



CONTENTS

	Page
Tribute to the Memory of the Right Honourable Harold Holt, Prime Minister of Australia . . . . .	1
Agenda items 28, 29, 30 and 31: Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons ( <i>continued</i> ): (a) Report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament; (b) Report of the Preparatory Committee for the Confer- ence of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States Question of general and complete disarmament ( <i>contin- ued</i> ): (a) Report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament; (b) Report of the Secretary-General on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and on the security and economic implications for States of the acquisition and further development of these weapons Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament ( <i>continued</i> ) Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	2

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

**TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF THE RIGHT HONOUR-  
ABLE HAROLD HOLT, PRIME MINISTER OF AUS-  
TRALIA**

1. The CHAIRMAN: I am sure that the members of the First Committee have heard with profound regret of the tragic loss yesterday of the Prime Minister of Australia, the Right Honourable Harold Holt. On my behalf and on behalf of the Committee, I wish to extend our condolences to the Australian representative, and through him to the family of Mr. Holt and to the Government and people of Australia.

2. Mr. McKEOWN (Australia): I should like to read a statement being made in Plenary this morning by the Permanent Representative of Australia:

"On behalf of the Australian delegation, I express my appreciation for the kind words that you have said on the occasion of the untimely loss of the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Harold Holt. It is deeply gratifying to me and to the members of my delegation to hear these expressions of sympathy and we shall not fail to pass these on to Mrs. Holt and to the people and Government of Australia.

"To many of us in the Australian delegation, the loss of Mr. Holt at the height of his powers came as a personal

shock. So far as concerns myself, my memories of him go back to Melbourne in the early 1930's, when I was a university student and he had recently graduated. I remember that it was at that time of economic depression and political unrest that Mr. Holt made his decision to serve his country in the political field. Over the three decades our paths have constantly crossed in Canberra and overseas; his the path of a Member of Parliament and Minister of State and mine that of a public servant.

"It was in 1935 that Mr. Holt first won election to the Australian Parliament, which he continued to serve until the time of his death. Because of his abilities, he quickly achieved Ministerial rank in 1939. With the outbreak of war that year, he decided that his duty to his country required him to resign his ministerial position and enlist with the humble rank of gunner in the Australian army. He was later recalled to take up his Ministerial duties. Over the years he has held the ministerial portfolios of Labour and National Service, Immigration and Treasury. He achieved the highest political office when he became Prime Minister of Australia in January 1966.

"Mr. Harold Holt was first and foremost a parliamentarian. He believed in certain policies of government, and he believed in their advancement through the machinery of parliamentary democracy. This meant that he was resolute in his ideas and forthright in his expression of them. He was a ready speaker, brought up in the hard school of open debate against active political opponents. But because of his devotion to the rule of law, in which he was trained, and to the conventions of parliamentary democracy within which he pursued his career, he never failed to retain the respect and the friendship of his political opponents. He had his disagreements on the hustings and in Parliament with his opponents who often held widely divergent political beliefs. But I am sure that, today, in Australia, Mr. Holt is being mourned not simply by members of his own political party but by representatives of all parties and all sections of the community.

"Everyone may not have agreed with him, but everyone admired him for his honesty and his courtesy. Indeed, the late Prime Minister's career brought him in touch with all sections of the community. As Minister for Labour and National Service, as Minister for Immigration and as Treasurer, he had to work daily with the independent trade union movement, which is a powerful factor in the life of Australia. In fact, it is only through the understanding and acceptance of the trade union movement that our major programmes of immigration and development have been achieved. The same programmes required Mr. Holt to gain the closest understanding of the banking and commercial institutions of our country, and of the representatives of agriculture and industry. Co-operation between Government and these varied and independent institutions of our social and economic life has been a

major factor in Australia's maintenance of a high standard of economic growth within a framework of political stability. In a democracy such as ours, such co-operation depends on personal capacities of persuasion and trust, and it was through these personal capacities that Mr. Holt contributed so much to our national life.

"Mr. Holt was well known internationally. He believed that the same principles of respect for law and for the institutions of democracy, which meant so much to him at home, could be applied for the benefit of world peace and co-operation. It was that belief that lay behind his active interest in the work of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, over whose conferences he presided in Ottawa and later in Nairobi.

"As Minister for Labour, he attended meetings held under the International Labour Organisation, and he presided over the International Labour Conference at Geneva in 1957. He remained deeply attached to the principle of tripartite co-operation between organized labour, management, and Government, on which the International Labour Organisation is founded.

