

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1586th  
MEETING

Saturday, 19 October 1968,  
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Organization of work .....	1

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

*Organization of work (A/C.1/964 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2)*

1. The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the first speaker on my list, I feel it is the duty of the Chairman to give some indication of how the Committee should proceed.

2. I have gone over the verbatim records of the two meetings held yesterday—of course very quickly, since none of us has had sufficient time to read them carefully. I have come to the conclusion that the exchange of views yesterday had some positive sides. I think that has already been emphasized by some representatives. One point I should like to stress is the very helpful suggestion made by the representative of India [1585th meeting, paras. 19-21], and accepted by the representative of Japan [ibid., para. 23], namely: that we discuss the order of priority of the items of the agenda, the order in which we would like them to be discussed; and, secondly, that we decide about the motion which the representative of Japan had in mind [1584th meeting, para. 106]—that is, of course, if he maintains that motion, once we have decided our order of business.

3. I think that was the decision taken yesterday. Therefore, I should like to recommend to those delegations that have put their names on the list to speak this morning to concentrate on the first point, the order of business, so that we can take a decision at the earliest possible moment and then decide about the second point I have just mentioned.

4. Since there are seventeen speakers on the list, I would also recommend that representatives should make the shortest statements possible.

5. Mr. KANTÉ (Mali) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, relying on your customary indulgence, I am taking the liberty—if you will allow me—of not complying with your disinterested appeal of yesterday morning [1584th meeting, para. 95]. Despite your modesty, Mr. Chairman, allow me to extend to you, on behalf of the Republic of Mali, my very warm congratulations on your election to the Chairmanship of the First Committee.

6. These congratulations are also addressed to the Vice-Chairman and to the Rapporteur. There can be no doubt

that under your wise and enlightened guidance our Committee will successfully accomplish its work. Your great experience, your great intellectual, moral and human qualities, confirm us in that belief. For its part, the delegation of Mali wishes to assure you of its full co-operation in attempting to solve the great problems before our Committee at this twenty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly.

7. I am also availing myself of this favourable moment to pay, on behalf of the delegation of the Republic of Mali, a fraternal tribute to the outgoing Chairman, Mr. Fahmy, the Ambassador of the United Arab Republic, who guided the work of the First Committee during the twenty-second session of the General Assembly with the remarkable skill appropriate to such an outstanding statesman. Such accomplishment is not surprising when we recall that Mr. Fahmy is a son of that great country which was the ancient Egypt of the Pharaohs, which exerted its influence where Africa hinged on the Middle East and which left an indelible imprint on the history of the world. He has been an honour to the United Nations, to his country and to Africa, which is our common fatherland. We thank him here, and we hope that his fine country, the great and martyred United Arab Republic, will accept this expression of the fraternal feeling of the delegation of the Republic of Mali.

8. I should also like to take this opportunity to welcome Comrade Kutakov, the new United Nations Under-Secretary-General, and to extend to him our most cordial congratulations on this well-deserved promotion. The wide experience and competence of this fellow citizen of the great Lenin will be an invaluable addition to our Committee.

9. The delegation of the Republic of Mali does not intend to speak on the very original point of order put forward by the representative of Japan, since pertinent replies commenting on it have already been made.

10. I should merely like to tell this friend that the tricksters, the subversives, the hawks, the sparrow-hawks and the dupes of our Organization are not to be found among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2, who are all free men, the representatives of free countries and of popular and democratic régimes devoted exclusively to the service of mankind, and totally different from the despised aristocracies which remain in power only with the help of the arsenal of their masters.

11. I shall certainly have occasion to return to this subject during future discussions. But out of respect for you, Mr. Chairman, and for our meeting, I shall confine myself to our agenda.

12. My delegation finds it difficult to separate what are being called the "two sub-items" of the item on our agenda, since its position on the first sub-item is conditioned and explained by the purpose of the second sub-item. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall speak on all the questions included on the agenda of this meeting.

13. With regard to the agenda item entitled "Korean question", the delegation of the Republic of Mali considers that at this stage in our work its substance cannot be discussed, since the parties concerned are not present; the iniquitous formula whereby only South Korea is heard has proved bankrupt. If the traditional requirements of an arbitrator, namely impartiality, objectivity and wisdom, still apply, then we cannot act on the Korean question in the absence of the parties concerned. Everyone here will acknowledge that this absence, which has been enforced here continually and deliberately for fifteen years, has been prejudicial to the settlement of this unhappy problem. You will agree that this state of affairs is the result of the most blatant partiality, and that, furthermore, it impugns our Organization. In addition, this iniquitous procedure, which has prevented a settlement of the Korean question for fifteen years, is unique in our annals.

14. Paradoxically, countries which in other circumstances and within this very Hall would be clamouring for every means to be explored in finding solutions to the problem before us, are continuing to force upon us a single and iniquitous solution to the Korean question, and they have been doing so for fifteen years.

15. My delegation is certain that the United Nations will not continue any farther along this negative path, the ineffectiveness—not to mention failure—of which is today clear to everyone. It is time for our great Assembly to redress this wrong and it cannot be otherwise if, in accordance with the noble ideals of the Charter, we want to bring peace to all men.

16. The delegation of the Republic of Mali therefore feels that the time has come for us to throw off the old yokes, the myths, prejudices and pressures, to free ourselves from the influences of Machiavellian, servile and degrading groups, and to discuss the Korean question frankly and in accordance with traditional moral standards. In so doing, we will provide the Korean people with the legitimate redress it has been seeking for twenty years. That is a duty incumbent on all of us.

17. In the light of the foregoing, and in keeping with our responsibilities to the Korean people, to mankind and to history, my delegation therefore hopes that our Committee will, in its wisdom, accede to our request, which has the advantage of being just, wise and effective.

18. I am referring to draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 of 7 October 1968, submitted to the Committee by a number of European socialist and Afro-Asian countries, my own among them, and which proposes a simultaneous and unconditional invitation to representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and those of South Korea to take part without right of vote in our discussions of the Korean question.

19. Having said that, I shall now try to make a contribution, on behalf of my delegation, to the discussion on the organization of work.

20. My delegation fully understands—and shares for that matter—the concern which led our friends the representatives of Chile and Saudi Arabia to make their proposals for the establishment of the order of priority of the items on our Committee's agenda.

21. Because of the duration and because of the moral and material damage wrought by, and the implications of, the Korean tragedy, there can be no doubt that we must give it priority. However, in attempting to settle it, we must take into account all the existing factors that can help guarantee us some success.

22. For this reason, my delegation is taking it upon itself—with the consent of the representatives of Chile and Saudi Arabia—to amend the first proposal somewhat by suggesting that the Korean question should be placed third.

23. In this way, the parties will have enough time to prepare themselves and to reply to the invitation that may be made by our Committee.

24. I am still convinced that we cannot act otherwise without prejudicing, at this stage in our discussions, the future of draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 now before our Committee, if we really intend to solve this serious crisis which has been of concern to the brave Korean people and to the international community for twenty years.

25. To force debate on the complex and difficult Korean problem without taking this prime factor into account would be to destroy in advance any chance for the success of our noble undertaking. The United Nations will surely be above such a repugnant and criminal subterfuge. My delegation is sure that in its deliberations our Committee will take this fully into account, for all of us here are acutely aware of our Organization's prime responsibilities in this matter.

