

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1585th  
MEETING**

Friday, 18 October 1968,  
at 3 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
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 calling on the first speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that I have fourteen representatives already inscribed to speak. If the Committee will allow me, I would suggest that representatives try to make their statements as short as possible.

2. I now call on the representative of Cambodia who is the first speaker on my list.

3. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) (*translated from French*): We have to face the fact that at the moment our Committee is in a state of total confusion, a fact we all deplore.

4. This morning [*1584th meeting*], some delegations, in disregard of the Committee's agenda, raised points of order as a pretext for making statements on matters of substance. The Cambodian delegation has been on the list of speakers for two days, yet this morning it was not allowed to speak.

5. According to the agenda of our Committee, we were to deal with the election of the Vice-Chairman, the election of the Rapporteur, and then with the organization of work. We elected the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur and then went on to the question of the organization of work. However, as I have just said, some delegations, purporting to be making points of order, made statements that had no connexion with the organization of work. One representative even made a proposal for the rejection of draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 submitted by sixteen countries. We feel bound to note, and we deplore the fact, that that delegation made its proposal without even allowing the sponsors of this draft resolution to speak: this is a strange way of proceeding, which has no precedent in this Committee.

6. I shall not reply to the accusations made by that representative; however, I hope that after my statement he will realize that the draft we have submitted does in fact deal with the organization of the Committee's work.

7. Sixteen countries, including Cambodia, submitted the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 which forms part of the agenda of our Committee.

8. I should like to assure the Committee, which has heard the statements made by representatives of those countries, that we decided to submit this draft in order to establish an orderly, efficient and constructive procedure for the work of the Committee and to help to improve its working methods. I would recall that this is in keeping with the spirit and the letter of resolution 1898 (XVIII) adopted by the General Assembly in 1963.

9. Whether the agenda item deals with Korea, with another country or with another area of the world, we have to admit that it cannot be considered fairly and effectively in the absence of the parties concerned. I should like to stress this, since it is a basic truth which the Committee must recognize, if it really wants to work seriously and reach a constructive solution.

10. Since the Korean question is on our agenda, we proposed that the Committee, in the light of this general principle, should simultaneously and unconditionally invite both the interested parties and their respective representatives, who would participate without, of course, the right to vote, in the consideration of matters directly concerning them. The Cambodian delegation believes that if the Committee really wanted to succeed in accomplishing good, serious and constructive work, it should adopt the sixteen-nation draft resolution, i.e. document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2.

11. The matter I have just raised is a simple procedural question dealing with the organization of our Committee's work. Therefore, the Cambodian delegation suggests that this draft resolution should be considered and that an equitable decision should be taken so that not only the two Korean parties concerned could appear and state their views before our Committee, but also so that our Committee could have serious and constructive discussions. As I have emphasized from the beginning of my statement, this draft resolution is relevant to the item entitled "Organization of work," as is the proposal dealing with the discussion of the order of priority of the items on our agenda.

12. Mr. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) (*translated from French*): My delegation wishes to be amenable. At no time does it intend to abandon its firm determination to co-operate sincerely with the Chairman and to contribute, in so far as it can, to the success of our work. Thus, after your appeal, Mr. Chairman, we shall restrain ourselves and shall say to you merely that we are pleased and happy to work under your wise and competent leadership.

13. This being the case, our delegation has asked to speak this morning on what was and remains the subject of our discussion, namely, the organization of our work. It has, along with other delegations, regretted it was unable to speak when it wanted to do so, though it had requested to speak on a point of order. However, it does understand the Chair's problems, and the difficulty inherent in guiding a discussion such as this one in the circumstances which prevailed this morning.

14. My delegation nevertheless would like to emphasize that the problem which has been raised here and on which it wishes to speak is solely the problem of the organization of our work. It would also like to reiterate its conviction that the draft resolution which has just been submitted is indeed completely relevant to this question of the organization of work. What is it the sponsors and those who co-sponsored this draft want? We want our Committee to undertake its work on an important problem in the best conditions for a successful outcome, so that we can attain in an objective and effective manner the goals we have set ourselves.

15. From the point of view of organization, and in the light of the United Nations Charter, my delegation fails to see how, when we are discussing a problem in which two parties are concerned, one party can be present while the other is not invited. I shall not go into the substance of the problem. You will not hear the slightest question of substance raised during the present statement. This morning, we were amazed to hear some delegations raise this question straight away and request that a draft resolution submitted logically, under a specific heading, should be ruled inadmissible and withdrawn. We feel we must bear the objectivity of the Committee and the success of its work in mind, and that the organization of work should be so planned as to cover all the work to be done, and that this does indeed include the invitation which the Committee must decide upon, an invitation which, if approved, must be sent off early enough to enable those invited to be present here in time.

16. Subject to what it has just said, the Mauritanian delegation has no objection to the Chair's suggestion regarding our order of work. The one thing we are saying and upon which we wish to insist, is that the question of the invitation is relevant to our organization of work and that it must not, by the various manoeuvres and moves, be taken out of this context.

17. The CHAIRMAN (*translated from French*): I should like to thank the Mauritanian representative for the friendly words he has spoken about me, and also for the understanding he has shown the Chair.

18. Mr. MISHRA (India): Until the last two speakers made their statements my delegation had been under the impression that we were discussing this morning [*1584th meeting*] the timeliness of the point of order raised by the representative of Japan. Now, if the Committee has already agreed that it is discussing the draft resolution and the point of order related to that draft resolution, then my delegation has nothing to say at this stage. However, if we are still trying to sort out the problem raised by the point of order, after the Chairman had made certain suggestions

in regard to the priority of items or the order of items, then my delegation would like to put forward a suggestion that would perhaps help the Committee to order its work a little better.

19. The suggestion is not novel; the representative of Ghana had something to say about it this morning. What I have to indicate is only slightly different from that. The elements are the following. We were discussing the third item on our agenda for the meetings today. You, Mr. Chairman, had made certain suggestions in that connexion. Before those suggestions could be discussed and commented upon—and I am sure there would have been various comments on them—the representative of Japan raised a point of order relating to a document which is before the Committee, but on which discussion had not yet started.

20. My suggestion is that you, Mr. Chairman, might like to inquire of the representative of Japan whether he would not agree to keep his point of order pending until we come to the discussion of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2. If he were to agree to that, then we could begin a discussion on the priority and order of items and, of course, on the suggestions which were made by you this morning.

21. On the other hand, if the representative of Japan were to press his point of order for disposal at the moment, then, of course, the last two statements which were made in this Committee are quite in order, and we are already beginning a discussion of the draft resolution before us. Therefore I would request you, Sir, to inquire of the representative of Japan whether he would not agree to keep his point of order pending for decision at the stage when we begin to discuss the draft resolution.

22. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of India has requested me to inquire of the Japanese delegation whether it wishes to press the point of order it raised this morning, or whether it would agree to our postponing decision on that point of order until we have settled the order of the agenda, as I suggested this morning. That is the way I understand the request put by the representative of India. If the representative of Japan is prepared to give an explanation I shall call on him.

23. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan): I agree to the suggestion made by the Indian representative; and, Mr. Chairman, to my mind you summarized his idea very correctly. I am ready to agree that the proposal I made this morning be kept in suspension, so to speak, until the priority of the items to be discussed in our Committee is determined, at which time we will see what to do.

24. The CHAIRMAN: Having listened to the representative of Japan, I feel we are coming close to a clarification. If I understand the feeling of the Committee, we would start by discussing the order of priority in which we want to discuss the items referred to our Committee, and that after we have taken a decision on that we would take up the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 to see, on the basis of the point of order put forward by the representative of Japan, what decision we could take.

25. Mr. MISHRA (India): Mr. Chairman, you were quite correct in your summary of the suggestion which I made. I should only like to clarify the fact that the draft resolution is still before the Committee under the item that we are discussing; and, naturally, at the time when that draft resolution is discussed the point of order raised by the representative of Japan will also be before us. But my suggestion does not amount to taking a decision that the draft resolution in question is not to be discussed under the item that we are considering at the moment.

26. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Algeria on a point of order.

27. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): As the Cambodian representative very rightly indicated a short time ago, the situation was somewhat confused this morning. It is my impression that this afternoon the degree of confusion is even greater, since, if my understanding is correct, we have agreed to defer taking any decision on the motion of order raised this morning by the representative of Japan. Yet the rules of procedure are very clear in this respect: when a motion of order has been submitted, either the Chairman or the Committee must take an immediate decision.

28. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this morning, after the motion of order was raised by the representative of Japan, you felt obliged to make two statements, one concerning the order of priority of the items on our agenda and the other concerning the fact that the discussion on the order of priority of the Committee's agenda items and draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 formed part of one and the same question, namely, the organization of work.

29. Is this, then, the basis upon which we are now working, as the representative of Ghana rightly indicated this morning and as you yourself rightly emphasized at the end of this morning's meeting? To put it briefly, we are in the process of discussing an agenda item entitled "Organization of work" and this item raises two types of problems: one having to do with the priority to be given each agenda item, and the other with the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2.

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

31. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised to hear you say that the list of sixteen is a list of speakers on a point of order. I thought I had entered my name on the list of speakers for the discussion of agenda item 3, and not the point of order—particularly as the first two speakers on this list are the representatives of Cambodia and Mauritania, who entered their names, as the Cambodian representative told us, two days ago. How can these be statements on a point of order? The list is a list of representatives who wish to have an opportunity to comment on the substance of item 3.

32. There are two documents under item 3. I feel that every representative on the speakers' list is entitled to state his views—and I am convinced that many more names,

possibly dozens of names, will be added to the list—on both documents and on the substance of agenda item 3 of the First Committee, an item which we adopted as a single whole, without in any way separating the two sub-items.

33. I think this is logical: the two sub-items are grouped under the same item—organization of work. Every representative is therefore entitled in his statement to comment on both, and to state his views both on priority in the discussion of the questions referred to the First Committee, and on the sixteen-Power draft resolution. In this connexion I fully share the regrets expressed by the Cambodian and Mauritanian representatives with regard to the confusion introduced by certain representatives who spoke on a point of order. Moreover, the systematic statements made at our morning meeting [*1584th meeting*] give the impression that this was a previously organized confusion-creating group. The Cambodian and Mauritanian representatives were prevented from speaking as representing the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, and a confusion-making discussion on points of order was begun. In fact, to our great regret, we wasted a considerable part of our morning meeting.

34. In supporting the Cambodian and Mauritanian representatives, I cannot but express my own regret that the initiator of this organized confusion was the representative of a country situated very close to Korea. I must also note that this sort of organized confusion has been going on for twenty years. Every time, prior to the discussion of the Korean question in the United Nations, an organized confusion is created with a view to preventing a serious discussion of the Korean question and defeating the proposal about inviting both Koreas. I had the honour of being present at the inception of the "Korean question", during the coldest years of the cold war. At that time the United Nations had fifty-five Member States. Since then, to our general satisfaction, the United Nations has grown, so that it now counts 125 Members. Twenty years have elapsed, but those who have been creating organized confusion before the Korean question could even be discussed are still using the same tactics. A representative here mentioned Toscanini. Toscanini was a musician and conductor of genius; but the "Toscanini" in this case has been conducting an orchestrated confusion from the wings.