"Later, as Treasurer of Australia, he attended the annual meetings of the Board of Governors of the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the International Finance Corporation. He had a deep interest in programmes of international aid for the purpose of economic development, and it was under his Treasurership and Prime Ministership that Australian participation in these programmes reached the stage at which Australia came to rank amongst the largest contributors in the world in terms of population and national income.

"The late Prime Minister saw clearly that the swift march of world events meant that it was in the Asian and Pacific region that we were now confronted by developments which faced mankind with its greatest dangers and its most challenging problems. He sought for means to establish that all nations in that vast region, including those of different ideologies, should come to live together in terms of mutual respect. Under his guidance, Australia attempted to play its proper part in securing the stability of the Asian-Pacific region and in contributing to its social and economic development and thus in helping to ensure world-wide peaceful co-operation.

"As far as concerns the United Nations, I recall vividly that it was only on 9 June last that Mr. Holt had a profitable first meeting with the Secretary-General of this Organization here in New York. It was only in the past week or so that I received instructions for the development of that personal relationship early in the coming year—plans which, unfortunately, by a stroke of fate, cannot now be fulfilled.

"Finally, one cannot conclude without referring to the personality and humanity of the late Prime Minister. In politics and in government, hard things have to be said and done from time to time and there is no escape from the burdens of high office. But, throughout his long career, Mr. Holt retained a cheerfulness, a courtesy and a capacity for relaxed friendship. He was able at the end of his busy day's or busy week's work to put aside his official duties. From boyhood, he loved and excelled at games. Sport for Australians is something not simply for spectators but for participants, and this means active participation in difficult and sometimes dangerous activi-

ties. Indeed, it was in pursuit of a hazardous but much loved pastime that our Prime Minister met his untimely end yesterday."<sup>1</sup>

3. Mr. Chairman, Australia will be in mourning for our late Prime Minister. This will indeed be something that will affect the whole Australian community. The people and Government of Australia will appreciate the gracious words which you, as Chairman of the First Committee, have uttered in his memory. Mr. Holt's widow and family will be comforted by the sympathetic references which have been made to the Prime Minister by this world Organization. On behalf of the Australian delegation, I thank you for what you have said.

### AGENDA ITEMS 28, 29, 30 AND 31

#### Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons (*continued*):

- (a) Report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (A/6951-DC/229; A/C.1/955; A/C.1/L.416);
- (b) Report of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (A/6817; A/C.1/L.420).

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

- (a) Report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (A/6951-DC/229; A/C.1/955; A/C.1/L.411/Rev.1, L.412 and Add.1-2, L.415, L.417 and L.419);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and on the security and economic implications for States of the acquisition and further development of these weapons (A/6858 and Corr.1; A/C.1/L.413 and Add.1-4).

#### Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: Report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/6951-DC/229; A/C.1/955; A/C.1/L.414 and Add.1-2)

#### Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/6951-DC/229; A/C.1/955; A/C.1/L.418)

4. The CHAIRMAN: Before I give the floor to the first speaker on my list to explain his vote, the representative of Hungary has asked for the floor in exercise of the right of reply.

5. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): Before making my statement in exercise of the right of reply, I wish to associate myself with your words of sympathy, Mr. Chairman, addressed to the delegation of Australia on the death of the Prime Minister.

6. At our 1553rd meeting, the representative of Thailand made a statement relating to the factual address I made on

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 1637th meeting, paras. 8-18.

behalf of the Hungarian delegation. This statement by the representative of Thailand was a repetitious display of inconsistency similar to other statements which remarkably ignore the facts and which try to make some references to history; those references, however, would be very hard to substantiate.

7. At the 1467th meeting of the First Committee, during the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, the representative of Thailand still denied the existence of foreign military bases in his country. When the Hungarian representative, replying at the 1469th meeting, quoted from an official release of the Pentagon substantiating the existence of these military bases, the representative of Thailand attempted to brush off the evidence simply by asserting that one should not give full credit to such official releases.

8. At the present twenty-second session of the General Assembly, the representative of Thailand has made some progress in his attitude, since he does not deny any more the existence of these military bases. That is evidently impossible since the whole world knows of their existence; information is abundant on them. He tried instead to insinuate, to divert the attention of other delegations from the topic under discussion. He tried to distort some facts about my own country by repeating some allegations of sheer fantasy.