26. The CHAIRMAN (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Mali for the congratulations he was kind enough to extend to me and to the other members of the Bureau.

27. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) (*translated from French*): It is most unfortunate to have to say that from the outset our Committee has been intentionally diverted from the method of organization which is, in fact, the first task of each Committee of the General Assembly.

28. I must agree with Mr. Baroody of Saudi Arabia that there has been an attempt made to put the cart before the horse. Because of this faulty sequence, Mr. Chairman, I should like to appeal to your authority, so that you may ensure that the First Committee finally takes a decision on the order in which the various items on our agenda should be discussed. Accordingly, my delegation is asking that you use your authority to see to it that the Committee decides first and solely—I repeat, solely—on the priority of the items for discussion. After that, we shall decide how to consider the draft resolution dealing with the invitation to the representatives of the Korean people. It should be noted, in this connexion, that my delegation is of the opinion that no tangible and positive result can be attained unless our Committee succeeds in adopting the proposal

made in draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 submitted yesterday by Mr. Huot Sambath of Cambodia [1585th meeting]. It is therefore clear that the unconditional presence of both parties cannot but help our Committee in attaining its goals.

29. In addition, I should like to emphasize that surprising new light might be cast on many unsolved problems if North Korea were present among us.

30. Mr. Chairman, I am mindful of the fact that in addressing the Committee for the first time, I should associate the delegation of Guinea with all those who have spoken before us by extending warm congratulations to you on your outstanding election to the Chairmanship of the First Committee.

31. I know that your task will be difficult, Mr. Chairman, both because of the complexity of the questions before the First Committee at its current session and because of the diversity of the political ideas held with regard to each of them. Your country, Italy, of which Rome is the capital, recalls to us that part of the world where at a moment in history art and culture, while revolutionizing European civilization, was also linked to the great African civilization of Egypt, which is also famous. I will certainly not dwell on this subject, since some delegations have already evoked with exceptional eloquence the many virtues of this ancient but still vital civilization of which you are a product.

32. I should also like to congratulate Mr. Galindo Pohl and Mr. Zollner on their unanimous elections to the posts of Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

33. In the twenty years that the United Nations has been discussing the question of Korean reunification, my delegation wonders whether the Organization has in fact been conducive to reunification or to division. However, we are sure that the current session will succeed in taking concrete measures, notwithstanding all the manoeuvres and boycotts which seem to stand in the way of the will of all peoples.

34. The CHAIRMAN (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Guinea for the congratulations he has been kind enough to extend to me and to the members of the Bureau.

35. Mr. NIMON (Togo) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, the delegation of Togo would like to begin by extending to you its warmest congratulations on your outstanding election to the Chairmanship of this Committee. With your high qualifications, and the authority, tact and delicacy which it knows you possess, it believes and hopes that, despite the preliminary indications we have had, the work of our Committee will proceed successfully and will be brought to a fruitful conclusion under your enlightened leadership.

36. I also congratulate the Vice-Chairman, who, side by side with the Chairman, will, we are sure, help us to attain our goals.

37. In turning to you, Mr. Zollner, I shall refrain from mentioning the many things which the people of Dahomey and Togo have in common. I shall refrain too from mentioning the abilities, qualifications, and functions which

have lent you such distinction and which compel our admiration, and I shall say only this: in your new position you are like the Cid, linking experience with youth and wisdom with enthusiasm. As an Officer of this Committee, we think you represent a fine compromise between, or an elegant combination of, the experience of age and the abilities of youth. And since you are now our Cid, we say to you, as in Corneille's play: "Go forth with all speed and requite us".

38. The Korean question is no longer a matter for the Koreans; it has turned into a game of hide and seek. Throughout the years the question has been considered here, a clearly defined tradition has been built up around it. Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, when you set forth the order of priority in which you wanted us to consider the items on our agenda [1584th meeting], it was my impression that in so doing you wanted to ascertain our reactions to that specific proposal. If I am not mistaken, that was the understanding of the representative of Japan when he raised a point of order which some delegations considered to be a point of disorder. If the bad can cure the bad, then the bad that cures is no longer bad. Since the Japanese representative was good enough to agree to withdraw his point of order, with the reservation of raising it again at an opportune time, the deadlock seems to have been broken. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, that in order to extricate us from these quicksands once and for all, you suggest a priority which would not hurt the susceptibilities of some of our members. That would enable us to go ahead with our work.

39. With regard to the request made by the representative of Saudi Arabia that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.423 should simply withdraw it, I should like, with all due respect to his age and his vast United Nations experience, to point out to him that that draft resolution is nothing but a natural reply to draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2.

40. The CHAIRMAN (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Togo for his congratulations and compliments to me and to the other Officers of the Committee.

41. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, I should like to begin by telling you how much you disappointed us yesterday when you stated that you did not want us to congratulate you, thereby depriving us of the opportunity to extend congratulations to you and to your outstanding colleagues, the two representatives who are seated on either side of you. I attempted to do so at the end of my statement yesterday, by expressing the hope that you would, with our co-operation of course, be able to overcome the difficulties which may accumulate during the course of our Committee's usual work. This attempt of mine to offer congratulations was misunderstood by some delegations—a very few, I would add—or rather, if I am not mistaken, deliberately misinterpreted. What led to my remarks yesterday was the point of order raised by my colleague and friend Mr. Tsuruoka, the representative of Japan, who, by putting forward his motion on our Committee's organization of work—I am sure with the best of intentions—succeeded only in confusing the discussion for a while and in turning everything upside down. Thanks, however, to your patience and tact, Mr. Chairman, and thanks also to the co-operation

of some Committee members, including the delegation of Japan, we are now undertaking a brief and, I trust, useful examination of the item entitled "Organization of work", and in particular a consideration of documents A/C.1/964 and Add.1 and A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2. These documents both deal with the way in which the Committee's work should be organized in order to be more productive.

42. In your comments on the first document, Mr. Chairman, you proposed as a suggestion from the Chair an order of discussion different from that which the Committee has customarily followed hitherto. With the aim, no doubt, of facilitating the Committee's work and of bringing out the importance of the Korean question, you suggested that the Committee consider this item first. You also suggested that the Committee should then take up successively the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, then the five items dealing with disarmament, and finally the item on outer space.

43. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria does not object to our giving prominence to the Korean question in the First Committee's agenda this year, so that we may settle this question once and for all.

44. As Committee members are well aware, this question has been disrupting the work of the United Nations for a very long time, and each time it comes up for discussion before the General Assembly, and above all before the First Committee, it brings with it a climate of disagreement and cold war. Any time that anyone wants to create a cold-war climate here, he need only raise the Korean question to disrupt the work of the United Nations.

45. Nevertheless, in order to consider the Korean question seriously, thoroughly and above all, constructively, and in order to find an acceptable solution to it, we must have the conditions which are favourable and necessary to its consideration. It is in this spirit that the procedural draft resolution dealing with the invitation to be extended to both parties concerned—the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea—which appears in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2, was submitted.

46. Up till now, the Korean question has been discussed in the absence of one of the parties concerned, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, whereas the other party, the puppet government of South Korea, has been given every opportunity to use and abuse the facilities provided by United Nations bodies and any other services available here. This has been made possible by the fact that the country in which United Nations Headquarters has been established is the friend and protector of the South Korean authorities. These authorities are allowed to enter into contact with delegations, to present their side of the events which occur in and around Korea, and to give receptions in order to make friends and to attempt to convince people of the rightness of their cause.