35. I therefore think that we should disregard this organized confusion and proceed to discuss item 3. Every representative is entitled to express his opinion both on the first document included under this item and on the second. What decision we shall take on these questions will become clear by the end of the debate. The less time we spend on discussing points of order, the faster shall we agree on the order of discussion of these questions and on what is to be done with the sixteen-Power draft resolution. In any event, on behalf of the USSR delegation, I reserve the right, when my turn comes under this list, which I regard as a list for statements on item 3 and not on points of order, to comment on both questions.

36. Mr. PEDERSEN (United States of America): Like everybody else in the Committee I think that we share some of the confusion which has been generated here by an unprecedented move this year to put into the organization of work an issue which has been discussed throughout the

history of the United Nations in connexion with the item under which it belongs, the Korean question. We indeed regret the delay in the proceedings of the Committee which was occasioned by this—a delay that we experienced in previous years when efforts were made to raise this matter under other points in the agenda, when it was not before us.

37. Our understanding of the situation before the Committee is much like that of the representative of India at this point. My understanding of his suggestion was that the point of order that was raised this morning in connexion with the discussion should be suspended while we continue to decide the order of priority of the items before us and then, when that order is decided, we can come back to this point. That was a very wise suggestion, in my opinion, because it may well be that when the order of the agenda is decided it will be possible for the Committee to dispose of much of this procedural argument and to get on with the business before it.

38. There is one item before the Committee: the organization of work. There are two documents which have been listed under that item, one by the Secretariat [*A/C.1/964 and Add.1*], which deals with the order in which we discuss our items, and the other which is listed under that item by some sponsors of one draft resolution [*A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2*]. There is another draft resolution before the Committee, contained in document *A/C.1/L.423* and sponsored by a number of other States, which deals with the same subject and is listed under General Assembly item 25, the Korean question.

39. On the first point, the point of the necessity of establishing the order of the agenda, there is no difference among the members of the Committee. That is obviously the main task which we have before us, a task which is made clear by the memorandum that was submitted to the General Assembly by its President a few years ago, Ambassador Slim of Tunisia, in which, referring specifically to the work of the First and Special Political Committees, he said:

“... at the beginning of their work, these two Committees cannot avoid a procedural debate... to establish the order in which the items allocated to those Committees are to be discussed. In principle, this procedural debate should not touch on the substance of the items in question. There is, therefore, no reason why it should not take place during the general debate in plenary and be completed before the conclusion of that debate. This procedure would have the merit of saving valuable time. It would also enable all delegations to be prepared, in good time, for the discussion of the first question to be considered by each of the two Committees. It does not seem to me that this would in any way interfere with the general debate in plenary.

“It accordingly seems eminently desirable that the First Committee and the Special Political Committee should meet as soon as possible during the general debate in plenary in order to establish the order of priority of the various items allocated to them.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 86, document *A/5123*, paras. 25 and 26.

40. So we believe that the suggestion made by the representative of India is a helpful suggestion.

41. In line with that, I should like, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, to make a few comments about the suggestions which you put forward this morning concerning the order of the agenda items. We particularly appreciated them because you suggested an order which might facilitate the work of the Committee and because you suggested establishing targets as to the amount of time which might be spent on those various items. In a year when the amount of time available for substantive debate is more limited than usual because we are commencing late, some guidance and direction as to amount of time are particularly valuable.

42. As you know, Mr. Chairman, in our informal discussions with you and others we expressed our preference for an order of items somewhat different from the one you have proposed, but despite that we are prepared to agree to the order you have suggested. That order, in the nature of things, is a compromise, or perhaps an accommodation of different views, and therefore it is unlikely to be entirely satisfactory to everyone. At the same time, it does contain elements which help to meet and satisfy the views of all.

43. Now, in particular in connexion with the debate in which we are now engaged, a not inconsiderable benefit would flow from prompt agreement on the order that you have proposed, Mr. Chairman, with the Korean item as the first item, in that the Committee would thereby be enabled to address itself immediately to the question of inviting representatives of Korea to take part in our debate, a question to which my delegation and others attach great importance. If this were done, the Committee would be taking an important step to avoid a lengthy, distracting and perhaps fruitless procedural debate on the proper timing and manner in which it is necessary to deal with this subject. We need only go over debates in previous years in this Committee to be reminded that, in connexion with this matter, a long, protracted procedural argument could develop. We believe it is useful to avoid that by following your suggestion and promptly establishing an order of the items along the lines you have suggested, and then moving immediately into the discussion of the Korean question.

44. As far as my delegation is concerned, we are prepared to do this and we hope that this accommodation will enable the Committee promptly to get down to a systematic and substantive consideration of the items on its agenda. The alternative, as far as we can see, would be to proceed with another procedural debate in order to resolve the issue quite properly presented by the representative of Japan, on which our views coincide, based upon the invariable practice of this Committee in the past and on the recommendations of the President of the General Assembly.

45. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): Mr. Chairman, I shall take the liberty of disagreeing with and disobeying your injunction to us this morning regarding the paying of tributes to you on your election as Chairman of this Committee. An indication of the high esteem in which you and your country are held by members of this Committee is the impressive list of names of some of your great compatriots whose contribution to human progress and civilization is

known to all. We have no doubt that your Chairmanship of this Committee will be a memorable one. You have already displayed considerable skill and tact in conducting the work of this Committee, and we have every hope and, in fact, conviction that you will lead our work with great distinction and ability.

46. May I also present our congratulations to the Rapporteur and the Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

47. I shall now discuss the two questions under the item now before us, which is "Organization of work". Those two questions are the order of the agenda items, and the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2. I shall discuss the substance of those two questions on the basis of the interpretation given by the representative of Ghana [*1584th meeting*], to which the Chairman agreed, namely, that under the present item "Organization of work" there are two questions—he called them sub-items although they should more properly be called questions—the letter from the President of the General Assembly to the Chairman of the First Committee, and the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2. I also base myself on the explanation given by my friend and colleague, the representative of India, whose views, if I may say so, were not accurately reflected in the statement just made by the representative of the United States. I heard the representative of India distinctly say that there can be discussion—in fact, he envisages discussion—on the order of the agenda items as well as on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2. That was the view of the representative of India which I heard and which, I am sure, all members of the Committee heard. He said that we can discuss under the present item "Organization of work" both questions, namely, the question of the order of agenda items and the draft resolution.

48. Therefore, it seems to me from the statement of the representative of Ghana this morning, which you endorsed, Mr. Chairman, and also from the statement of the representative of India this afternoon, which you and other members of the Committee also endorsed, that it is quite in order to discuss the two questions appearing on the agenda of today's meeting, namely, the order of agenda items and the draft resolution.

49. I believe that the representative of the United States has a very restrictive interpretation of the meaning of the words "Organization of work". He seems to be under the illusion that that means exclusively the determination of the order of the agenda items to be discussed in the Committee. That is not so. "Organization of work" means many things more than merely the determination of the order of the discussion of items. Under "Organization of work" the Committee can decide many things, such as the frequency of meetings, the length of statements, the method of presenting draft resolutions, and so forth. It is a very broad heading under which many matters can be discussed. It does not cover exclusively the determination of the order of agenda items.

50. Therefore, in view of that and also in view of the statements made by the representatives of Ghana and India, which have not been challenged, namely, that we can

discuss these two questions under the present item "Organization of work", I take the liberty of discussing the substance of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2.

51. My delegation supports and will vote in favour of that draft resolution, which, I may add, is not a substantive draft to be discussed only under the Korean question; it deals with the question of organizing the work of the Committee in an orderly fashion and, therefore, it can be discussed now. We support that draft resolution because we believe the time has come to give a proper and adequate hearing to a party to this problem; we think the time has come for the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to be heard in this Committee without any prior conditions. There has been a practice in the United Nations to allow parties to a dispute to be heard in all freedom and on the basis of complete equality, without attaching conditions which would prejudice the essential merits of the case and also might prejudice the position which one of the parties had taken on the question. Therefore, we find no justification for continuing the anomalous situation whereby only one party to a dispute is heard and the other party is prevented from being heard by procedural means which really have only one aim, that is to muzzle one party to the dispute and give preferential treatment to one party over the other.

52. For that reason my delegation supports the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2.

53. Regarding the other matter before us, namely, the order of the items, I think that you, Sir, said in your opening remarks that usually the First Committee has attached the greatest importance to questions relating to disarmament—which, of course, is the main task of this Committee, and perhaps of the Organization. Recent developments, and especially the adoption at the resumed twenty-second session of the Assembly of the resolution 2373 (XXII), commending the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the memorandum of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament [*A/7134*], and also the report of the recently held Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States, compel us to agree that it is only proper for the First Committee to take up these urgent and important items, and as you have said yourself, Sir, it has been the practice of this Committee to give special consideration to the items concerning disarmament. Therefore, my delegation would support the proposal to take up these questions on disarmament as the first items on our Committee's agenda.

54. Then, I believe that in order to allow the Committee sufficient time to deal with a very important and comparatively new item, we should take up General Assembly agenda item 26 concerning examination of the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, etc. In order to give the Committee sufficient time to examine this question and discuss it adequately, I believe that we should take it up comparatively early, and, therefore, after examination of the questions relating to disarmament.

55. Following that, it would be possible, of course, to take up General Assembly agenda item 25 on the Korean question with its three sub-headings. And finally, as you suggested, Sir, we can take up, as our last item, General Assembly agenda item 24 on the question of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space.

56. These are, in brief, the views of my delegation regarding the two questions in the item now before the Committee and reflected in the agenda for today's meetings.

57. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Iraq for the tribute which he paid to my country and for the complimentary terms he used in speaking about me.

58. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): I apologize for taking the floor again, but I shall be brief. This morning [1584th meeting] my delegation ventured to give its own interpretation of the declaration, as I would call it, made by the Chairman after the representative of Japan had raised a point of order. The problem now appears clearer, although my delegation found it perfectly clear this morning: the representative of Japan said he would withdraw his point of order for the time being, reserving the right which every delegation has to raise a point of order whenever he sees fit to do so. This, I think, makes the problem even clearer.

59. But before proceeding, I would like to pay a due tribute to the Rapporteur, Mr. Zollner of Dahomey, on this morning's election. We all recognize his ability, his energy and the precision with which he invariably expounds his views. All these qualities will make him an outstanding Rapporteur.

60. How at the present juncture does my delegation see the matters we are discussing? In the first place, we are discussing the question of organization of work. At this morning's meeting, the Chairman made it clear—as I think we too did, and so did other delegations, in particular I recall that of Ghana, and this afternoon those of India, the Soviet Union and Iraq that at the moment we are not discussing a point of order, since it has been withdrawn, but organization of work.

