeting for tomorrow morning in order to continue the general debate on item 96, namely, Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. However, if no delegation has indicated to the Secretariat by 6 p.m. today its readiness to speak tomorrow I shall be forced to cancel that meeting. The *Journal* will indicate whether we are going to meet or not.

22. Secondly, on Thursday at 10 a.m., the Working Group on the item proposed by the delegation of Malta, i.e., Examination of the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, will meet in the Economic and Social Council chamber. Therefore, no meeting of the First Committee is scheduled on Thursday, either in the morning or in the afternoon. We will have two meetings on Friday. At the morning meeting, if there is no objection, we will take up item 91, Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, in particular to discuss the revised text of the resolution submitted by the Latin American delegations under this item. During that meeting members may give explanations of vote and after that we will vote on the draft resolution. If, as I hope, we conclude the item concerning Latin America, the Committee will resume the general debate on item 96, the item proposed by the Soviet Union, and I hope that by then a sufficient number of delegations will be ready to speak. Moreover, I should like to inform members of the Committee that I intend to close the list of speakers on item 96 at 4 p.m. on Friday. We began the debate on this item on Monday and it seems to me that we will not be able to take it up before Friday. Up to now we have heard two speakers. You have seen that, as far as the Chair is concerned, I have been very flexible; I have given everybody enough time to prepare a statement. Therefore, at 1 p.m. on Friday the list of speakers on item 96 will be closed.

23. If there is no objection, I take it that the Committee agrees to the programme I have indicated.

24. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I apologize if I raised my hand somewhat precipitately, Mr. Chairman; I certainly did not wish to interrupt you.

25. The Soviet delegation fully agrees with the schedule which you have proposed for the week, but I should merely like to draw your attention to the practice already established at the present session, under your guidance, to close the list of speakers, not during, but at the ending of the afternoon meeting.

26. It might be easier to close the list for item 96 at the end of our second meeting on Friday at 6 p.m.

27. This is the small request which I wished to make.

28. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has heard the suggestion made by the representative of the Soviet Union. If there is no objection, the list of speakers will be closed at 6 p.m. instead of 1 p.m. on Friday, 24 November.

29. If there are no further comments, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to the programme which I have outlined.

*The meeting rose at 4 p.m.*