47. Furthermore, thanks to a practice which has gone on far too long, they are allowed to appear before the Committee, while the other party concerned—the Democratic People's Republic of Korea—is not allowed to attend

our meetings. Thus they can indulge to their heart's content in the work of "misinforming" the Committee and in slanders against the absent party, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

48. The Korean question has been before the General Assembly for many years, and the notorious Commission for Korea is supposed to be working towards the unification and rehabilitation of Korea. During this time, however, under cover of the United Nations flag, the troops of the United States of America and its allies have continued to occupy the territory of South Korea, with the complicity of the South Korean leaders, and have turned the country into an American military base for disrupting peace in the Far East.

49. The continued inclusion of the Korean question on the General Assembly's agenda and its discussion, as well as the decisions the United Nations has taken until now, have merely resulted in prolonging American occupation under cover of the United Nations flag and in the use of the country as a military base for provocations and for preparing aggression in the Far East.

50. I shall not dwell on specific facts at this time. There are plenty of them, and if it becomes necessary we can bring them up at the proper moment. I merely want to draw attention to the objective for which the Korean question is used, so that we may see how to overcome these difficulties.

51. Being aware of all these developments and of the fact that Korean unification is a question that can be dealt with only by the Koreans themselves, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as it says in its statement,

"... has always regarded the discussion of the 'Korean question' at the United Nations based on the so-called 'annual report of the Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea' as illegal, and resolutely opposed it from the outset" [*see A/C.1/966*].

52. Of course, as I have already mentioned, this question serves here to maintain a cold-war atmosphere. That is why no solution can be found. And of course, the Koreans are not pleased at our discussing the question in their absence. Nevertheless, even though the Koreans do not want the question discussed here on the grounds that they alone can determine their own unification, they have declared themselves ready to participate in the discussion on condition that the United Nations also invite, as the statement says, "the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean question".

53. This invalidates the objections raised here to the effect that the Koreans do not want to participate in the discussion and that that is why they are not invited. Consequently draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 has been submitted and distributed so as to provide for the invitation of both parties concerned. We are convinced that the presence of a delegation from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will introduce a new factor into the First Committee's consideration of the Korean question, a factor which is bound to be helpful.

54. After due preparation, the participation of a delegation from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will be able to throw greater light on the true situation which prevails in Korea. This will also enable the Committee to find a constructive solution to which both parties can agree.

55. Thus, we have before us a draft resolution, of which Bulgaria is a sponsor, dealing with our Committee's organization of work. It concerns the manner in which we should consider the Korean question and, more particularly, the prerequisites for that consideration, namely, the customary invitations to be extended to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and to the Republic of Korea. By proceeding in this manner, we would be acting more effectively and we would gain time, since we feel that this is the only way to guarantee the presence of both the parties concerned at the discussion and to make that discussion a constructive one.

56. It is obvious that if we really want to engage in serious discussion, we must invite both parties in order that we can learn their positions on the question.

57. We have been instructed to consider a serious problem: the unification and rehabilitation of a country. It is therefore quite natural for us to want to know the opinion of that country's representatives, especially since this is a vital question which involves the development and the future of the Korean people. We have the right to ask a legitimate question: can the unification and rehabilitation of a people be discussed in the absence of that people's representatives? The presence of the interested parties at a discussion of the problem that concerns them is required not only by custom, and by rules that have been internationally recognized for many years, but also by the practice followed in our Organization and in other commissions which have considered questions other than that of Korea; it is also a classical rule of law which has always been applied. To disregard it would be tantamount to admitting our impotence and our lack of goodwill in treating the Korean problem objectively, for in such a case we would be unable to undertake a thorough consideration of the question in the absence of one of the parties, and that would mean that we had no intention of holding any serious discussion.

58. It would seem that once again this year some Powers do not want to allow a delegation from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to come to take part in the consideration of this question. These Powers, led by the United States, want to stick to the script they have prepared so many times before when this question has been discussed here, and they do not want that script to be spoiled by any revelations as to the real situation in Korea. They want no new factors brought in which could affect the previous decisions which guarantee them—that is, the United States—the right to station occupation forces in South Korea.

59. With this in mind, the United States has prompted the submission of a draft resolution [A/C.1/L.423] which follows the old method with regard to invitations, a method which can lead only to the old decisions that have proved so disastrous to discussion and solution of the Korean question. The very wording of the draft resolution sub-

mitted by the United States and some other Powers is discriminatory and makes a satisfactory discussion impossible. This draft sets conditions which are unnecessary and which it is not customary to impose on anyone, and it assumes that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has never wanted to work with the United Nations. Nevertheless, I should like to point out to the Committee that in document A/C.1/966 the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has agreed to participate in our discussions and to abide by the United Nations Charter, which, for that matter, it has recognized for years; however, it is unwilling to bow to the conditions some Powers are trying to impose here by means of this draft resolution with a view to forcing decisions on which they can base their future actions in continuing to occupy South Korea.

60. In these circumstances, we feel that in order to hold a constructive discussion of the Korean question, the problem of the invitation must be dealt with first, so that a delegation from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea can come here to take part in discussing that question. We also feel that those representatives must be given enough time to prepare for their constructive participation in our discussion.

61. This being the case, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is of the opinion that the order of discussion of the items which you suggested, Mr. Chairman, might be slightly modified, so that if the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is invited, it can prepare itself. As I said earlier, if this delegation is invited, it will have to make preparations and contacts, study the documents, and accustom itself to the atmosphere of the United Nations and to its work. We therefore feel that the best way to give this question all the importance it deserves would be to give that delegation the time it needs to make its preparations.

62. We believe that we can then carry on with our work as we did last year with regard to the organization of work: we might first discuss the question of disarmament, which is the most important, following which we would have no objection to discussing either the Korean question or that concerning the ocean floor; after that, we could take up the remaining questions and arrange the agenda accordingly.

63. Guaranteeing the presence of a delegation from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and setting up the agenda in such a way as to allow that delegation sufficient time for preparation is the only way in which we can have a constructive discussion which will yield effective results and, above all, provide a solution to the Korean problem.

64. The CHAIRMAN (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Bulgaria for his compliments to the Officers of the Committee, including myself. I can assure him that in quoting the words of Julius Caesar, I fully understood that he did not want me to attempt to emulate Julius Caesar in a military way, but that he hopes I can overcome the difficulties of our Committee's work through diplomatic, rather than warlike methods.

65. Mr. MAVOUNGOU (Congo Brazzaville) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, we heard you request that we



refrain from offering you our congratulations, but my delegation is going to yield to temptation and, with your permission, I should like to extend to you my sincere congratulations on your outstanding election to the Chairmanship of the First Committee.

66. In so doing, my delegation is not merely adhering to protocol. We look upon you as the illustrious representative of a State with which my country enjoys friendly relations. You also bring to our minds another outstanding Italian, Savorgnan de Brazza, born at Castel Gandolfo, whose name has a place in the history of our young State. Lastly, your qualifications as an accomplished scholar and diplomat are further reasons for hoping that under your wise leadership our labours will be successful.

67. I should also like to congratulate the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Reynaldo Galindo Pohl, the representative of El Salvador, and our Rapporteur, Mr. Zollner, the representative of Dahomey.