61. The Chairman made it clear that what he was proposing was that in discussing the organization of our work we should first take up the matter of the order of priority of the eight items before us. There appears to be agreement that five of them should be combined under the general heading of disarmament and that immediately afterwards, and still under the heading of organization of work, we should embark on the discussion of a proposal submitted by several delegations and explained today for the benefit of our discussion of it by the representatives of Cambodia and Mauritania.

62. We are discussing—I think I agree with the representative of India here—the problem of the organization of work, which covers two points and could cover three or four. This morning I proposed that we hold Saturday and Sunday meetings if necessary. This again comes under organization of work.

63. What has precedent to say regarding the organization of work? General Assembly resolution 1898 (XVIII), of 1963, reads as follows (paragraph c):

“The First Committee should meet as soon as possible—” (which is what we are now doing) “to organize its work, determine the order of discussion of the items allocated to it and start the systematic consideration of its agenda . . .”

The resolution goes on to say (paragraph (d)):

“Each of the Main Committees should establish its programme of work as soon as possible, including the approximate dates on which it will consider the various items referred to it and the date on which it proposes to conclude its work, on the understanding that this programme will be transmitted to the General Committee . . .”

64. What does all this mean, quite honestly, without any *parti pris*? It means that “organization of work” is not purely and simply a matter of agreeing on the order in which the various items are to be discussed. I think that a careful reading of paragraphs (c) and (d) of resolution 1898 (XVIII) proves that. Paragraph (c), which I shall not repeat, includes several points: organizing the work, determining the order of discussion; and then paragraph (d) adds: “including the approximate dates”. Organization of work is a very broad term, as long as it does not extend to problems of substance, which must naturally be discussed when the debate starts on each one.

65. But what are we dealing with now? It seems to me that the representative of India made himself perfectly clear. For the time being you yourself, Mr. Chairman, suggested an outline of work—no objection being raised apart from a point of order which has now been withdrawn, and hence there can be no procedural issue—and you said that under the heading of organization of work we would discuss the order of items and then immediately, without entering into a discussion of the substance, take up the draft resolution submitted by a number of delegations [A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2]. I know that that document contains a number of “appreciations”. One of its preambular paragraphs states that no question can be discussed equitably and effectively without the participation of the interested parties. Later, in the operative part, it makes a statement to the effect that the two parties, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea should be invited without condition.

66. Another document which I would like with your permission to cite by way of reference [A/C.1/L.423] was distributed in connexion with the item “The Korean question” at the request of a number of countries. I cite it for purposes of reference, since I am not dealing with the basic problem. It speaks of considering that participation by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea would contribute to an equitable and effective discussion of the Korean question. It is a fact also that the end part imposes certain conditions, as any delegation is entitled to urge, namely that the representation of one of the Korean Republics should accept the competence and authority of the United Nations.

67. These are two different appreciations, but the intention is similar: to make whatever efforts are necessary to

enable the two Koreas, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea, to participate. In this they coincide, though the wording differs. At least that is the way my delegation sees it. I shall not try to interpret what was in the minds of the sponsors, but that is my delegation's interpretation. Why, then, could we not—and here I agree with the representative of India—consider this matter as part of the organization of our work? As we know, one of the items under this heading is the Korean question, to be placed first, second, third or fourth, so that if there is agreement on the conditions, as there may or may not be, the two parties, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea, would have an opportunity, if invited on conditions accepted by all, to participate in the debate and have sufficient time to prepare. It seems to me that given an open mind, this could easily be regarded as coming under organization of work. Let us suppose that the Committee decides that the Korean question is to be discussed during the last few days in December because this Committee has so decided. Would it be possible in those few days, in what I will not call a hypothetical case because I do not know, I am not prejudging the position, to invite the delegations of the two Republics at the last minute?

68. My delegation considers that this comes under organization of work, because it seems to us that without taking any stand on the substance of the matter, if the possibility of inviting the two Republics is to be a practical one, reasonable notice must be given. I know that this is a controversial question. I know that it has political implications. My delegation sees no reason why it should not state its views on that procedural issue here while withholding them until the appropriate moment on the way in which the parties invited are to come. It may well be that we shall vote against the one draft resolution and in favour of the other. However, the position I take in regard to procedure will not commit my delegation in respect of any position we may adopt later on in regard to the substance of the problem.

69. This morning you, Mr. Chairman, suggested an order which strikes me as very sound. I will not repeat the arguments, but I would like to point out that in urging that the question of the sea-bed be dealt with before the problem of disarmament, my delegation does so not because it considers disarmament as anything less than the most important item before the Committee; it certainly is. But it does not lose any of its importance if we begin to discuss it on 7, 8 or 10 November. We would have at least six weeks ahead of us before the end of December. Thus we are not belittling its importance. If we have urged, in accordance with your own suggestion, that immediately before disarmament we should discuss the problem of the sea-bed, it is because the latter item is of interest to my own country as a developing or under-developed country. What we have to try to do is to reconcile positions rather than encourage a scramble for authority between committees. Everything seems to suggest that the Second Committee can take up this problem on or about 10 November, so that it would have the benefit of knowing the outcome of the debate in this Committee.

70. I believe that this request, coming from one under-developed country and shared by many others, is legiti-

mate. It does not flout the agenda or underrate the disarmament item, since it leaves full latitude for debate.

71. With regard to the Korean question, I supported your suggestion this morning, Mr. Chairman, because, as you pointed out, this Committee will only begin its work in ten days. Today's date is 18 October and you intimated that we would begin on 28 October as soon as the general debate in the Assembly was over. Hence we see no reason for not beginning with the Korean question, because whatever decision is taken on the draft resolution before us, we would still have ten days to reach a decision on invitations, and if this were affirmative, on the conditions under which those invitations would be issued.

72. To avoid the necessity of taking the floor again, my delegation can state here and now that if a sizeable majority in the Committee was in favour, and if following your consultations you felt it right, Mr. Chairman, we would not object to a slight change in the order, placing the sea-bed first, then disarmament, then Korea, and finally outer space.

73. If this statement has been lengthy, it is because I wanted to be precise and to make my country's position perfectly clear, and also to back up the position you adopted this morning, Mr. Chairman, doubtless as a result of efforts at conciliation and understanding. Hence my delegation's support of your suggestion this morning. Another reason why I have spoken at length is that this afternoon, with the temporary withdrawal of the Japanese representative's point of order, the last vestige of doubt is removed, as far as my delegation is concerned. The third reason is because we still have ten days ahead of us even in the event of Korea being the first item on our agenda.

74. Thus I think the position taken by Chile could be the first step towards agreement. I am in good company, Mr. Chairman—your own and that of several representatives who have spoken before me. Similarly, if I have interpreted them correctly, I hold the same views as India, Iraq and other delegations. The fact that there are slight shades of difference does not invalidate the essence of your proposal. Let us hope that we can come to some agreement this very day on the organization of our work.

75. Mr. JOUEJATI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, while mindful of your appeal for brevity, the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic, speaking here for the first time, would not want to let pass this opportunity of extending to you and to the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur its warmest congratulations on your unanimous elections. My delegation would also like to welcome the new Under-Secretary-General and to express its appreciation to the Secretary of the Committee and his associates. We are convinced that the assistance of such a team so rich in experience and ability augurs well for the quality of the work the Committee will accomplish at its current session.

76. The lengthy procedural debate which took place this morning and which is still going on originated in the remarks made by the Japanese representative with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2, and a motion of order which he saw fit to withdraw a short while

ago. Some of those remarks were, of course, unfortunate. The draft was called misleading, whereas it was actually drawn up to make the organization of work easier. As such it is purely procedural and should be considered independently of the various items on the Korean question which are included in the agenda.

77. In order to emphasize this procedural aspect, the sponsors were careful to entitle it "Organization of work", which is the item it comes under. Had it been their intention to mislead anyone, they might have chosen another title. Thus the draft, by its nature, takes priority in the discussion of the organization of work, for its adoption or rejection will in fact determine both the perspective in which one of the most important of the agenda items will be discussed, and the number of meetings the Committee will decide to devote to this problem, according to the hearings it may or may not grant to the parties concerned. Last but not least, it will determine the preliminary steps to be taken by the Secretary-General to ensure that the invitation is issued as soon as possible so that the representatives of the parties concerned can be present at the discussion if, of course, the draft resolution is adopted.

78. These factors play a part in the way our work is organized, and we should take a speedy decision on them, in order that we may more easily proceed to this organization.

79. An attempt was made, at the very outset, to discredit the draft resolution by raising the question of lack of precedent, as though this lack of precedent, for reasons of pure coincidence, could in itself establish a strict rule of conduct, and as though such a lack of precedent had already been confirmed by procedure as an established standard.

80. I submit that logic and reason are better criteria, that they should outweigh the lack of precedent and that they should guide our discussions and our decisions. We could speak at length on the soundness and timeliness of the draft; but at this stage in the discussion this is beside the point. In any case, several very pertinent remarks were made this morning in this connexion by a number of representatives, more particularly by Mr. Baroody.

81. Suffice it to say, Mr. Chairman, that in your opening statement [*1584th meeting*], you called for common goals. In keeping with that aim, we believe that the exclusion of the most involved and most concerned party and the denial of its right to put forward its point of view amount to disregarding the commendable guidelines you so ably set for us.

82. Let us hope that this question will be settled in a suitable manner with a minimum of delay, and, if possible, with a minimum of controversy.

83. The CHAIRMAN (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Syria for the congratulations he has extended to me and the other officers of the Committee.

84. Mr. DAVIS (Australia): Though speaking for the first time, out of deference to you, Mr. Chairman, I shall avoid the well-merited words of praise to the officers of the

Committee—others more eloquent than I have spoken them. I simply want to offer the sincere co-operation of our delegation.

85. But I believe, Mr. Chairman, that you have come to this Committee not as a Caesar but as a Solomon. You proposed this morning a solution of the problems that have been confusing us which divides the baby fairly between the contending parties. What in effect draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 seeks is an early consideration of the seating question. To my delegation's way of thinking the Chairman's proposal is the most logical compromise which permits us, after settling the order of business, to go straight on to the Korean item.

86. I think the position has become a little clearer since the representative of India made his suggestion and the representative of Japan suspended his point of order. And those two actions led you, Mr. Chairman, to say, as I understood it, that the feeling of the meeting was that we should discuss the order of items first, and after that the decision regarding draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2, and that the Japanese point of order could then be considered. I believe that at this stage of our discussion we should confine ourselves to the order of work.

87. I should say in this context that my delegation sincerely believes that the content of draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 does contain matters of substance essentially and inevitably, that it is not a mere matter of procedure or organization. It raises a question which has been debated at length in the past, and on this occasion when it comes up will no doubt be debated at length again. It is not just a simple question of procedure. I do not want to go into detail at this particular juncture, but even the question of whether or not conditions should be attached to an invitation is not, to my way of thinking, a simple matter of procedure.