9. There is, however, one point of sincerity in his statement—when he shed tears over the defeat of the uprising of a counter-revolutionary clique in Hungary, which was directed by fascist elements, and at the end of which the socialist system was victorious; for it enjoys very broad popular support.

10. By this attitude, the representative of Thailand is consequently supporting, not only in words, the counter-revolutionary movements and the military fascist clique in South Viet-Nam, which is trying to suppress a popular movement, a military fascist clique which is selling out the earth, body and soul of the country to the United States.

11. Beside giving this support in words and in deeds, the relationship between Thailand and the United States includes supporting the suppression of the popular movement in Thailand as well as in Viet-Nam. Both countries are contributing with their armed forces to both actions. Thailand is involved directly in the United States war against the Viet-Nameese people, and takes part in the savage destruction, hitherto unsurpassed in history, of material wealth, social institutions, historical traditions—killing, maiming millions of the people of a small Asian country: Viet-Nam.

12. The war in Viet-Nam is condemned by all the peoples of the world, by all men who have a conscience and who cherish the right to give expression to their concern. I should also say that all the peoples of the world admire the heroic Viet-Nameese people resisting foreign military aggression.

13. This war is generally considered the shame and disgrace of twentieth century history. Nevertheless some Governments, notably that of Thailand, are supplying their

territory, their resources—flesh and blood—tens of thousands of young people, to kill the people of a neighbouring country, who are fighting for freedom. This policy is a violation of the Charter and international law, and is causing great damage and destruction in the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, in South Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia.

14. Thus, the existence of foreign military bases and the involvement of the Thai Government in this war is contributing to wide-scale conflagration and the danger of a third world war. I submit that it is a very strange exercise of sovereignty to undertake such a criminal act. The Hungarian delegation resolutely condemns this policy which tries to exculpate the United States aggressors and their accomplices.

15. In the view of my delegation, military bases, especially those in Thailand, are endangering the peaceful future of all mankind.

16. The CHAIRMAN: I give the floor to the first speaker on my list wishing to explain his vote, the representative of Iraq.

17. Mr. SALEEM (Iraq): As the Committee comes to the closing hours of its work, my delegation wishes to make its view clear on the draft resolutions before us, before the vote is taken on those resolutions.

18. It is certainly disheartening and even perhaps disappointing to all of us gathered here to confer that only two treaties have been prepared during the last twenty or so years of the life of this world Organization for the control or prohibition of nuclear weapons—namely, the Moscow partial test-ban Treaty and the Treaty on outer space [resolution 2222 (XXI)]. However, we do still have faith in the continuing present efforts to outlaw experimentations in all fields. We therefore wish to register our deep appreciation of the efforts of the Secretary-General, made so clear to us in his report on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons, and we support his recommendations as referred to in draft resolution A/C.1/L.413 and Add.1-4.

19. We have already signed the Moscow Treaty, and we are firm believers in the necessity of stopping all nuclear and thermonuclear tests. For this reason, we will also support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.414 and Add.1-2. With regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.416, Iraq is one of its co-sponsors, as we are sure that any major attempt to enhance the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is a service to mankind and a major step towards achieving total and complete disarmament.

20. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.418, which deals with foreign bases, is a matter that is dear to us, especially to us in the Arab countries, where foreign bases have repeatedly caused our nations very dear and enormous losses in human life and in property. Iraq has always opposed the existence of such bases anywhere, and therefore we will support this draft resolution.

21. We will also support draft resolution A/C.1/L.419 which calls on the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarma-

ment to resume its work and consider further the question of general and complete disarmament, and to report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly on its expected and long-awaited progress.

22. It is with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.420 that we find some difficulties, as my delegation is already co-sponsoring a draft resolution calling for a resumed session of the General Assembly for the purpose of dealing with the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and other matters at about the same date as that mentioned in draft resolution A/C.1/L.420. We are supporters of the substance of the draft, and have supported the idea in the past; we still believe in its great benefit. It is the timing of the Conference that we find difficulty in accepting.

23. It is for this reason that my delegation wishes to appeal to the sponsors of the said draft to accept a later date for the convening of the Conference. This appeal, if accepted, will make it so much easier for my own delegation and others to support the draft resolution at hand.

24. The CHAIRMAN: Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I appeal to representatives who wish to explain their vote to indicate their desire to do so and to inform the Secretary of the Committee, so that—in the light of the list of speakers—we can plan our programme and decide exactly when we are going to vote on all the draft resolutions now before the Committee.