68. Yesterday morning, some delaying tactics were used to distract us from our basic goal, namely, discussion of the organization of our work, so much so that at the beginning of our session we are already becoming bogged down in a lengthy procedural debate.

69. My delegation is not unduly surprised at this organized confusion which is, in fact, being occasioned by representatives acting on behalf of a party I need not name. My delegation associates itself completely with the delegations which have spoken earlier to say that draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2, of which my delegation is happy to be a sponsor, is indeed relevant to our current business, namely, the organization of our work. Therefore, it is unthinkable that when we come to discuss a problem in which two parties are involved, one of those parties should be muzzled and the other party should be given preferential treatment. In any case, it is ridiculous to talk about inviting two parties, since one of them is already present here. Since yesterday, in fact, our chamber has been invaded by the Seoul puppets, who enjoy the guarantees afforded them by their powerful sponsor.

70. A basic principle recognized by all is that parties concerned in a matter should be heard on an equal footing. For that reason, we feel that the presence of the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the Republic of Korea is essential for a serious consideration of this question.

71. My delegation reserves the right to speak again when we discuss the substance of this question.

72. The CHAIRMAN (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of the Congo (Brazzaville) for the tribute he has paid my country and for the compliments he paid to me and to the other Officers of the Committee.

73. Mr. SCHUURMANS (Belgium) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, yesterday morning you expressed the hope that we might forgo for the present the custom of congratulating the Officers of the Committee at the outset of the session. If I promise to be brief, I hope you will allow me the pleasure of this *passus extra viam*. The brief

tribute I should like to pay to you and the members of the Bureau can hardly be a formality on the part of the Belgian delegation when it has the great good fortune to see before it on the podium three representatives whose wisdom, background and devotion to our Organization made them such obvious choices for the direction of our discussions.

74. I can easily imagine that our Chairman, Mr. Vinci, whose country has such close relations of mutual trust with mine, must have secretly contrived to gain the assistance of two diplomats of the calibre of Mr. Galindo Pohl of El Salvador and Mr. Zollner of Dahomey. Such a triumvirate cannot but be a sure guarantee for the success of our work, especially since we know that it will have the support of Mr. Kutakov, the talented representative of the Secretary-General, and of our Committee's friendly and devoted Secretary, Mr. Vellodi.

75. I am sure that this Committee will long remember with admiration and gratitude the masterly way in which the outgoing Chairman, Mr. Fahmy, led its discussions during the twenty-second session of the General Assembly.

76. My delegation wishes to make some comments on the organization of our work in connexion with the agenda of matters entrusted to the First Committee at this twenty-third session of the General Assembly. In so doing, I believe I am acting in strict conformity with the recommendation you made at the beginning of this meeting.

77. My first comment concerns the items which are customarily considered to be the most important on our agenda and which constitute an integral whole, even though it is true that they have been the subject of preparatory discussions in various international bodies. I am referring to the items dealing with disarmament.

78. During the course of this year, the First Committee has already held meetings lasting for several weeks devoted to a detailed discussion of the Treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], a document which is the fruit of many years of lengthy and difficult negotiations. Since then, the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament has not had the opportunity of giving any serious consideration to the agenda which was not adopted until 15 August,<sup>1</sup> in other words, just a few days before it adjourned. It is therefore not surprising that the report should state that

"Because of the comparative shortness of this session, the Committee reports that it has not been able to give comprehensive consideration to the matters before it."<sup>2</sup>

79. What are these "matters"? It appears that the ten-point list in the memorandum issued by the Government of the Soviet Union dealing with certain pressing measures for halting the arms race and for disarmament<sup>3</sup>—that is, the nine measures deemed urgent and the problem of general and complete disarmament—is not an exhaustive

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1967-1968*, document DC/231, para. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Document ENDC/227; for the text, see *Official Documents of the General Assembly, Twenty-Third Session, Annexes*, agenda item 94, document A/715.

one when compared to the agenda the Conference adopted on 15 August 1968. Nevertheless, the Soviet memorandum formed a useful basis for drawing up this agenda. My delegation intends in due time to present its views on the suggestions made in that memorandum, but it would have preferred that these suggestions should first be examined by the Conference, of which the Soviet Union representative is a co-Chairman.

80. In addition to the discussion held by the First Committee during May and June, and the discussions held from 16 July to 28 August by the Eighteen-Nation Committee, the United Nations this year organized the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States, which was held at Geneva from 29 August to 28 September 1968.

81. On the proposal of the Secretary-General, an item has been added to our agenda to enable us to examine the result of this conference, which has just issued its final report [document A/7277]. Today, in fact, had this meeting not been called, I had intended to acquaint myself with it.

82. In other words, the whole of 1968 has been a year of discussions on disarmament, and especially on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

83. I think we are agreed that the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States should not be discussed here until we can view it in sufficient perspective to make an accurate evaluation of the scope of its work and an adequate study of its reports.

84. I repeat that I have three considerations in mind: the lengthy discussions held throughout this year on the problem of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the consequent paucity of conclusions brought forward by the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in other areas; the list contained in the Soviet memorandum, which is designed to help in planning the organization of the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee rather than provide our discussions with a list of measures all or nearly all of which have already been discussed in the First Committee in previous years; and third, the advisability of waiting until the work of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States can be seen in its proper perspective against the background of recent events, before examining its results.

85. These three considerations quite naturally lead to the conclusion that the five items dealing with disarmament do not warrant this year the priority which they are usually given.

86. Among the items on our Committee's agenda, there is another which does not seem to warrant priority debate. I should like to recall that on 19 December 1967, the General Assembly adopted an urgent procedure to ensure adoption of resolution 2345 (XXII), in which it expressed satisfaction that an agreement had been negotiated on the rescue and return of astronauts and the return of objects launched into outer space, annexed to the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and considered in plenary session without being referred to the First Committee. However, at the same time the Assembly urgently requested the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of

Outer Space to conclude the preparation of a draft agreement on the liability for damages caused by the launching of objects into outer space, at the latest before the convening of the twenty-third session of the General Assembly. Despite this explicit recommendation, the Committee was unable to draw up the draft agreement requested. Thus it is quite possible that the sole achievement of the Committee, which is in session at the present time, will be the United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, which appears to have made great progress. Nevertheless, this Conference, which was postponed for a year, can hardly justify our urgent consideration of a report which has still to be published.

87. Therefore, I should like to suggest that the items dealing with disarmament should be discussed during the four weeks from 18 November to 13 December, and that our final week of work, from 16 to 20 December, should be set aside for the problem of outer space. Then we shall have the three weeks from 28 October to 15 November in which to consider the Korean problem and the problem of the ocean floor.

88. I shall make no secret of the fact that in my delegation's opinion the item dealing with the peaceful uses of the sea-bed and the ocean floor deserves priority this year, in the light of the important work achieved by the *Ad Hoc* Committee to Study the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction and by its two working groups during the course of three sessions, the last of which was held at Rio de Janeiro. The report submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Committee [A/7230] is full of information and suggestions which we feel the First Committee should examine with great attention and as a matter of priority.