88. In a spirit of compromise, your proposal, Mr. Chairman, is that we settle the order of business first, and written into that is that Korea should then be dealt with, however the other items may follow. My delegation would agree with your proposed order. It may not suit everyone, but it seems to us to be a sensible compromise. I am sure it will allow sufficient time for both Korean delegations to prepare themselves and to get here. I am sure that they both have been following closely the debates in the United Nations, are well prepared and are in a position, if draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 is adopted, to take up the invitation and come promptly.

89. I suggest therefore that we should proceed at this stage to discuss the order of the items on our agenda. After that, the question of whether or not Japan wants to take up its point of order again is a matter for it to decide. I think it is very clear at this stage that we should be discussing, and discussing only, the order of our business.

90. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Australia for his kind words.

91. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that I was not in my seat. I thought that some of the representatives would speak longer than they did. This is a

good sign—that they are curtailing their speeches. I shall try to do the same.

92. Mr. Chairmam, to be frank with you, I think it is high time that the protagonists on this question in this Committee should no longer call a spade a silver spoon. We cannot be fed with such a spoon any longer, having lived with this question for so many years in this Committee as well as having attended the Security Council in the early fifties, when none other than our colleague, Mr. Malik, was a member. I think it is high time that we know what we are going to do in this Committee. Either we are going to have an academic discussion on the Korean question, as we have done in the past, or we are going to continue to beat around the bush and use all the procedural instruments or methods at our disposal, just to confuse the issue more and to let world public opinion laugh at us for having, as in preceding years, discussed the Korean question without achieving any tangible result.

93. This question reminds me of the common, hackneyed saying about putting the cart before the horse. We should put the horse before the cart, but we are not doing that today, nor have we been doing that in the past.

94. I must be frank, as I always try to be, and say that in discussing the organization of work, if we do not take the Korean question forthwith as the first item it will never come to be discussed as it should be. This is contingent, of course, on whether the two parties, meaning South Korea and North Korea, will be heard on an equal basis before this Committee. As things are, many here—I do not say the whole Committee—are divided on the question of inviting North Korea. There are sixteen nations which feel strongly that North Korea should be invited immediately so that it may be afforded the opportunity to come, perhaps at a later date, and speak before us.

95. On the other hand, there are other States which are putting certain conditions—I am not saying whether they are justified or not, because then I would be delving into the substance—and which do not think that North Korea should be invited. They say that it should be invited, but they put conditions. I am neither from North Korea nor from South Korea, but if we read the draft resolution co-sponsored by Australia and other States [A/C.1/L.423], I do not believe that North Korea, or any country for that matter, would come before us, because there are stringent conditions attached.

96. Therefore, the question revolves upon whether we mean to discuss a report about the unification of Korea or we do not mean to discuss the question of the unification of Korea. It all arises with the two major Powers which have special interests in South Korea and in North Korea. Should we small nations become clients of one Power or the other for certain ulterior motives or perhaps special interests of our own? I submit that we cannot go on on that basis. Either we discuss the unification of Korea seriously and not academically, or, as I said, we might just as well allocate a few meetings and afford a platform for the major Powers to tell us why the other party is wrong and why they are right. Then this would be propaganda, mere and sheer propaganda. It is high time that the question of the invitations to North and South Korea be decided upon immediately.

97. In talking about the organization of work, I have a proposal to make, if we decide that the Korean question should be the first item on our agenda. With all due respect to my brother from Iraq—and he is right in saying that the organization of work is not limited only to the allocation of the number of meetings to each item and the order in which they will be discussed, but something more—I must say to him and to others who think that disarmament or any other item should be discussed first, that we will find ourselves in the same position as we found ourselves in previous years, having the Korean question put in our lap during the last week or during the last few days of the session with no result whatsoever. Regardless of whether this Committee decides by majority to invite North Korea or not to invite North Korea, and since we are talking about the organization of work, may I submit that we should discuss the Korean question first with the following proviso: that if the Committee decides to act favourably on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2, submitted by Bulgaria and fifteen other States, we suspend the discussion on the Korean question until about the middle of November, giving an opportunity to the representatives of North Korea to present themselves before this Committee, and then we can resume the discussion of the Korean question in a businesslike manner, in an orderly manner, and without equivocation.

98. Now, without delving into the substance, I must touch upon the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.423, which is co-sponsored by Australia and, I believe, eleven other States. They use such terms as “unequivocally”. It has a bearing on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2, which we are now discussing. It refers to an unequivocal acceptance. And that appears not only in the preamble. They use the words “provided it first unequivocally accepts the competence and authority of the United Nations”.

99. If we decide to invite the representatives of North Korea, I must tell my friends who co-sponsored this draft resolution that the mere fact that they come here would indicate that they respect us as the United Nations. The United Nations is not one or two or three countries, but is our collectivity. We should not treat them as if they were children: “You do this and that before you come here or we do not receive you”. We do not think that it is polite or courteous to do such a thing.

100. Good Lord, students are rebelling nowadays in all parts of the world. If their teachers tell them that they should do this and that, they organize and revolt against them. And here in the United Nations we tell States, whether we recognize them or not: “You behave and listen to what we have decided”.

101. How many decided in 1950 and in 1951 to send troops to fight in Korea? Sixteen nations. I was in the United Nations; I was in the Security Council when the question of Korea came to a head. That is the wrong approach, I must say. On the other hand, I do not think our friends from Bulgaria and the fifteen other States should emphasize the point “without condition”. Let us drop such terminology from resolutions when we are dealing with States which have their own dignity, whether we agree with them or disagree with them.

102. I am in a position to talk objectively without having any political axe to grind on this question on behalf of my Government. It is only fair to say that perhaps by tomorrow none other than the representative of the United States will meet with the representative of the Soviet Union, because after all they have a bigger voice and a more influential voice in North and South Korea than we do. Let them decide whether they really want to unify Korea this year or initiate any step that might lead to the unification.

103. Or perhaps the time is not ripe. They are in a better position to tell us. We will not blame them if they are not ready. Perhaps they have certain strategic considerations in Asia. We do not know. We do not know what goes on. But we should not be like false witnesses coming here year in and year out to endorse an academic discussion of this problem.

104. One might say that this is an unorthodox approach to the question. But by using the diplomatic modalities of the past we have not been making any headway. I believe that both Powers would render us a great service. They can seek instructions, if they wish, in a few days. I am sure that if we go on like this the procedural debate will take another two days, as to whether we should put the cart before the horse; whether we should, in other words, decide, before deciding upon the priority, to invite or not to invite.

105. If they really mean to initiate any steps for the unification of North and South Korea, let them come in with draft resolutions that do not set conditions for the invitation of one party or the other. If they do not mean it, we have suffered enough; why prolong our misery more? We have many subjects. Disarmament is very important. The item on the sea-bed is very important, they tell me, because proteins are becoming in greater shortage in the world and people may go hungry in a few years. And the safety of the world is bound up with questions of disarmament.

106. To sum up, I suggest—and I would dare say I propose—that, if we are not through by 5.30, we should close this procedural debate and take a decision this evening or tonight: first, to discuss the Korean question, taking into consideration that it is essential that we pronounce ourselves on draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2.

107. Now, if draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 is adopted by this Committee, then, of course, we will ask the Secretary-General to invite—or we, through the instrumentality of the United Nations, can invite—the North Koreans to come at any time convenient to them, but not later than between the middle and end of November, so that we may deal constructively with this question.

108. If, on the other hand, that draft resolution is not adopted, I do not think we should be bothered too much by the Korean question, because we shall be talking to ourselves. I would appeal, then, to the representatives of Australia and the other States which have co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/L.423 to withdraw their draft resolution, because it would be of no value; it would not be obeyed by anyone. Why discuss it just to hear more propaganda? Either those two major Powers which have

special, strategic and other interests in that part of Asia are willing to work towards the reunification of Korea this year or they are not. If they are willing, well and good, and we will show by our votes whether or not to invite North Korea. If North Korea is not invited, we might just as well not spend more than two or three meetings on that question; that would be more than enough, because the whole discussion would be academic and on the same basis as in previous years, which was fruitless, abortive, and a waste of time.

109. The CHAIRMAN: If I correctly understand the representative of Saudi Arabia, he has proposed that we come to some decision by 5.30. I should like to ask him if that is an official motion to close the debate, under rule 118.

110. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Yes, Sir; it is a formal motion to close the debate, and I make that proposal, and also the other part of my proposal is well known to you, Mr. Chairman, and to my colleagues around this table: that if the majority of members wish to invite North Korea, this question should be postponed until some time between the middle and end of November. If that is not the case, I appeal to the others to withdraw their draft resolution, because it would mean nothing; the whole discussion would be academic.

111. The CHAIRMAN: May I try to interpret correctly the proposal of the representative of Saudi Arabia? He spoke about 5.30. Would that mean that he is moving to close the debate now, or that we should close it at 5.30, or that we should put his motion to the vote according to rule 118, giving the opportunity to those who want to speak on the proposal to do so at 5.30?

112. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Five-thirty. Let others speak, if they want, now.

113. Mr. PEDERSEN (United States of America): Point of order.

114. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the United States, who has asked to speak on a point of order.

115. Mr. PEDERSEN (United States of America): I think we need to have clarified very clearly for the Committee what has now been presented to us. I understood the representative of Saudi Arabia to have proposed that we decide at 5.30 to take up first, General Assembly agenda item 25 on Korea. But I believe we need to have it made very clear precisely what the proposal is that is before us.

116. The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the representative of Saudi Arabia to clarify his views.

117. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I made the clear and unequivocal proposal that we close the debate on priorities, on the understanding that the Korean question will be taken up first; secondly—I am trying to be more clear—that we pronounce ourselves on the draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2; thirdly, that if that draft is adopted, we should then take steps to have the North Koreans invited; and, fourthly, if that draft resolution is not adopted—I see the name of my friend from the United

States on draft resolution A/C.1/L.423—I appeal to the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.423 to withdraw it, because we have had enough in past years of talking to ourselves about the Korean question. I think this is clear.

118. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Point of order.

119. The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on other representatives I would ask the representative of Saudi Arabia to reconsider his proposal, for one good reason: that there have been some other suggestions made before, there was a point of order which has been suspended for the time being; and I am afraid that if we followed his proposal we would get involved in another procedural debate which would complicate the one we have had already. So I wonder whether he would agree to reconsider his proposal so that we could proceed with the list of speakers as they are inscribed—and I hope they will be brief so that we might come to a decision, if not at 5.30, let us say around 6 p.m.

120. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Make it 5.45; let them all speak before closure of the debate at 5.45 p.m.

121. The CHAIRMAN: After that clarification by the representative of Saudi Arabia, I now call on the next speaker on my list, who is the representative of the Soviet Union.

122. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I have a point of order.

123. The CHAIRMAN: May I say to the representative of Cyprus that the representative of Saudi Arabia has agreed for the moment not to press his proposal for closure of the debate, and has himself asked that we proceed with the list of speakers in the order in which they are inscribed.

124. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. Chairman, I agree with you to some extent and I should like to congratulate you and the other officers of the Committee on having been elected to these high and responsible posts. On behalf of the USSR delegation, I associate myself with the kind words addressed to you and wish you success in your work. You and some other representatives have had kind words to say about your predecessor, Mr. Fahmy, representative of that friendly country, the United Arab Republic. I should also like to associate myself with those good wishes and the evaluation of his successful work and note that his Chairmanship of the First Committee was crowned with great success. The First Committee and later the General Assembly adopted an important, indeed an historic, decision: they approved the draft Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII)*]. That resolution was adopted by an overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations. The Treaty has now been signed by more than eighty States and is on the way to becoming an important international instrument and a rule of international law. In recalling this, I wanted to express the hope that your Chairmanship, too, would be crowned with equal success.

125. My delegation, in taking part in the discussion of agenda item 3 and in speaking as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution [*A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2*] on inviting the

representatives of both Koreas to take part unconditionally (except, of course, for the one condition that they shall have no vote) in the discussion of questions relating to Korea, supports this proposal unreservedly.

126. I have already had an opportunity to point out that an unjust situation, produced and maintained by a certain group of States, has been continuing for some twenty years, and that the time has come to right this wrong, especially as, in the bad old times, when the resolutions pushed through by a certain group of States used to be adopted, as we said then, by a “built-in majority”, are now but a memory. The United Nations has grown in membership, and its qualitative composition has changed. It now counts among its Members a great number of newly-independent sovereign States which have fought long and hard for their independence and which know the meaning of freedom and sovereignty as they know the meaning of injustice. In the case with which we are concerned, the People’s Democratic Republic of Korea has been subjected to flagrant injustice for nearly twenty years. Because of the pressure of a certain group of States Members of the United Nations it is not permitted to participate in the discussion of a question which concerns it vitally—the Korean question.

127. My delegation has had an opportunity to speak on this matter at the first meeting of the General Committee at this session of the General Assembly<sup>2</sup> and then at the plenary meeting of the Assembly [*1676th meeting*], when the General Committee’s report was considered. We then drew attention to the fact that questions relating to Korea cannot usefully be discussed in the United Nations in the absence of representatives of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, which is one of the parties directly concerned. It is therefore entirely logical and regular to discuss the question of inviting this country now, as part of our discussion of the organization of work of the First Committee.

128. The sixteen-Power proposal that this question should be discussed during the consideration of the organization of work of the First Committee speaks for itself. It takes a correct approach to the question, and reflects a sincere desire of the sponsors to ensure in good time an indispensable condition for the normal discussion of this important item and thereby improve the organization of the First Committee’s work. As one of the sponsors, I could not but express my appreciation to those speakers who have already supported the idea that the representatives of both Koreas should be invited to take part in the discussion of that question. I now appeal to all those delegations whose Governments and peoples are fighting against discrimination in any form against other countries and peoples, and I express the hope, that this just, legitimate, and constructive proposal, which is fully in accord with the United Nations Charter, will have their support.

129. We know from our long experience of work in the Security Council that, whenever a question is discussed which concerns States not members of the Council, but Members of the United Nations, and frequently even non-member States, a question which concerns them directly, they are invited to participate in the discussion.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., *Twenty-third Session, General Committee*, 174th meeting.

130. A decision to invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part in the discussion must be taken well before the Korean question is discussed. The practical reason is that these representatives must be given time to arrive in New York. It is well known that in this regard the representatives of South Korea are in a privileged position. They enjoy the protection of the United States authorities and are already in New York, or can arrive at any time. The representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are in a different position. As everyone knows, the authorities of the country in which the United Nations has its Headquarters take a hostile attitude to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. They therefore do not admit representatives of that country to New York—the very city in which the United Nations is situated. In order for such representatives to be able to come here, a United Nations organ—and in this case the First Committee—must take a special decision inviting them. This fact alone speaks volumes for the need to resolve this question favourably.

131. Our long practice of General Assembly discussions of questions relating to Korea amply demonstrates that it is most important to provide the requisite conditions for a fruitful debate on the substance of those questions, if the States Members of the United Nations really want the United Nations to play a constructive part in solving them.

132. Mr. Baroody, the representative of Saudi Arabia, my friend and fellow veteran in the United Nations, who spoke before me, has explained in great detail and proved beyond doubt that the presence here of representatives of both parties is essential.

133. Hitherto, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea have been denied a fundamental right—the right to state their Government's views on questions which vitally concern the entire Korean people. A certain group of States—headed, to be frank, by the United States—succeeded in imposing on the United Nations one-sided decisions which run counter to the interests of the Korean people.

134. Those States Members of the United Nations which cherish the Organization's prestige and want its Charter to be observed must no longer allow the United States and its allies in military blocs to force the General Assembly to take a discriminatory attitude towards inviting the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to come here. Discussion of Korean questions in the absence of such representatives has not resulted in any progress towards a political settlement of the Korean question.

135. All those who truly desire the establishment of a lasting peace in the long-suffering land of Korea must take a fresh, sober and realistic look at the situation, and reject the worm-eaten, indefensible practice of the past twenty years of not allowing the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of this matter. Surely it is obvious that any attempt to settle questions relating to Korea while ignoring the existence of an independent sovereign State—socialist Korea—are doomed to failure. We must put an end to such intolerable discrimination and to the harmful and unlawful practice of inviting only the representatives of South Korea's puppet régime.

136. This approach is so absurd and unreasonable, and the conditions set are so special—having never been required in any other case during the entire existence of the United Nations—that they cannot be taken seriously. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a sovereign State, it maintains broad contacts with other countries, and it maintains diplomatic and various other relations with a large number of States Members of the United Nations.

137. It is also an open secret that, when its interests are at stake, the United States itself uses certain channels for political contacts with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In such cases, the United States finds it possible to hold talks with the official representatives of that country without any conditions whatever. Why, then, must the United States make special conditions for inviting that country's representatives to the First Committee?

138. Everything militates in favour of giving the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, at the current session of the General Assembly, an opportunity to take part in the discussion and expound the position and proposals of their Government regarding the peaceful settlement of the Korean question, a matter of great concern to the entire Korean people, both in the North and in the South of that temporarily divided country, and in fact, not only to the Korean people, but to the peoples of East Asia, of the entire Far East, and in the last analysis to the peoples of the whole world, because the situation in that part of the globe is so tense and dangerous that any serious complications would be fraught with peril, not only for the Korean people or the peoples of the region, but for the world as a whole. That is the only way to enable Members of the United Nations to obtain authentic information on the position taken by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the reunification of Korea and on other highly important aspects of the Korean question. That approach would also be in accordance with the established procedure for examining important political questions in the United Nations. It would be consonant with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and with the basic principles of justice and impartiality in considering important international political questions.

139. In deciding this matter of invitation, I feel that 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. In this connexion, I would draw attention to a statement issued by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 21 September 1968, which will be found, together with a letter from Comrade Pak Sung Chul, its Minister for Foreign Affairs, to the Secretary-General, in document A/C.1/966.

140. In this statement, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea draws attention to the danger of war in Korea, and to the threat of peace and security in Korea, Asia and the world created by the aggressive acts and military provocations on the part of Seoul, with the participation of the United States Military Command,

against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. "Today peace in Korea is maintained only by the persevering efforts on the part of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea", this statement says.

141. Representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea must be afforded an opportunity to tell all States Members of the United Nations, in the First Committee of the General Assembly, the truth about the situation in Korea. That is important for the preservation of peace and tranquillity not only in Korea alone, but in the entire region. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea represents the true interests and expresses the will of the Korean people. It has no dangerous connexions with imperialist monopolies and is no vassal of theirs.

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

143. 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. It has also repeatedly declared that it has always respected the Charter and the purposes of the United Nations. It has reaffirmed this attitude in the above-mentioned statement of 21 September 1968. In the light of this official statement, we can see no logical or other foundation for the condition set by the delegations of the United States, Australia, Japan and other countries in the draft resolution they have submitted today [A/C.1/L.423].

144. To invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would mean a new, just and constructive approach to the Korean question, which has been discussed in the United Nations for nearly twenty years.

145. Bearing these considerations in mind, my delegation appeals to all other delegations in the First Committee to support the sixteen-Power draft resolution.

146. Turning now to the order in which agenda items are to be discussed, I have the following to say on behalf of my delegation. We are of course in favour of an early examination and discussion of the Korean question. I am naturally speaking of those questions relating to Korea which have been raised by a number of African, Asian and socialist States. They are of great importance and they should be discussed without delay, and certainly should be among the first to be taken up by this Committee.

147. However, as the representatives of Hungary and other countries have pointed out and as even the Australian representative has recognized, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea must be given time to arrive here in order to participate in the discussion of the Korean question. But that is not all. They need time not only for travel, but for studying the situation at this session of the General Assembly, for familiarizing themselves with the documents and for reading all we have said since 2 October in the plenary debates of the General Assembly—and that represents a quite voluminous documentation. Consequently, in all seriousness, representatives of the Korean States will need time for more than their flight

alone. Besides, even the flight from Pyongyang to New York is quite a long one. In this respect, too, the representatives of South Korea are in a favoured position, since, as we know, they are here. They are following our debates. I am sure that one of them, and possibly all of them, are present at this meeting. They receive daily press releases about the course of the debates. They are present at the debates, and at plenary meetings. They are well informed on everything that has been going on in this Assembly from 24 September 1968. They are in a privileged position. Why? Because they are the friends and wards of the country in which the United Nations is situated and in which all of us now are. But the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are in an entirely different position. I believe there is no United Nations Information Centre in that country as yet. Or am I mistaken? Our records do not arrive there, or if they do, they arrive very late. Even in Moscow the records of the General Assembly arrive many weeks after their publication here, and Pyongyang is even farther away. Hence these representatives will require much more time, not merely to come here but to make a serious study of the situation and of the records and other documents. They must study them and establish contacts with delegations here present. That takes much more time than merely flying from Pyongyang to New York, a circumstance which some delegations fail to take into account. In the light of these serious considerations, my delegation is inclined to agree with the Hungarian representative, who proposed that the first question to be discussed by the First Committee should be the question of disarmament. Moreover, the Chairman in his opening remarks also emphasized the importance of that question. It has become a practice, a tradition, for the General Assembly and the First Committee to give priority to this question, to which they attach special importance. My delegation would accordingly put forward some considerations regarding the First Committee's order of priorities, in other words, the order in which the various items should be discussed.

148. As everyone knows, in the interests of relaxing international tension and strengthening peace and security the USSR Government has submitted to the General Assembly for consideration at the current session an important and urgent item, entitled "Memorandum of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament" [A/7134]. The USSR Government issued this Memorandum on 1 July 1968, on the same day on which it signed in Moscow the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and on which the Treaty was being signed by many other States in the capitals of the depositary countries—Moscow, Washington and London. This Memorandum was shortly thereafter handed to the Governments of all countries, Members and non-members of the United Nations alike. We take it that this Memorandum and the proposals contained in it have by now been sufficiently studied by the Governments of Member States. My delegation therefore hopes that the discussion of the Memorandum at this session of the General Assembly will be practical and fruitful.