25. I give the floor to the representative of France.

26. Mr. DEJAMMET (France) (*translated from French*): In response to your request for brevity, Mr. Chairman, my delegation will confine itself to a very short general explanation of its vote.

27. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/L.413 and Add.1-4, we should like to point out that, while we do not endorse all the conclusions reached in the report of the Secretary-General on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons [A/6858], we approve the arguments in favour of general and complete disarmament, and we will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

28. I would add, however, in respect of operative paragraph 4, that this vote does not imply any change in our attitude towards disarmament procedures. Our general position in regard to these is well known, and it is our justification for abstaining on all the other points referring directly or indirectly to the work of the Geneva Committee.

29. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): My delegation should like to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.418, submitted by India, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia.

30. Last year there was a similar draft resolution on which the Thai delegation abstained, and in casting our vote of abstention my delegation had occasion to say the following:

“My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/L.387. We do not wish our abstention to be

interpreted to mean that we have any reservations about the transmission of the records of this debate to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament in Geneva for further discussion. We do, however, have some reservations about the subject title of the agenda item. We feel that the title does not take into account two very pertinent facts. First, the subject title does not take into account the foreign military bases in other continents; we feel that it is a one-sided title. Secondly, we feel that the subject title does not take into account the distinction between dependent and independent territories in those continents. For those reasons the Thai delegation abstained on the draft resolution just adopted by the Committee.”<sup>2</sup>

31. Having listened to the debate during the present session, my delegation sees no valid reason to change its stand on the matter and, accordingly, the Thai delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/L.418.

32. While I have the floor, I feel in duty bound to say a few words in reply to the extraordinary charges, which are completely false, made by the Hungarian representative. Having listened to his exercise of the right of reply this morning, I still fail to see what exactly the Hungarian representative tried to point out to the Committee. The Government of Thailand has never tried to hide the existence of military bases in Thailand; the only distinction we make is that those bases—as they exist in Thailand—are Thai military bases under the jurisdiction of the Government of Thailand. It is a different matter when we have a separate arrangement with friendly countries and with our allies for the use of such facilities for the common defence of our country and of our neighbouring allies. We make that distinction. One can well see why the Hungarian representative should use terms which are rather venomous and rather malicious against the Government and people of Thailand.

33. In my intervention the other day, I did try to point out certain historical facts which, in my view, were in accordance with history and with the realities which existed eleven years ago. I was also trying to point out the fact that North Viet-Nam has been a threat, and has been endangering the security of several countries in South-East Asia, particularly South Viet-Nam, Laos and also Thailand. I did say that, at present, according to the Laotian Government, there are no less than 40,000 North Viet-Nameese regular troops in Laos. That figure was stated by His Highness, Prince Souvanna Phouma, the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Laos, which is a neutral country whose territorial integrity and independence and neutrality have been guaranteed and formally recognized by fourteen Powers including the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. By illegally occupying the Kingdom of Laos, North Viet-Nam has been flagrantly violating article 2 of the Geneva Agreements on Laos, of which it is a co-signatory.

34. I was surprised when the Hungarian representative, in referring to my statement with regard to the history of his country, tried to imply that there were no facts—that it was

<sup>2</sup> This statement was made at the 1471st meeting of the First Committee, the official record of which is published in summary form.

very hard to find facts to substantiate that history. I can presume that he wanted to ignore, or even forget, the dark pages of the history of Hungary during that period. But, for the benefit of those who have listened to him this morning, I should like to read what I said the other day:

“The Hungarian representative said that the United States aircraft based in Thailand were bombing the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam without any declaration of war. The representative of Hungary certainly should be an expert on this matter. After all, aircraft of a Power allegedly friendly to Hungary, ironically enough, bombed his own capital a little more than eleven years ago without any declaration of war, and, in fact, they were taking off not from the outside, but from the soil of his country itself. Yet the representative of Hungary does not appear to harbour any ill feeling against that Power, obviously because he feels that those aircraft were acting in defence of his Government, if not exactly in defence of the interests of his own people and country.” [1553rd meeting, para. 199.]

I leave it to the First Committee to judge whether the statement I made corresponded to the actual events which took place during those dark days.