89. It goes without saying that my delegation will be open to any suggestions that my colleagues may make, and it has paid special attention to the suggestion put forward yesterday by the Chairman, which was repeated today. In this connexion, we shall take as our motto the elegant words of Cicero, *refellere sine pertinacia et refelli sine iracundia* (to show restraint when disproving and to accept contradiction gracefully). Our goal is to work out, in a spirit of goodwill, a time-table which can satisfy everyone as far as possible.

90. The CHAIRMAN (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Belgium for the congratulations he so kindly extended to the members of the Bureau and to me.

91. Mr. KAPLAN (Canada): Mr. Chairman, you have already been congratulated by many speakers on your election. My delegation can do no less and indeed congratulates the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur as well. Like other speakers, we also congratulate ourselves on choosing a Bureau which will match the high standard of previous years. But while congratulating you, Mr. Chairman, I extend to you Canada's sympathy that on your first days in your new position the Committee should have pulled itself into a procedural impasse.

92. We are in this impasse because we have been trying to deal with two distinct matters simultaneously namely, the

order of business and the question of extending invitations to participate in our debate on the Korean question. If it was not clear at the outset, it should have become clear by now that these are different matters. Combining them has been a recipe for confusion, contention and delay.

93. Some say that both questions relate to the organization of work; others say that the seating question is essentially substantive. My delegation shares the latter view. In any event, it is this difference of opinion which has given rise to the awkward turn taken by our debate. My delegation wishes to associate itself with those delegations which believe that the seating question is more substantive than procedural, and we believe that the point of order raised yesterday by the representative of Japan, and currently suspended with his consent, was well taken. It is our view that the question of invitations to representatives of Korea to take part in the debate should be considered as part of the Korean question.

94. We were aware, before the Committee met for the first time yesterday, that there was a difference of opinion on these matters and that a serious division in the Committee was likely. We were therefore extremely pleased, Mr. Chairman, when you began the discussion of organization of work yesterday [*1584th meeting, para. 91*] and again opened up today's meeting with suggestions which would have avoided the procedural impasse I have mentioned. Part of your solution involves agreeing on a particular order of business. While this order is not in all particulars the order which my delegation would have chosen, we are prepared to accept it in the spirit of compromise and, accordingly, we agree that the order should be: first, the Korean question; second, the question of the sea-bed and the ocean floor; third, the five disarmament items; and finally, the outer space item.

95. Coming from you, Mr. Chairman, particularly in view of all the consultations which you held, that order should have won the immediate support of all the members of this Committee. Adoption of the order of items which you have proposed would involve taking up the Korean question first, and naturally we would begin our discussion by dealing with the question of invitations to participate in the debate. Such a discussion would lead us logically to taking a decision on whatever draft resolutions are before us. I would include, of course, in this category the sixteen-Power draft resolution [*A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2*] and the twelve-Power draft resolution [*A/C.1/L.423*]. Once a decision on those drafts is taken, the implications of that decision in terms of the further handling of the Korean question can be considered.

96. In the view of the Canadian delegation, the consideration of draft resolutions A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 and A/C.1/L.423 at the beginning of our debate on the Korean question, if that question is taken first, does not prejudice provision of a reasonable period of time between the taking of the decisions on the extension of invitations to participate in that debate and the substantive discussion of the whole Korean question.

97. To sum up, the Canadian delegation entirely supports the order of items suggested by you, Mr. Chairman, at our meeting yesterday. We express the hope that the members

of the First Committee will clear the way to unite promptly in support of your suggestion in the interests of orderly procedure and a efficient and fair arrangement of our work.

98. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Canada for the congratulations which he extended to me and to the other members of the Bureau.

99. Mr. DE ARAÚJO CASTRO (Brazil): Mr. Chairman, in compliance with your request and with the views you expressed, I shall limit to the bare essentials my reference to the satisfaction I feel in seeing you presiding over the proceedings of the Political and Security Committee of the current session of the General Assembly. Our congratulations are warmly extended to the other members of the Bureau, Ambassador Galindo Pohl of El Salvador and Ambassador Zollner of Dahomey.

100. At the same time, I wish to express my admiration for your patience, forbearance and fortitude as regards the procedural chaos which, in spite of your efforts, has prevailed in this committee room.

101. It is rather disappointing to see that, when we are confronted with such grave and far-reaching matters as the items inscribed on our agenda, we should be entangled in Byzantinisms and hair-splitting speculations on points of order and rulings. We have come to a point where procedure has become more relevant than substance and where words have become more important than action. Peace and security, which should be the subject-matter of our deliberations, are relegated to a secondary position until we may be able to dispose of the labyrinthine procedural points before us.

102. As we are not particularly interested in this rather futile and elusive procedural exercise, and in accordance with your own suggestions and recommendations this morning, Mr. Chairman, we shall address ourselves specifically to the question of the organization of work of the Committee.

103. Therefore, we shall state that, as far as the organization of our work is concerned, we have no particular difficulty in following and accepting the general lines of your proposal for the priorities to be observed in the consideration of the various items of which the Committee is seized. We might have thought out a rather different approach or formulation, but we are prepared to accept this one if it proves generally acceptable.

104. There is a point, however, which I feel bound to emphasize and on which my delegation has very strong views. My Government attaches particular importance to the question raised in the final document of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States [*A/7277*], and it is our firm understanding that the fact that that report will be discussed together with and along with other items on disarmament will not in any way hinder the full and exhaustive consideration of that final document and of the important resolutions adopted and the drafts examined in Geneva. If that is the prevailing understanding, my delegation is prepared to accept the order of business you have suggested. My only contention is that the Brazilian dele-



gation will on all occasions insist on a full and unrestricted debate on the documents and resolutions forwarded by the Geneva Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States.

105. We view this matter of the final document of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States as one offering us the opportunity of fruitful and creative deliberations by the First Committee, and it is our intention to introduce specific proposals and suggestions. Any curtailment of discussion on this item could not be accepted or justified, and it is on such premises and with this understanding that we accept the order of business you have proposed, Mr. Chairman.

106. As a last word, let me say that we count upon you, Sir, and upon your experience to lead us out of this procedural chaos so that we can organize our work and thus lay the basis for fast and safe progress on the different items of our agenda. Our firm opinion is that substance is still more important than shadow.

107. The immediate task before us is to organize our work on organization, which I venture to say is slightly disorganized. As to what is really under discussion now, we have heard statements which bear no relation to organization but rather concern the very merits of the questions on the agenda. Thus this debate has become a general preview of the debates on all specific points. A new general debate is now being engaged in by the General Assembly in a different room and on a Saturday. An effort was made to avoid, at this stage, the debate on the question of an invitation to the North Korean authorities. But now it seems we are engaged in a debate on the very merits of the Korean question. The representative of Canada has expressed the view that our difficulties arise from the fact that the Committee is considering two questions simultaneously. With all due respect, I would say that we are considering several questions—indeed practically all the questions on the agenda—simultaneously.

108. As was helpfully suggested yesterday by the representative of India, we should promptly reach a decision on the order of priority for the conduct of our business. Then let us take up the point of order raised by the representative of Japan [*1584th meeting, para. 106*] in order to determine whether we are going at this stage to vote or not to vote on the question of an invitation to the North Korean authorities.

109. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Brazil for the congratulations he expressed to the Chairman and to other members of the Bureau. I thank him also for having recalled what I said about the decision taken yesterday. I would like to recall it again and ask the speakers inscribed on my list to try to concentrate, as I said before, on the order in which we would like to take up the items on our agenda.

110. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I have sat listening with pleasure and agreement to the various remarks made about you, Mr. Chairman, and the other members of the Bureau, and I will confine myself to saying that I associate myself fully with them, knowing from my long association with you how true they are. It is an honour to serve under such an excellent Bureau.

111. Yesterday we met to take up the question of the order in which the items on the agenda would be discussed. We, for our part, had hoped that the Committee would get off to a businesslike start. But the waters were muddied right from the outset by the manoeuvre which attempts to put under "Organization of work" the highly political question of extending invitations to the Republic of Korea and to the régime in the north of that country. As a result of this, we were soon bogged down in one of those procedural debates so dreadfully familiar to representatives in this Organization and so discouraging to those outside who pin their hopes upon it. In the course of this procedural debate much of the discussion was brought by the proponents of this manoeuvre to centre not only upon the order of items, but also upon the detailed and substantive question of whether representatives of the Republic of Korea and of North Korea should be invited.

112. And now where are we? At one stage I had understood that, at the suggestion of the representative of India, the Japanese point of order had been suspended. It will be recalled that that point of order was to the effect that the draft resolution of the Soviet Union and thirteen other States, document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2, was not appropriate for discussion under the heading "Organization of work". At that stage it had seemed—and I readily admit that things are not always what they seem—that we were finally in a position to discuss the order in which our agenda items should be taken, and that temporarily, at least, the red-herring called document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 had been removed from the trail. My understanding, at least, has not been fulfilled.

113. We were yesterday, and we are again today, discussing the order of items and document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 simultaneously, along with a number of other subjects. Because I believe that to proceed in this way leads along the path to the destruction of good order, it is with reluctance that I am obliged to extend my own remarks slightly beyond the compass of the basic question, the order in which our items should be taken in this Committee. I am so obliged because what has been said by the proponents of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 has been so utterly misleading that my delegation can hardly allow it to go unchallenged. So if I stray slightly from strict procedure, Mr. Chairman, I hope you will recognize that I am necessarily following the precedent set by many of those who have spoken before me.

114. But having said that, I return to the point at which early yesterday you suggested the order in which our First Committee items might be taken up. I should like to say immediately that my delegation found your suggestion—you modestly stopped short of calling it an actual proposal—reasonable and conciliatory. You had obviously, in the proper performance of your duties as Chairman of the most important Committee of the Assembly, been in touch with the various groups and members which have particular interest in particular subjects. Equally clearly you had considered carefully the competing claims for priority in the consideration of various items. The result was the very sensible suggestion that we should take our items in the following order: first, Korea; second, the sea-bed; third, all the disarmament items; fourth, outer space.

115. I shall not comment upon the number of meetings you thought might be devoted to each item except to say that for our part we considered your estimates to be realistically related to the likely contributions that members would wish to make to the various debates. On such matters of detail one can only estimate; one never knows for sure. We do know, however, within reasonable limits the considerations that lead delegations to their views on the priority that should be accorded to the items on this Committee's agenda.

116. Disarmament, including all the items related to it, has generally been regarded as having top priority, and in our view that subject has lost nothing in importance. But with the non-proliferation treaty already disposed of—that is, so far as the Assembly is concerned—I think that we can scarcely expect a further major breakthrough at this session. Certainly, we have the report of the Non-Nuclear-Weapon States Conference to consider, but there is not as yet, so far as I know, any report from the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Conference. So there is no strong argument for taking disarmament first this year.

117. The sea-bed item, on the other hand, is one on which much work has been done by the *Ad Hoc* Committee and which many countries are anxious to discuss at an early stage. The basic documentation exists.

118. So far as Korea is concerned, I need hardly say that for New Zealand, as a country which contributed forces in 1950 to help stop the communist aggression against South Korea from the North, this is an item of the utmost importance. The Korean war may seem a far-off event of little consequence to many countries now seated in this Organization, but to us and to the other Member countries that contributed forces to turn back the communist assault it was a battlefield on which many thousands of our young men lost their lives. We do not want to see a repetition of that threat to South Korea's freedom.

119. During the past year North Korea has been giving dangerous indications of renewed aggressive intentions. Those indications go even beyond the acts of sabotage and assassination which have shocked the people throughout the Asian and Pacific area. Let me just take up one of the most recent statements that I have seen—it is only five weeks old, 7 September 1968. This is what Kim Il Sung said, among other things:

"The freedom and liberation of the people do not come of themselves without struggle, and only by using the revolutionary method can the people win power. True, it is possible for the growth of the revolutionary forces to properly combine diverse forms".

120. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

121. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Is it not your impression, Mr. Chairman, that the present speaker, who is discussing a procedural question, has been going too deeply into the substance of the matter and has been engaging in slanderous propaganda against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in an attempt to create a hostile atmosphere in the Committee on the question of inviting a representative of that country to come here?

122. You yourself, Mr. Chairman, have warned us repeatedly that in discussing procedural questions we should comment on procedure only, and never on substance. The present speaker is certainly commenting on the substance. Would you, perhaps, ask him to refrain?

123. When we discuss the substance of the Korean question, he will have the opportunity to defend whatever position he wishes; now, however, I believe he is being premature.

124. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the Soviet Union has asked me to advise the representative of New Zealand not to go into the substance of the item before the First Committee. I would say that many representatives have followed the same path, unfortunately for the Committee. I should just like to appeal to the representative of New Zealand to follow my recommendation, that is, to speak about the order in which we would like to take up our agenda items.

125. I call on the representative of New Zealand.

126. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I find those remarks coming very strangely from the representative of the Soviet Union, who only yesterday afternoon seemed to give us a complete summary of his general debate speech and a preview of his views on all the items coming before the Committee. In fact, I was addressing myself precisely to two remarks which he made and which will be seen in the record of the 1585th meeting. Indeed, my remarks were entirely precipitated by them. For instance, yesterday the representative of the Soviet Union, discussing only procedure, not substance, said among many other things:

"The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea represents the true interests and expresses the will of the Korean people. . . .

"It pursues a peace-loving policy and hence deservedly enjoys the support and confidence of the Korean people.

"The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has repeatedly put forward constructive proposals aimed at a peaceful settlement of the Korean question in the interests of the Korean people." [1585th meeting, paras. 141, 142 and 143]

And so on. Again, in furtherance of these procedural remarks that he was making yesterday, the representative of the Soviet Union said:

"The members of the First Committee must also bear in mind the tense situation now prevailing in Korea because of increased acts of provocation against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the part of the South Korean armed forces which, as we all know, are financed and directed by the United States Military Command." [Ibid., para. 139]

127. I have given the full quotation. So it will be seen that the representative of the Soviet Union is hardly within his rights now to protest at a reply being made—and I think that members will realize the relevance of such a quotation. Incidentally, I was quoting before from what I believed to be a correct translation of the remarks of Prime Minister Kim Il Sung, and I note that the representative of the Soviet Union designated those as slanderous remarks against the people of Korea—remarks made by their own leader. It is surprising that they should be designated "slanderous".

128. Anyway, members will form their own opinion as to whether this is slanderous or whether it in fact is a direct reply to the statements made yesterday by the representative of the Soviet Union in a procedural discussion.