149. The USSR Government has been consistently and persistently advocating the realization of a broad programme of measures to stop the arms race and achieve

disarmament, culminating in general and complete disarmament. Because the Soviet Union, the socialist countries and all other peace-loving States have actively pursued these ends, it has been possible in recent years to take a number of practical international measures aimed at limiting the arms race.

150. The Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water was followed by the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies [*resolution 2222 (XXI)*]. It will be remembered that the representatives of three nuclear Powers, at the request of the Italian representative, once again drew attention to that Treaty. As far as I was able to judge, their statements were favourably interpreted by the Italian representative.

151. A third and even more important measure to avert the danger of nuclear war was the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXI)*]. As I have said, it was approved by an overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations in the summer of 1968 at the resumed twenty-second session of the General Assembly, and has by now been signed by eighty States. It is generally considered to be of extreme importance in strengthening the peace and it creates favourable conditions for the adoption of other practical measures to stop the arms race and to prohibit and destroy nuclear weapons. These practical measures must clear the path to that most important of international goals, in which all peoples are interested—general and complete disarmament.

152. The interests of peace require further steps to limit the arms race and achieve disarmament. The urgent need to take such steps, and take them quickly, arises also from the prevailing international tension and the dangers of any further continuation or acceleration of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. That the United Nations must take such measures also follows from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It will be remembered that article VI of that Treaty imposes on all the parties to it the obligation

“... to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control”.

In the resolution approving the Treaty, the General Assembly at its resumed twenty-second session expressed its firm conviction that

“... an agreement to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons must be followed as soon as possible”—

I would lay particular stress on the words “as soon as possible”—

“by effective measures on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament, and that the non-proliferation treaty will contribute to this aim”.

153. The USSR Government is convinced that consideration of its Memorandum, which contains such important

proposals as prohibition of the use and manufacture of nuclear weapons, the reduction and liquidation of their existing stockpiles and the limitation and subsequent reduction of the means of delivery of strategic and other weapons, is in the best interests of all peoples.

154. Realization of the proposed measures simultaneously or by stages would bring about a healthier international atmosphere, relax international tension and eliminate the threat of nuclear war, and would be an important contribution to the solution of our historical problem—cessation of the arms race and achievement of general and complete disarmament.

155. In view of the great political importance of the item submitted by the USSR Government to the General Assembly for consideration at its twenty-third session, my delegation believes that it should be taken up as the first item on the First Committee's agenda. Such a choice (which is no whim or personal wish on our part) is fully in accordance with earlier decisions and practice of the General Assembly, and, in particular, with the latest decision taken by the General Assembly at its resumed session in the summer of 1968. It is fully consonant with the established tradition that the problem of disarmament should be given primary or priority consideration in the work of the First Committee.

156. I hope that many other delegations will take the same view with regard to this important and urgent problem and will support my proposal.

157. In the light of these remarks, I would be prepared to endorse the Hungarian representative's proposal that our Committee should begin its work by discussing the question of disarmament, including a discussion of the USSR Government's Memorandum. Our second item might be the Korean question, and this would give the Korean representatives, if they are invited, time and opportunity to prepare for a serious and thorough debate on this question both in the First Committee and in the General Assembly.

158. Our third item might well be the question of the sea-bed and the ocean floor. My delegation takes this question very seriously and respects the wishes of delegations which want to have it discussed.

159. The question of outer space could be discussed last.

160. It seems to me that this order of discussion in the First Committee would be just, logical, and consonant with the established practice and earlier decisions of the General Assembly.

161. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for the congratulations he has expressed to the members of the Bureau.

162. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic): Mr. Chairman, allow me first to convey to you, on behalf of the delegation of the United Arab Republic, our sincere congratulations on your election as Chairman of the First Committee, to express confidence that you will successfully discharge your difficult and important task, and to pledge the support and co-operation of the delegation of the United Arab Republic.

163. I wish also to congratulate our Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur. Let me also express appreciation for the kind statements by you, Mr. Chairman, and the representatives of Chile and the Soviet Union relating to Ambassador Fahmy's chairmanship of this Committee during the twenty-second session of the General Assembly.

164. I wish to make a few comments on the relation of draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2, to the organization of work. My delegation does not subscribe to the restrictive interpretation of the notion of organization of work which some delegations appear to espouse in this Committee. We support the effective interpretation of the organization of work according to which it is not merely the mechanical or literal listing of the items on the agenda but includes all questions conducive to the orderly, expeditious and smooth working of the Committee. For that reason, we believe that draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 is an integral part and inseparable element of the organization of work. It also occupies a preliminary place and assumes a preliminary character, for, as rightly pointed out by some delegations, the decision on the order of priority is closely linked with the decision on that draft resolution.

165. Invitation of representatives of the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea is a question procedural in character. We therefore do not see the relevance of invoking paragraphs 25 and 26 of the memorandum by the President of the General Assembly in 1962. Those paragraphs emphasize that the question should be one of procedure and should not touch on the substance, and we do not consider the discussion of this question of invitation as in any manner intruding into the substance of the question.

166. Having made these preliminary remarks, I wish now to state our position on draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2. My delegation supports that draft resolution and commends the initiative of the sixteen delegations that have submitted it. Our position is based on both considerations of principle and practical considerations. With regard to considerations of principle, it is a basic and universally recognized principle of adjudication that parties to a case should be heard and given a fair hearing on a basis of equality. It is also conducive to finding a practical solution to the problem that all parties to the case should be given such a fair and equitable hearing. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2.

167. Before I conclude, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words about the order of priority. My delegation appreciates the effort you have made to enable the Committee to reach agreement. We appreciate too your effort for the conciliation of differing points of view. We hope that you will continue these efforts and that the Committee will reach agreement on this question.

168. We have our views on the order of priority. It is not a question of one item's having more importance than another. All the items on the agenda of the First Committee have great importance. But the determination of the order of priority is a question of emphasis, approach, timing and practical considerations. If we base ourselves on

such criteria and considerations, my delegation shares the views expressed this morning by the representative of Hungary [1484th meeting] and at this meeting by the representatives of Iraq and the Soviet Union. It has been the consistent practice of this Committee to take up the different questions relating to disarmament at the very beginning. There are more reasons which militate in favour of such a course at this session. The conclusion of the treaty on non-proliferation has given a new impetus to the question of disarmament. The presentation, also, of the memorandum of the Soviet Union, which has been so eloquently and brilliantly made this afternoon by the representative of the Soviet Union, makes such a course a commendable one. We also share the view of the developing countries that the question of the exclusively peaceful use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the use of their resources for the benefit of mankind, is one of particular importance to the developing countries. For this reason, our view would be that these two questions should be given priority. We wish, however, to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that we shall co-operate with you in all your efforts to enable the Committee to reach agreement on this question.

169. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the United Arab Republic for the kind words he conveyed to me and to the members of the Bureau.

170. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, I cannot refrain from congratulating you on your election, in spite of the appeal you made this morning. By way of compromise, I shall try in doing so to conform to the spirit of conciseness characteristic of our common Latin heritage and merely say that your election delighted us, because we admire your great country and recognize your experience and your talents, which we have no doubt will enable you to conduct our deliberations satisfactorily. Let me add that my delegation will give you its full co-operation.

171. In my delegation's view, when the representative of Japan agreed this afternoon not to press—at any rate for the moment—the point of order he had proposed this morning, the Committee found itself back at the stage it had reached this morning, which is clearly reflected in the *Journal* summoning us to this meeting. In other words, we are discussing the organization of our work, which as has been stated comprises several aspects plus further potential ones, including one that in the opinion of my delegation is of outstanding importance, namely the problem of the invitations to be sent to the parties concerned in the discussion of the two points grouped together under item 25 of the agenda of the General Assembly.

172. We have repeatedly stressed in this Committee the essential nature of those points as justification for a proper discussion of the problems relating to the Korean peninsula, namely the fact that in any such discussion the parties mainly involved should be able to take part, and further that the Committee should be able, as appropriate and at the right moment, to take up the question of determining who is to participate in the discussions.

173. The First Committee has plenty of experience in regard to this problem. It is well known that it has been in the regular habit of discussing the so-called Korean question

at the very end of its session, and that on the very day that the Committee was supposedly seeking solutions to the problems in that part of the world it was also discussing, absurd as this may seem, who should participate in the discussion on the subject.

174. We have said on other occasions that the very verb "invite" implicitly suggests that the sending or not sending of a invitation or invitations carries with it the notion of a prior decision on the substance of the matter for the discussion of which the invitation is to be sent.

175. Moreover, the Committee's experience also makes it clear that the proper and effective discussion and decision concerning the question of invitations is intimately linked to, and I would even say conditioned by, the need to take these measures in the earlier stages of the work of the Committee. This relationship between the invitations and the proper timing for the discussion of them is particularly important this year, and it is highlighted by the fact that the Chairman has proposed or suggested a certain order of priority for the discussion of items; and if this proposal from the Chair were accepted, we would begin little more than a week from now to discuss the problems relating to Korea. My delegation considers it implicit in the Chairman's proposal that the First Committee must decide as soon as possible on the invitations to be sent to the parties concerned so as to give them time to participate adequately in the discussions. No one can dispute the fact, after all, that any discussion, if it is to be effective, must be conducted in the presence and with the participation of the parties directly concerned.

176. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea has never attended this Committee; its views have never been heard by most of the delegations in the Committee, which are remote from the problems that emerged in that region twenty years ago; moreover, Korea is at the other end of the world. At this moment in that far-off land, the date has already been 19 October for some hours. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which could be invited to participate in our work if the Committee so decides, represents a sovereign State, an independent State which is fully entitled to be treated on an equal footing, on the basis of full respect for its sovereignty, and not fobbed off with an invitation sent out an hour or two in advance. My delegation therefore considers it essential that the Committee should decide to extend an invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and also, if it were necessary, to the representatives of the authorities of South Korea though, as everyone knows, they are already in this room, and that it should do this with the utmost speed, showing proper respect for the said participants and treating them on an equal footing. Furthermore, the order of discussion in this Committee of General Assembly agenda item 25, which combines several questions relating to the Korean peninsula, should be such as to enable those delegations to reach this hall and participate in our debate on a footing of equality with other delegations.

177. I do not think I am giving away any secrets if I point out the real reasons why we repeat this absurd, roundabout discussion year after year, every time we embark on the problem of invitations. We have here the paradoxical situation where certain Member States feel that it is the

task and the obligation of the United Nations to discuss the problem of the unification of Korea, and while they would have the Organization discuss, consider and promote the unification of that country, arbitrarily and artificially divided, they oppose year after year, stubbornly and using every procedural device and every imaginable trick, the suggestion that the representatives of the two parts of the temporarily divided Korea should come here.