35. The representative of Hungary also said something to the effect that there was a “popular movement” in Thailand. Well, we all know what is meant by “popular movement” when it is uttered by such delegations. In this connexion, I should like to read out an excerpt from the statement made by my Foreign Minister in the course of the general debate during the present session. I quote from the statement he made on 5 October 1967:

“Of no less or perhaps even greater importance is, in our opinion, the question of the war now raging in Viet-Nam, for it has given rise to such a campaign of fallacies and aberrations, about which so many people unfortunately have displayed such a lack of candour, that there has been created an abysmal chasm between realities on the one hand and the falsehoods and half-truths that the perpetrators of the war and their sympathizers have disseminated. North Viet-Nam and its supporters in the Communist world as well as its Viet-Cong agents in South Viet-Nam wanted the outside world to believe that the war of conquest they have been waging for many years against the small and independent country of South Viet-Nam is a genuine national uprising or, to use their current terminology, a ‘war of national liberation’. This travesty of the truth has convinced neither the South Vietnamese people nor those who live near the scene of the crime and who are directly or otherwise suffering from its nefarious consequences.

“Only those who are farther away, whose minds are less perceptive of the existing realities, and those who are always liberal with other people’s freedom or are prompted by less than altruistic reasons allow themselves to fall victims of this crude propaganda. But if the questions as to what they think of the conflict in Viet-Nam were directed to those Asians who have their feet firmly on the ground and whose vision has not been clouded by the outlandish ideology of the frustrated author of *Das Kapital*, they would reply in unison that it

is in effect an old-styled colonial conquest with only a few renovated outward trimmings.”<sup>3</sup>

36. The Government of Thailand has never tried to conceal its policy and its activities in regard to the situation in Viet-Nam. When we decided to send troops to Viet-Nam, we did inform the President of the Security Council formally of the action taken by our Government. There are military bases in Thailand, the use of which is the common defence and security of Thailand and other countries in the area.

37. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): The delegation of the United Arab Republic did not make any intervention in the general debate on the disarmament items now under consideration. Very briefly, I can state that these items are not new, and the position of the United Arab Republic is on record. Moreover, we do not have new and encouraging material before us.

38. Turning, now, to the draft resolutions before the Committee, the delegation of the United Arab Republic is co-sponsoring the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.413 and Add.1-4, A/C.1/L.414 and Add.1-2, A/C.1/L.416, A/C.1/L.418 and A/C.1/L.419. Thus our vote will be in favour of those drafts.

39. I now come to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.420 on the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States [A/6817]. The first preambular paragraph of this draft recalls resolution 2153 B (XXI), by which the General Assembly decided to convene a conference of non-nuclear-weapon States. It may be recalled that the United Arab Republic abstained on that resolution. That position stemmed mainly from the conviction that time was needed to allow the delicate negotiations taking place in Geneva to culminate in fruitful results. Thus it was necessary to avoid any action that might prejudice or hamper this process of negotiation. We believe that the progress achieved on the non-proliferation question, as envisaged in the submission of identical draft treaties by both of the nuclear super-Powers justifies the position we took last year.

40. I should now like to say that the delegation of the United Arab Republic will cast a favourable vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.420. This is not a change in position. Rather, we find that by now a Conference of that kind can render a constructive contribution to the question and to other related matters: the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the security of non-nuclear States and the peaceful uses of the atom. This is so mainly because the time that we allowed the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee has been satisfactorily used and we hope, shortly, to have a full report and probably a draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

41. It is pertinent that we now have before us the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States, which we deem to be of considerable significance. This, together with the report of

<sup>3</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 1580th meeting, paras. 41-42.

the Secretary-General on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and on the security and economic implications for States of the acquisition and further development of these weapons [A/6858 and Corr.1] will establish a very good starting-point for further constructive deliberations and serious consideration in the proposed conference. It is the hope of the delegation of the United Arab Republic that its favourable vote on that draft will be taken as further proof of the United Arab Republic's readiness and willingness to make every possible contribution in the field of nuclear disarmament—and this without any prejudice to any particular forum or channel. Our contribution has never been, and never will be, limited.

42. It is the earnest hope of my delegation that we shall see results achieved on the thorny road of nuclear disarmament. The concept behind the proposed conference was very amply explained by the representative of Pakistan when he said that adherence to the non-proliferation treaty would not render unnecessary complementary arrangements to promote the object of that treaty and to solidify it in a structure of international co-operation.

43. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Mr. Chairman, before explaining our vote, we wish to associate ourselves with the statement made by you about the tragic loss suffered by the Government and people of Australia in the death of their Prime Minister. Malta and Australia have strong ties of friendship, forged over a long period of time by the migration of many thousands of Maltese to the welcoming shores of Australia, so that there is hardly one family in Malta which does not have a close relative happily settled in Australia. Consequently, the people of my country share with strong personal feeling the sense of loss suffered by the Australian people.

44. Against the background of continuing nuclear tests, underground and in the atmosphere, an upward spiral in the arms race between the major Powers and in sophisticated conventional arms in several sensitive areas of the world, we are presented with a meagre report from the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament [A/6951-DC/229], full of hope but little substance, on which discussion could only be limited. Nevertheless, we have been able to devote some attention to disarmament questions in this year's debate in Committee and we have a number of draft resolutions demanding our attention.

45. One positive result of our endeavours since the last session has been the publication of a report by the Secretary-General, contained in document A/6858 and Corr.1, which merits the praise it has received. We, too, wish to congratulate the authors of this report for an excellent appraisal of the current problems associated with the existence of nuclear weapons. The report speaks eloquently and unmistakably of the dangers of the mushroom clouds darkening and threatening our existence, and we trust that the significance of the report will have a universal impact. In this connexion, we would stress that such reports are invaluable for many countries lacking the requisite expert opinion which similarly highly technical and complex issues require. This work by the Secretariat at the instance of the international community could usefully be repeated in several other significant fields, and we commend this particular work for widespread distribution.

It is for this reason that we have decided to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/L.413 and Add.1-4.

46. We have also heard some useful suggestions made in the course of our limited debate this year, including those by the representative of Sweden on means of identifying underground nuclear explosions. We would not wish such constructive suggestions to be pigeon-holed; on the contrary, effective action should be taken on them by those who have the power to do so. For this reason, and despite the fact that it is becoming rather farcical to call repeatedly and urgently on all States to suspend nuclear tests in the face of the tragic reality that these tests are not only continuing but increasing in number, intensity and sophistication, we will once again cast our vote in support of this appeal, as contained in document A/C.1/L.414 and Add.1-2.

47. We shall also vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.416 in the expectation that the long-awaited non-proliferation treaty will be finalized and referred for our attention early next year.

48. In accordance with the position that we have made sufficiently clear in previous years, we will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.418, but will support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.419.

49. We were privileged to serve on the Preparatory Committee for the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States, under the able guidance of its distinguished Chairman, the Ambassador of Kenya, with the inspiring participation of the representative of Pakistan—to whose delegation we are indebted for the suggestion to hold this conference—and with the active collaboration of other members, in particular the Rapporteur. We are aware of the consultations which have taken place on the question of the timing of the Conference. I need hardly stress that timely concerted action, designed to alleviate the legitimate concern of non-nuclear weapon States which have voluntarily renounced possession or acquisition of nuclear weapons on their territories, would be of great mutual benefit. We trust that these consultations will be successful so that non-nuclear-weapon States, with the co-operation of nuclear Powers, will be able to discuss in an appropriate forum the complex security issues with which they are faced in this unstable world. In principle, we are in favour of the proposed Conference, but flexible on the question of timing. In the light of these considerations, we are in favour of the idea behind draft resolution A/C.1/L.420 and we shall be able to support it if the amendments we have proposed to the sponsors are accepted by them.

50. Mr. SHEVCHENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Today my delegation wishes to make a few brief remarks on the draft resolutions relating to disarmament which, I believe, will shortly be put to the vote.

51. First, I must comment once again on the draft resolution on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons co-sponsored by the Soviet Union.

52. My delegation has already had occasion to emphasize that the urgency and importance of preventing the further

spread of nuclear weapons, that key to European and international security, can hardly be overestimated. It is obvious that any increase in the number of countries possessing nuclear weapons or giving other States access to them would not only increase tension in international relations, but would greatly augment the threat of nuclear war. The truth of the matter is that any further spread of nuclear weapons would create a danger for all States. It would be a danger not only for the nuclear Powers, but equally for all other countries, since, as the Secretary-General's report on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons authoritatively confirms, all nations without exception would suffer from a nuclear war. The African peoples have a direct interest in preventing the South African racists from obtaining nuclear weapons. The countries of the Arab world cannot but bear in mind the fact that Israel, which continues its aggressive actions against its neighbours does not flinch from the prospect of nuclear armament. It is equally obvious that for Europe, the nations of which have twice in this century suffered the scourge of world war, a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons would be of immense importance. We must not forget that in the Federal Republic of Germany there are aggressive revanchist forces whose great ambition it is to obtain access to that most dreadful weapon known to modern man.