129. I shall not go over again the same sentences I was reading when I was so rudely interrupted, but will continue:

“True, it is possible, for the growth of the revolutionary forces, to properly combine diverse forms of struggle, such as political and economic struggles, lawful and unlawful struggles, violent and non-violent struggles, small- and large-scale struggles, to suit the subjective and objective situations created so as to develop the revolutionary struggle. It is quite wrong to neglect a positive struggle, just waiting for a favourable situation, on the ground that the revolution is arduous. But whatever their forms, these struggles should all be preparatory to the decisive struggle for winning power, and this decisive struggle can be brought to victory only by a forcible method.”

130. That statement was made five weeks ago, and I ask Members to relate it to the remarks of the representative of the Soviet Union in paragraphs 139, 141, 142 and 143 of the 1585th meeting.

131. Now, because of this renewal of North Korea's aggressive intentions, for this reason alone we regard it as important for the report of UNCURK and for all aspects of the Korean question to be discussed, and to be discussed soon, at this session. I have outlined very briefly the reasons why my delegation supports the suggestion you made yesterday, Mr. Chairman, about the order in which we should take the items on our agenda; and I urge the Committee to accept your suggestions.

132. As for the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2, the discussion we have had so far yesterday and today has revealed that the question of inviting representatives of the Republic of Korea and of the North Korean régime is not a simple matter of procedure. Surely, this has emerged from all the statements that have been made. Everyone who has discussed this matter year after year knows that it is a major matter of substance; and the Soviet representative kept reaffirming this fact during his procedural speech yesterday. It really, therefore, is ingenuous to suggest that it falls under the heading of organization of work, which has traditionally involved such matters as the order of the items, the timing of the meetings, the deadline for the completion of the work of the Committee, and so on. It does not involve, it has never involved, and it should not involve matters of substance like this particular matter; and we shall get nowhere by pretending or being brainwashed into believing that this fourteen-Power proposal is a mere matter of organization of work. It is a matter involving much history, strong passions, and great interests. And Mr. Malik knows that well, and said so yesterday.

133. He has reminded the Committee that he was here in 1950, when the Korean question was being born in the coldest days of the cold war. Others of us were also here in 1950, and we do not forget the complicity of the Soviet Union in that notorious act of aggression.

134. This is no question, as has been alleged here, of some innocent people being denied their rights by the United Nations. The passage of time does not blot out memories as deeply ingrained as that. So the question of invitations cannot be dodged; it has to be faced up to as an issue in itself—not by the subterfuge of trying to have it included under the heading “Organization of work”.

135. It has been argued by a number of speakers that a week or so would not give the North Korean representatives time to prepare for the debate on the Korean item. Indeed, the representative of the Soviet Union yesterday proposed such a long programme of study for the North Koreans that we started wondering whether they could prepare themselves for a debate before the 1969 or 1970 session. However, no one in this Committee, I am sure, wants to be unreasonable about a matter like this. Certainly, the representatives of the North Korean régime should have time to get here, should have time to rest after their long journey, which is about as long a journey as from New Zealand to the United Nations. They should have time to read the documents. They should have time to consult with delegations. And it is precisely our view, Mr. Chairman, that by accepting the order of items you have proposed we would meet all those requirements.

136. Therefore, let us settle the order of items; let us put the question of Korea first; and let us immediately take up the question of invitations. Then let us give time for representatives to get here. A week or ten days is going to elapse, in any case, before the Committee gets down to other items on its order of business. But if we accept your suggestion that the sea-bed should be taken as the second item—and I notice that you have assigned a possible ten or fourteen meetings to it—we can meet even better the arguments that have been made by various representatives. If the representatives of the Republic of Korea and of the North Korean régime are not ready in a week or ten days' time, we can go on with the same item, the sea-bed, and take up the Korean item again when they are ready.

137. Therefore I propose that the First Committee approve the order of its agenda suggested by the Chairman of this Committee.

138. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of New Zealand for the congratulations he conveyed to the Chairman and to all members of the Bureau.

139. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): Mr. Chairman, my delegation wishes to express its warmest congratulations to you on your election to the Chairmanship of the First Committee. We who have witnessed your activities in the United Nations in the past years have every confidence that you will guide the Committee smoothly to its successful conclusion.

140. Our congratulations likewise go to the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur, who will no doubt play an important part in contributing to the conduct of the First Committee's work.

141. Should also like to pay a tribute to Ambassador Fahmy of the United Arab Republic for his very effective Chairmanship last year.

142. It is generally recognized that there was a state of confusion in the deliberations in our Committee yesterday. Such confusion was regrettable but perhaps not entirely unavoidable. It merely brought out the true nature of the Korean question, which, as everyone must have known already, is a highly sensitive issue politically.

143. At the beginning of this morning's meeting my delegation was gratified to hear from you, Sir, an appeal to the Committee members to concentrate their statements on the first order of business, the determination of the order of the agenda items allocated to the First Committee. My delegation applauds you for such guidance, and we will co-operate with you fully with a view to facilitating the orderly and business-like procedure of the work of our Committee.

144. My delegation had no strong feelings one way or the other as regards the priority of agenda items. However, on reflection on the suggestions you put forward yesterday, my delegation would have no difficulty in accepting your suggested order of the agenda: that is to say, that the Committee should take up the Korean question first, the sea-bed second, to be followed by all the five items related to the disarmament question, and finally outer space.

145. My delegation believes that that order of business would be most conducive to the smooth and effective working of the First Committee, and we are ready to abide by your wise suggestion.

146. In the course of the debate yesterday every delegation professed its desire to help the Committee find an approach which, in its view, would contribute to orderly and systematic proceedings. Unfortunately, the result was the opposite and this was due to the fact that some delegations, under the guise of procedure and objectivity, attempted to transform the debate on the organization of work to one on the substance of the Korean question. We really had a full dose of their medicine.

147. It was all too clear to any fair-minded delegation that those delegations were trying to score a propaganda point and trying to portray the North Koreans as the victims of an injustice. The whole debate yesterday amply revealed that the invitation question, however much it might appear to be procedural and even innocuous, cannot be entirely divorced from the substance of the whole Korean question.

148. The Korean question, whether procedural or substantive, has its own long history in the United Nations and has become an integral conglomeration of its own previous circumstances. As such, no part of it could be separated from the whole context and considered as if it were a new and unrelated problem to be solved according to this or that general principle.

149. It must be recalled, first of all, that the Korean question was taken up by the United Nations, not at the end of the Korean war and not even at the beginning of that war in 1950, but in the year 1947 when the General Assembly decided to establish the United Nations Commission on Korea [*resolution 112 (II)*] for the purpose of establishing a unified democratic and independent Korea. The Commission's task could not be accomplished owing

mostly to the totally unco-operative attitude of the North Korean authorities who, furthermore, chose to launch an invasion of the territories of South Korea in June 1950 while the United Nations was still directly seized of the Korean problem. That invasion by the North Koreans could not but be considered as a direct challenge to the principles and authority of our Organization, and the United Nations had no other choice but to condemn North Korea as an aggressor.

150. The intransigent position maintained by North Korea throughout the years, in my delegation's opinion, has been the root cause of the failure of all attempts to bring a just and peaceful solution to the problem of Korean unification. It has also been the root cause of the exclusion of North Korea, whether voluntary or otherwise, from the deliberations of our Committee on the Korean question.