178. There are on the other hand delegations like my own which think differently about the authority the Organization has, or is alleged to have, to discuss the problem of the unification of Korea. Nevertheless, we do believe that, since we are called upon year after year to discuss the problem of the unification of Korea, nothing would be more logical, nothing would be more just, nothing seems more elementary, than to start by inviting the representatives of the two parts into which the country is divided.

179. The attitude of the delegations in either camp reflect clearly what their intentions are.

180. To pretend to discuss the unification of Korea here without having the representatives of the whole of Korea present is tantamount to saying that what we want is to repeat year after year a discussion intended no to unify Korea but to perpetuate its division, not to solve the problem of the Peninsula but to go on stepping up the political tension in that region. To discuss these problems in the absence of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would be tantamount to continuing in practice a procedure not only unlawful but sterile to boot. To discuss those problems in its absence is, in fact, no more than a manoeuvre designed to perpetuate the artificial division of Korea.

181. The experience of the last twenty years is quite indicative. The idea, both now and in the past, has been to keep the Democratic People's Republic of Korea out and to make the Committee keep up a fruitless discussion so as to perpetuate the division of that country and in practice to prevent the desire for unification on the part of the entire Korean people from being realized. This is why my delegation associates itself with the group of countries that have submitted draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2. We are anxious that the First Committee should at long last, after twenty years of fruitless discussions, as the outcome of hundreds of working days devoted to this sterile discussion, as a sequel to thousands of pages of documents, of paper work on these problems, take at any rate a first positive step towards the solution of the problems involved in item 25 of the Assembly's agenda.

182. My delegation trusts that those delegations, representing the majority of the States Members of this Organization, that attained their independence subsequent to the events of 1950 and were thus not able to participate in the unlawful decisions adopted by the Organization at that time, may now be able to take this step forward and enable the Organization to break with an unworthy practice, with procedures which violate the Charter and are contrary to the spirit in which the Organization was set up in 1945.

183. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Cuba for the tribute he paid to my country and for the kind remarks he made about the Chairman.

184. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, the Romanian delegation takes pleasure in congratulating you on your election to the Chairmanship of this important General Assembly Committee. We are firmly convinced that your occupancy of this high office is a guarantee for the success of our labours.

185. I should also like to extend the Romanian delegation's sincerest congratulations to the Vice-Chairman and to the Rapporteur on their elections. They are both well known to all of us for their devotion to the United Nations cause.

186. At this time, I should like to make a few observations concerning the problem which has given rise to so much discussion in our Committee today.

187. In my delegation's opinion, the proposal made in the draft resolution submitted by Cambodia and fifteen other States [A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2], of which my own country, Romania, is one, is by its very substance closely linked to the question of the proper organization of this Committee's work. All that the sponsors of this proposal are asking is that a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and a representative of South Korea should be invited now and unconditionally to take part without right of vote, in the consideration of matters which are vital to the Korean nation.

188. The history of present-day negotiations unquestionably reveals that in our era no one can hope for settlement to a question which is discussed in the absence of the parties directly concerned. This conclusion applies even more strongly in the case before us, where we are dealing with a problem affecting peace in that area of the world.

189. It is high time, in our opinion, to abandon the extremely sterile and even harmful type of discussions which have been held within the United Nations for two decades with regard to the so-called Korean question. This demands that all of us adopt a wiser and more realistic attitude, one of respect for the national interests of the Korean people. Such an attitude implies in the first instance the establishment of conditions under which the Democratic People's Republic of Korea can express here in the United Nations its views on a question of the utmost concern to it.

190. We feel that these conditions can now be offered to it, before we take up the substance of the items on our agenda, by adopting draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 which sixteen countries have submitted to this Committee.

191. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Romania for the congratulations he conveyed to the members of the Bureau.

192. It is nearly 6.30 p.m. I have nine speakers on my list and since I believe that at this time it is difficult to think that we can dispose of the third item on our agenda for today's meetings this evening, I would propose that we adjourn now and resume tomorrow morning at 10.30. I had said during my statement this morning that we would not be able to resume our work until 28 October. Now, owing

to the short time available, I think we all feel it necessary to have disposed of the third item so that when we meet on 28 October we can start our concrete work.

193. May I add, as a sort of recommendation, that we should try very hard tomorrow morning to dispose of the third item, because if we did not I am afraid I would have to ask the Committee to meet also in the afternoon.

194. I call on the representative of Belgium on a point of order.

195. Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, we were very pleased to hear you say this morning that the *Journal* had erred in stating that there would be another meeting of this Committee at 3 p.m. on Monday, and that after today we would not be meeting until 28 October. Unfortunately, you have just stated your intention of calling a meeting for tomorrow morning, and there is every reason to think that an afternoon meeting will also be necessary, as we have noted that there is some confusion in this discussion as a result of the fact that two quite different problems have been deliberately mixed up.

196. Under these circumstances, this debate could be a long one, and I am not sure whether it is advisable for us to meet on Saturday, in the evening, and even perhaps on Sunday, at the very outset of our session. I am wondering whether it might not be better to follow your first indication this morning and to set aside the coming week for consultations which you might hold.

197. If, however there is strong feeling in the Committee in favour of a meeting before 28 October, I should like to propose that we adhere to the announcement in today's *Journal* and meet at 3 p.m. on Monday, as originally planned.

198. Mr. DAVIS (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to ask you a question to help clear the position in case we do meet tomorrow morning. As I understood the position, when the representative of India suggested that the representative of Japan might care to suspend his point or order—and he did so—you explained to the Committee your interpretation of the effect of that action. If I quote you correctly, you said that you understood that the feeling of the meeting was to discuss the order of items first, and after—and I underline the word "after"—deciding on that we should take up the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 on the basis of Japan's point of order.

199. Now, for quite some time this afternoon I have listened to a number of representatives discussing the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2. All I want to ask you Mr. Chairman, is this. Is the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 before us, or is it not?

200. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): I am taking the floor again, Mr. Chairman, in order to support your proposal. I feel that today's debates, at both the morning and the afternoon meeting, have been useful as enabling a number of delegations to make known their

views. There are still a number of delegations—nine I believe—scheduled to speak, and others too may wish to explain their views—their views on the question of organization of work. Every delegation is of course free to interpret as it sees fit what “organization of work” comprises. I am in favour of following your wise council and meeting tomorrow to continue hearing the speakers on the list for today and listening to all points of view in a democratic way.

201. If the meetings are long, it is because there are 125 countries, each of which has a right to express its views. Let us then continue tomorrow with the speakers on the list and any who may put their names down; then perhaps at midday we might hold informal talks to see whether we can manage to get an over-all agreement from the debate.

202. The question of the order of items should not be all that difficult. On the problem of discussing invitations under the heading of “organization of work”, many opinions have been heard today, for and against. You yourself intimated this morning, Mr. Chairman, that as soon as we had agreed on priorities we should take up this point. It appears in the *Journal*, though the *Journal* is not sacrosanct. You did not object on the grounds that there was an error in it, and the Secretary pointed out [1584th meeting] that documents A/C.1/164 and Add.1 and A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 had been included because both bear the title “Organization of work”. That is where we stand at the moment. That is what we are discussing.

203. One delegation—that of Japan—raised a point of order, which is now in abeyance. That is entirely as it should be; I do not know what is going to happen about it.

204. Let us continue, as we have done today, listening to everyone's views, and tomorrow let us try to reach a compromise agreement reconciling our views. Meeting next week will be extremely difficult, since we cannot meet at the same time as the General Assembly. My delegation therefore feels that we ought to try at tomorrow's meeting to reach an agreement on organization of work. This is incumbent on the Committee, since the plenary meetings of the Assembly next week would make it very difficult for us to meet. In this way we would begin our work on Monday 28 October, hopefully already having reached agreement.

205. I asked to speak merely to support your suggestion, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me a wise and democratic one, since it takes account of the rights of all concerned. Should it be necessary, my delegation would make a formal proposal that we should meet tomorrow until we reach the end of the debate.

206. Mr. HILDYARD (United Kingdom): The representative of Belgium has suggested that consultations should be held under your aegis, Mr. Chairman, before we meet again. The representative of Chile, if I understood him correctly, has, I think, equally favoured consultations, but wishes to see a meeting held tomorrow morning before those consultations take place.

207. I should like to suggest that, as we are in a state of some confusion and as the list of the order of items for the Committee's work, which you, Sir, proposed from the Chair—with, as we know, the agreement of a number of

members—has equally failed to find support from a number of other members, who have made alternative suggestions, consultations of some kind would now be the most valuable course of action. We want, if we can, to agree on the order of our work amongst ourselves. I should like to suggest that before the next meeting consultations should be held.

208. Mr. ASANTE (Ghana): I should like formally to oppose the proposal which has been made by my friend the representative of Chile that there should be a meeting tomorrow. Enough is enough, and I need time to digest what I have heard so far. My delegation was not quite ready to discuss the Korean question, which we have started discussing right now. But I have learned quite a lot from it. For example, my delegation has noted a connexion between the draft resolution before us under the organization of work and the decision on priorities, because obviously, if we take a positive decision on the draft resolution, then certain consequences follow, and perhaps your suggestions, Sir, may have to be altered somewhat.

209. But there are other suggestions floating about. It happens to be on the Second Committee, and we have postponed discussion on an item similar to item 26 on the agenda of the General Assembly, hoping that this First Committee would deal with it very early. Therefore, on behalf of certain delegations, my delegation, in the event of our taking a positive decision on the proposal before us, would like to propose that we take item 26 first. Now, we could go round and round in circles, and we are therefore of the opinion that the wisest thing to do is that we should not meet tomorrow but that you, Sir, with your experience and wisdom should consult the various delegations that have made proposals, with a view to finding out whether we can have a suggestion from the Chair the next time we meet.

210. Now, if it is absolutely important that we begin on the 28th and start work immediately, I would suggest that we might meet on the night of the 27th. If you are successful, Sir, it should not take much time to agree on what you put before us. But at the moment I do not think that anything useful would emerge if we met tomorrow, and I therefore beg to move formally that we do not meet tomorrow.

211. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan) (*translated from French*): Having noted some confusion concerning acceptance of the proposal made by the representative of India and summed up by you, Mr. Chairman, I feel called upon to clarify my intention with regard to the agreement in question, in the hope that this may enable us to go ahead with our work tomorrow or on Monday morning at the latest. In agreeing to the suggestion in question, I did not do so unconditionally.

212. My agreement was dependent on the Committee's undertaking to deal with the matter of deciding which problems would have priority. And on this condition, should the Committee agree to this method of procedure, I stated that I agreed to have a decision on my proposal deferred until this matter of priority was settled.

213. In bringing this to your attention, Mr. Chairman, I believe you will agree with me if I say that during the

discussions which have taken place this afternoon, I have noted that some delegations concentrated on discussing draft resolution A/C.1/L.422 and Add.1 and 2 more than did others, and I regret to say that from my point of view this greatly hindered the progress of our work.

214. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of India has spoken, and I think that I have understood very well what the representative of Japan meant.

215. Before calling on any other speaker, I would say that the representative of Ghana has made a formal motion that we should not meet tomorrow. I should like to inform the Committee that if we do not meet tomorrow—I have consulted the Secretariat on this—we could meet not on Monday afternoon, but on Monday morning. If necessary we could also meet Tuesday morning. So if the Committee is in favour of the motion which the representative of Ghana has submitted, we could perhaps follow this other alternative namely, to meet Monday morning and, if necessary, Tuesday morning.

216. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Until your last remark, Mr. Chairman, I intended to support your first proposal. My reason was that, as you noted in your opening statement, we have very little time at our disposal. I would also remind the Committee that both at and after the resumed session of the General Assembly, when the question of the opening date of the twenty-third session was raised, a good many representatives expressed the wish to have more time for the Geneva Conference and said that we could make up for our curtailed time by working on Saturdays.

217. Since it is very important to discuss and settle the question of the First Committee's organization of work so that we may without loss of time begin discussing the items on our agenda, I thought that we might begin this system and meet on Saturday, as you suggested in your first proposal. This would save time, especially as some delegations might find it inconvenient to meet on Monday, when the plenary Assembly will be hard at work.

218. I therefore think that we would do well to meet tomorrow. If, however, there is a formal proposal to meet on Monday and it is supported by the majority, I have no objection. However, with a view to meeting our time-limits and remembering that we have promised to work intensively, even on Saturdays, we might try to make a good start by working on this Saturday.

219. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): Actually, my proposal, which I intended to put forward only if it proved essential, is now made necessary by the fact that the representative of Ghana has anticipated matters, taking a stand vis-à-vis the proposal by saying he is against it; I respect his views. He used an English phrase, "Enough is enough". I do not understand what he means. It seems to me that at the moment we have on the list of speakers at least seven or eight who would like to speak this afternoon. Mere politeness requires that we continue the debate tomorrow so as to hear those on the list who have not spoken.

220. The Chairman suggested tentatively that we should meet on Monday or Tuesday morning. I should like to point out the situation of the smaller delegations, in other words those of most of the developing countries. There are many of us in that category; not just twenty-seven, but about ninety by now. Glancing at Monday's schedule, I see that the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Committees all have morning meetings.

221. Consequently I must insist and make my proposal a formal one. I understand that it has the support of the Soviet delegation, which I think will add weight to the case of the small delegations of developing countries like my own for holding a meeting tomorrow morning. The proposal is prompted by two reasons: first, the need to hear those on the list, a mark of deference normally paid in the United Nations, whether in compliance with a rule or otherwise, and not just as a matter of courtesy but out of the respect due to colleagues; and second, the fact that the Chairman's suggestion concerning Monday and Tuesday clashes with the arrangements for other meetings in which many delegations had thought of taking part.

222. Hence I appeal for understanding to delegations, jointly and severally, especially to those of developing countries which have small staffs, with a view to meeting tomorrow morning. About noon we could hold consultations and reach an agreement before lunch.

223. This is my concrete proposal, and I submit it formally in view of the fact that a counter proposal has been made opposing a meeting tomorrow. With all due respect to that proposal, I am completely opposed to it.

224. Mr. MISHRA (India): I wish to speak to the proposal about meeting tomorrow or on Monday or Tuesday.

225. Before I do that I should like to remark that a number of versions have been given of the proposal which I made earlier to the Committee. Perhaps when the representatives read the verbatim record tomorrow morning they will be better informed of the intent of my proposal.

226. With regard to our meeting tomorrow, my delegation has no objection to meeting on Saturday morning although it is a little unusual so early in the session to do so. But as the representative of Chile has said, a few speakers are already on the list and we should pay them the courtesy of hearing them as early as possible.

227. But if for some reason a meeting is not desired tomorrow, then the only valid reason could be that we need to continue informal consultations in regard to the mess in which we are today, and that cannot be done if we are to meet Monday morning. It is obviously impossible for the Chairman to consult us and for us to consult with each other on this important subject if we decide to meet Monday morning. Therefore, if a meeting is not desired tomorrow morning, it seems to me that the only course is to meet Tuesday morning and not before then; otherwise there will be no time to consult various delegations with regard to the priority of the items and to other matters which are before us.

228. Therefore, I have no objection to our meeting tomorrow morning, but I would propose that if we are not

to meet tomorrow morning, we should not meet before Tuesday morning.

229. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): It was my intention to propose the closure of the debate, but I deferred to the requests of many friends and did not press such a proposal. I did that because I anticipated a lengthy and protracted procedural debate; as the Chairman said, we still have several speakers on the list.

230. I do not see how we can meet Monday morning when the general debate is scheduled to continue in the General Assembly Monday morning; many speakers have inscribed their names to speak at that time. My delegation is not among them, nor are we scheduled to speak on Tuesday. But it is not fair for us to meet on Monday when delegations are scheduled to speak in the general debate of the General Assembly on Monday. We cannot ask them to postpone their statements to another time. That would alter the whole schedule of the general debate.

231. There is no reason why we should not meet tomorrow, either in the morning or in the afternoon—that does not matter. We are here to work. The coming weekend is not one that we should enjoy in the countryside when we have duties to perform here. All of us would like to escape from the polluted atmosphere of New York. But I think there is quite a good atmosphere in this room—the air is filtered—and we should address ourselves seriously to the agenda. If we start postponing the procedural debate until Monday, we have no assurance that it will not continue for two or three days—and when will the work of the First Committee start in earnest?

232. Therefore, and with all due respect to my good friend from Ghana and my other friends, I wish to say that we are here to work and that they do not have to have three or four representatives in the Committee; one can be present here for the procedural debate. I believe that no matter how small a delegation may be, it can have one other representative sit here if the principal representative does not want to participate in the procedural debate.

233. I am a stickler for the work of the twenty-third session of the General Assembly. My friend Mr. Malik, the representative of the Soviet Union, was right. I was the Chairman of the Afro-Asian group during the month of August, and that group decided, after consultation with other groups, that since it had been decided to postpone the opening of the general debate until 2 October, we should do our utmost to find time to deal with all the items on the agenda rather than to curtail any discussion.

234. Therefore, out of courtesy to those members who are scheduled to speak in the general debate of the General Assembly on Monday and Tuesday, we should meet tomorrow. We leave it to the Chairman whether, in deference to the suggestion made by the representative of India, we should meet in the afternoon. What is wrong with meeting on Saturday afternoon if members do not want to meet on Saturday morning? I insist that we meet tomorrow and finish this fruitless procedural debate and come to grips with the substance of the questions that are before us.

235. Mr. PEDERSEN (United States of America): We do not have a strong preference on this matter. If the members

of the Committee wish to meet tomorrow to hear those inscribed on the list of speakers, we would be prepared to do that, and we would be prepared to put our name down on the list of speakers. I had thought, however, that the suggestion made by the representative of Ghana and some others might be the most expeditious way in which to proceed with our work. I believe that all of the elements of this debate are before the Committee. We all understand all the elements now. It had been our thought that private consultations would be more likely to produce an early solution to this question than continuation of public debate and that, therefore, perhaps the suggestion that we use that procedure and meet early next week upon its conclusion or return to the debate in public if it were not successful would yield more valuable results than meeting Saturday morning. As I have said, we are prepared to co-operate with the Committee either way, but we had thought that the suggestion of the representative of Ghana was a good one in this connexion.

236. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) (*translated from French*): We are supporting the proposal made by the Chilean representative because we feel that a meeting on Monday would perhaps be difficult for the small delegations. Furthermore, after this day of stormy debate, along with the fact that the list of speakers has become extremely long and that the representative of Saudi Arabia has withdrawn his motion to close the debate, I must say I have some misgivings and am wondering whether there might not be as many as twenty or thirty speakers on Monday, instead of nine. If we do not meet until Monday, we may not be able to finish by the end of the week. For those reasons, I think we should meet tomorrow, both in the morning and in the afternoon. Of course, none of us gives up a weekend gladly. However, I feel that this small sacrifice may perhaps lead some of the members of this Committee to think further, and that their statements may be shorter as a result. I feel that that would probably facilitate the continuation of our discussions.

237. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon): My delegation would like very strongly to support the proposal made by the representative of Chile that we meet tomorrow, a proposal which is merely an echo of your own recommendation, Mr. Chairman, to the Committee. It has been observed that it is unusual for us to have Saturday meetings so early in the session. I should like to observe that it is most unusual for a Committee made up of such responsible representatives to be unable to take an early decision on the very first and only item which will enable it to go on with its work—that is, the organization of its work. I do not think that at this stage we should encourage any marked hiatus in our proceedings, and I would therefore suggest that we accept the proposal made by the representative of Chile and meet tomorrow morning and continue with our meetings until we reach a decision on this question.

238. Mr. ASANTE (Ghana): I had asked to speak on a point of order with a view to facilitating our work and to stopping the debate on this question, if possible. I wished to ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether we had started to debate the draft resolution under the heading "Organization of work"—because if we were, I would not have dreamt of asking for a postponement. It has never been the practice of my delegation to be discourteous to other

delegations, and we did not think that substantive statements were being made on the draft resolution before us. If you consider that to be the case, then we would gladly continue the debate tomorrow, but our understanding was that some delegations were contesting the propriety of discussing the draft resolution under the "organization of work" and we were trying to prevent the prospect of coming here tomorrow and finding ourselves involved in a sterile procedural debate. But if you, Sir, feel that we have already begun discussion on the draft resolution—and I have heard quite extensive remarks; in fact, so far as I can understand what is going on, we are actually discussing one of the items on the agenda—we shall gladly withdraw our formal proposal and agree to meet tomorrow. It has never been our intention to be discourteous to others. We had the impression that those who put their names on the list did not do so in order to hear their own voices, but wished to facilitate the procedural debate which is going on. It has never been my experience that procedural debates cannot be adjourned in order to find a more useful way of facilitating our work. Therefore, if that is the understanding, I shall be glad to withdraw my proposal.

239. I would add that the delegation of Ghana has not been noted for its laziness. When I asked that we should not

meet tomorrow it was not because we wanted to enjoy the weekend. We are a small country; we have a small delegation; we do not have a large office with officers who read the documents while we sit here. We have to do that work ourselves and often use Saturdays and Sundays to do our homework. It was precisely because of this difficulty—which, I believe, many small countries such as Ghana face—that I asked that we should, if possible, be spared what I thought would perhaps be a fruitless meeting tomorrow. But from what I have heard so far, I suppose that I am wrong and, therefore, I gladly withdraw my proposal.

240. The CHAIRMAN: I think that we all fully understand the difficulties of the small delegations. Now that the representative of Ghana, having heard the views of other delegations, has withdrawn his own suggestion, my own suggestion, which was taken up as a formal proposal by the representative of Chile, seems not to meet with any objection. I would take it, therefore, that the Committee is in favour of meeting tomorrow morning at 10.30.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 7.5 p.m.*