151. Lest the position of my delegation be misinterpreted, I should like to assure the Committee that my delegation never had any intention nor the desire to stifle discussion of the invitation aspect of the Korean question. On the contrary, we look forward to a full and comprehensive debate on the invitation question so that we, on our side, will be able to give our side of the story which is based on historical facts and current attitudes and policies of the North Korean régime.

152. All my delegation maintains is that, while we recognize the right of any delegation to submit a draft resolution, we do not believe that draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 properly belongs under the organization of work, and should therefore not be discussed in that context. On that basis we are in agreement with the point of order raised by the representative of Japan yesterday. We would, however, be happy to support your wise suggestion, Mr. Chairman, and proceed forthwith to the whole Korean question, dealing firstly with the invitation, and debate together under the same heading the two draft resolutions—the ones contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 and that in document A/C.1/L.423, of which Thailand is proud to be a co-sponsor. I may even add as a footnote that my delegation is fully sincere in its approach. Should the Committee decide to give a positive answer to the draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2, that is to say, to invite both North Korea and South Korea without any conditions, my delegation would even be prepared to give the North Koreans all the time they need to fly or even to take a slow boat to New York. We even envisage the possibility that the North Koreans would necessarily have to break their trip somewhere along the way for a few days to pick up their instructions and to receive the blessings of their masters.

153. In conclusion, my delegation would like to support the proposal of the New Zealand delegation in asking the Committee to accept the Chairman's suggestion.

154. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Thailand for the congratulations he conveyed to the Chair and to the members of the Bureau.

155. I call now on the representative of India on a point of order.

156. Mr. MISHRA (India): I have a formal proposal to make, but before I do so I should like to apologize to the representatives who are inscribed on the list of speakers.

157. Mr. Chairman, I think that you have from eight to twelve speakers on your list and that obviously we cannot decide this matter at this meeting. I would therefore suggest—and this is a formal proposal—that the Committee should adjourn until the middle of next week and that the Chairman should be authorized to hold consultations with regard to the item that we are discussing, which is listed in to-day's *Journal*.

158. While making this proposal, I should like to emphasize that my delegation is aware that the representatives of Chile and Saudi Arabia, among others, have some important proposals with regard to the organization of our work, and we hope that the Chairman will consult them also and take their views into account.

159. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of India has moved that we adjourn. Under rule 119 this motion has to be immediately put to the vote. My understanding is that the representative of India has proposed the adjournment so that the Chair can begin consultations and so that we may meet next week. Having consulted the Secretariat, I think that we might hope to have a meeting on Tuesday morning. Rule 119 says that such motions shall not be debated but shall be immediately put to the vote.

160. I call on the representative of Ceylon on a point of order.

161. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon): Under rule 119 a Member may move the adjournment of a meeting, but he cannot move an adjournment of a meeting to a particular date. All that the representative of India can do under rule 119 is to ask that the meeting adjourn now. It is then for the Chair to consult the Committee and inquire when we should next resume our discussion. I will not refer at this stage to the proposal that we should meet on Tuesday. I reserve the right to discuss that later.

162. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Chile on a point of order.

163. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): I have asked to speak on a point of order because, if I am not mistaken, rule 119 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly stipulates that when there is a motion for the suspension or the adjournment of the meeting, the motion shall not be debated, but shall be immediately put to the vote. I therefore wish to raise the following point of order, making an appeal to the broadmindedness and understanding of the representative of India. I would have preferred it if I had been able to speak to him beforehand, but I was unable to do so as I had gone up to speak to the Chairman. My purpose in raising the point of order is that while it is a fact—without going into detail—that rule 119 is quite clear, it is equally clear that, in Spanish at any rate, to suspend a meeting means to recess, for however long or short a period, after which the meeting can be resumed. Implicit in the suspension of a meeting is that the meeting is not over but that another date has been fixed. On the other hand, when there is a motion for adjournment, the meeting is ended without further ado.

164. I fancy the representative of India was asking not so much that the meeting be adjourned as that it be postponed, and I think he even asked that Tuesday be the date of our next meeting. Thus the matter is important and I think that a point of order arises.

165. There is a General Assembly resolution [1898 (XVIII)] under which the First Committee and the General Assembly should not in the ordinary way meet simultaneously. I apologize for bringing this up because I dislike points of order; but I do like to try to reach honourable agreement. Thus if we are to suspend the meeting until Tuesday, I should like to point out that according to resolution 1898 (XVIII), the First Committee should arrange to meet so as not to interfere with the plenary Assembly. Paragraph (c) reads as follows:

“The First Committee should meet as soon as possible to organize its work, determine the order of discussion of the items allocated to it and start the systematic consideration of its agenda; at the beginning of the session, such meetings might be held when there is an interruption in the general debate; later, plenary meetings might be held during one part of the day, the other part being reserved for the First Committee, thus enabling the Committee to proceed with its regular work as soon as possible after the opening of the session;”

166. The idea underlying the resolution is that meetings of the First Committee should not coincide with the general debate in the Assembly. I should like to support—and I am still within my point of order—the Indian representative's proposal that the meeting be suspended, and resumed on Tuesday, provided there is no plenary meeting of the General Assembly when we meet that day. Now I see that in today's list of meetings there are plenary meetings scheduled for both morning and afternoon on Tuesday.

167. If the representatives and you, Mr. Chairman, will bear with me for a couple of minutes, I would like to say that the suspension of today's meeting until Tuesday could be extremely useful, but subject, in my opinion, to two prior conditions. First, that we are if possible in a position to reach agreement on Tuesday as to the order of priority. Second—and I put forward these conditions merely by way of suggestion, in accordance with what you, Mr. Chairman, stated yesterday—that the moment we reach agreement on priorities, we immediately take up the question of invitations, without prejudice to the right of any delegation wishing to do so to use whatever devices the rules of procedure allow. But if I remember correctly, Mr. Chairman—and I am following your own thinking—you stated yesterday that as soon as we had reached agreement on priorities—by consensus rather than by vote I fervently trust—we would take up the draft resolution submitted by a group of countries. You underlined the point yesterday, Mr. Chairman, in further statements. I will not bore you by quoting your own words. You know them better than I do.

168. If suspension of the meeting until Tuesday, subject to the plenary meeting's being cancelled, enables us essentially to attain those targets, then I withdraw my point of order, which I raised in connexion with the Indian representative's. But we should all know—at any rate my delegation would like to know—why we are suspending the meeting; we should not meet again and resume discussion



of matters that it might be better to thrash out this morning.

169. The CHAIRMAN: I should like to say to the representative of Chile that I have made quite clear what the decision was that was taken yesterday, and I do not intend to go into it again. Rule 119 of the rules of procedure is quite clear. It reads:

“... Such motions shall not be debated, but shall be immediately put to the vote. The Chairman may limit the time to be allowed to the speaker moving the suspension or adjournment of the meeting.”

170. I shall not call on any other member to speak except the representative of India, who has presented the motion, and I am sure that he will be brief.

171. Mr. MISHRA (India): I did not propose a suspension of the meeting; I proposed an adjournment. I did not propose that the Committee should meet again on Tuesday. It is naturally left to the Chairman to decide when he will call the meeting, after consultation with various members. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, may I ask you to put the motion to the vote.

172. The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote the motion of the representative of India that the meeting be adjourned.

*The motion was adopted by 89 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.*

*The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.*