53. As we have said earlier, the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons would strengthen general security and promote the creation of favourable conditions for solving other problems relating to disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament.

54. The Soviet Union has repeatedly emphasized that it regards a solution of the problem of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons not as an end in itself, but rather as a link in a whole chain of measures aimed at averting the threat of nuclear war. For that reason we support and will vote for the draft resolution calling on the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to be mindful of the need to make progress towards the end goal—general and complete disarmament. That all States Members of the United Nations must make every effort to achieve general and complete disarmament is made plain in a number of General Assembly resolutions, and is a requirement under international law, which has by now firmly sanctioned the principle of disarmament.

55. We must also expedite the consideration of such questions as the elimination of foreign military bases and banning underground nuclear weapon tests. My delegation will therefore vote for the relevant draft resolutions. As everyone is well aware, we have energetically pressed for a solution of the problem of banning the use of nuclear weapons, that means of mass destruction the use of which, as stated in the General Assembly declaration approved in 1961 [*resolution 1653 (XVI)*], is contrary to the rules and principles of contemporary international law and would be a crime against mankind and civilization.

56. This year, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the General Assembly has already adopted an important resolution [*2289 (XXII)*], expressing its conviction that it is essential to continue urgently the examination of the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons

and of the conclusion of an appropriate international convention.

57. However, as we have said before, it is clear to everyone that of those measures which at the present time might contribute to slowing down the nuclear arms race, the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is the closest to realization. Not only our contemporaries, but future generations as well will deeply appreciate the conclusion of such a treaty, if this undertaking, so important for the cause of international peace and security, is quickly—and I emphasize quickly—completed and if all States, nuclear and non-nuclear alike, join their efforts in attaining that goal as rapidly as possible. That is why it is important, as provided for in the draft resolution co-sponsored by the USSR, to enable the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to complete its preparation of the draft treaty on non-proliferation. This draft resolution sets a definite time limit—15 March 1968—for the Eighteen-Nation Committee to submit a full report on this problem; we deem this time limit to be reasonable and realistic. Obviously, negotiations in the Eighteen-Nation Committee must be intensified to ensure that the Assembly's instructions are carried out in due time. According to the above-mentioned draft resolution, the Eighteen-Nation Committee's report on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should be considered at the resumed twenty-second session of the General Assembly, that widest forum of the United Nations.

58. As regards the convening of a conference of non-nuclear countries, my delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the sponsors of the draft resolution on that subject for having shown comprehension, goodwill, and a desire to facilitate a solution of the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. My delegation, for its part, is ready to meet the wishes of a number of African, Asian and Latin American countries and will support the draft resolution if it provides for the convening of the conference of non-nuclear countries in August-September of 1968.

59. As we have said before, we note with deep satisfaction that the initiative taken by Poland, a socialist country like my own, has borne fruit, and that the draft resolution approving the Secretary-General's report on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons has met with such wide support. We support this draft resolution and will vote for it.

60. In conclusion, I would say a few words on the question of chemical and bacteriological weapons. It is a question which has great political significance. We are therefore very grateful to Mr. Csatorday, the Hungarian representative, for the efforts he has made to reach an understanding in this Committee. We also welcome the fact that the representative of Malta does not insist on his draft being put to the vote. We are convinced that he is right and is acting in the general interest.

61. In this connexion we deem it our duty to remind the Committee that in its resolution of 5 December 1966, the General Assembly invited all States which had not yet done so to accede to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 on the prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons. That

appeal remains in force and we trust that it will be heeded. I am bound to note that a number of African countries, such as Madagascar, Ghana, Niger, Sierra Leone and Tunisia, paid heed to the General Assembly's invitation and acceded to the Geneva Protocol in 1967. But what about the rest? What about those States which failed to do so? We believe that they too should not ignore, have not the right to ignore, the General Assembly resolution in question. It is surely obvious that we must all vigorously fight against the use of all means of mass destruction: nuclear weapons, and also chemical and bacteriological weapons, which even today are being used against the Viet-Namense people.

62. Now that the Committee is about to conclude its discussion of disarmament questions, the USSR delegation appeals most vehemently to all States to take a stand against the arms race, for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, for the earliest solution of long-standing disarmament questions and for making atomic energy, biology and chemistry serve peace and not war and using them for the good of mankind.

63. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon): My delegation did not participate in the general debate on this item. This is not because there is any lack of interest on the part of our delegation so far as this item is concerned but because we believe that our delegation has had ample opportunity over the years and in the various statements made by our delegation to evolve the principles which guide our delegation in the consideration of the complex question of general and complete disarmament.

64. Nevertheless, I have asked this morning for the floor to speak particularly to explain our vote on one document, namely A/C.1/L.418 regarding foreign bases situated in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Inasmuch as my delegation would have preferred to see a different title given to that particular document, nevertheless we have no difficulty in casting a positive vote for the title and for the document itself. We would like to state, however, that our vote for it does not in any way mean that we are prejudging the complex issues involved in the consideration of this particular item. We will have an opportunity to state our position on the substance once we are faced with the results of the deliberations of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. But we believe that resolution 2165 (XXI) which asks that Committee to consider the question of foreign bases should be complied with; we believe that it might be helpful for the Committee on Disarmament to evolve certain political guidelines which would help our Committee in the legal field and I wish to refer to the fact that the Committee on the Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter, has dealt with the question of foreign military bases. One of the difficulties in trying to evolve legal principles was that we did not have any directive from the members as to the political positions and principles which guide the Members of the United Nations to help us evolve the legal principles.

65. We believe that such a study by the Disarmament Committee would be useful, especially if it is taken up the following year by the General Assembly. Furthermore, I wish to state here that it has been my Government's

position ever since Lebanon acceded to independence in 1943 that we in Lebanon do not grant any foreign bases to any Power, whatever side it is on. We do this in the exercise of our sovereignty and as an attribute of our sovereign right. This is why my delegation will have no difficulty in voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.418.

66. The second document for which my delegation wishes to explain its vote is A/C.1/L.420. In previous years, we have co-operated very closely with those who initiated the idea of convening a conference of the non-nuclear Powers. We believe that in the world of today the question of nuclear weapons should not be reserved for those who have nuclear weapons and that positive action on the part of non-nuclear Powers might be useful. We have always supported the idea of the convening of the Conference and we are very pleased to note the work of the Preparatory Committee which was established by the General Assembly last year. We will cast a favourable vote on behalf of that resolution. We feel that such a Conference will definitely help and not hamper the negotiations which are taking place within the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee to reach agreement on a non-proliferation treaty. We hope that the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States will facilitate the work towards a speedy agreement on a non-proliferation treaty.

67. As far as the other documents with which we are concerned, our vote will be clear evidence of, first, the importance we attach to the whole item, and second, of our policy position on the questions they deal with.

68. I refer now to document A/C.1/L.414 and Add.1-2 on the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. My delegation will vote in favour of it.

69. Before concluding, I should like to associate my delegation with the words of sympathy which have been expressed here to the delegation of Australia on the occasion of the untimely loss of the distinguished Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Holt, in the tragic accident which took place yesterday. My delegation wishes to offer to the people and Government of Australia, on behalf of my Government and people, our heartfelt sympathy and condolences. Lebanon has many thousands of its countrymen living in Australia, enjoying the hospitality of its people and its Government, and so my people deeply share the feeling of sorrow of the people of Australia.

70. Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I should like to express my delegation's support of draft resolution A/C.1/L.411/Rev.1. We understand that the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/L.412 and Add.1-2 is not pressing for a vote. We wish to state that we do not feel that these two resolutions are in conflict with each other. We feel that draft resolution A/C.1/L.412 and Add.1-2 would fill a gap, while draft resolution A/C.1/L.411/Rev.1 would be implemented by the Disarmament Committee. However, since the representative is not pressing for a vote, we should like to say that we would have supported draft resolution A/C.1/L.411/Rev.1.

71. We should like to refer to our reservations on draft resolution A/C.1/L.418. It will be recalled that, at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, the delegation



of Liberia made certain reservations as regards the title of the draft resolution—"Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America". We felt then that there was a kind of discrimination being made since the continent of Europe was excluded. We should like again to state our reservations as far as the title is concerned. I should also like to state a second reservation, which we made at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, to the effect that we in Liberia, while having no foreign military bases, have always respected sovereign rights of States which desire to have foreign military bases in their countries to exercise the right to do so. We felt then that some distinction should have been made between dependent territories and sovereign States. We feel that in dependent territories the population is not able to negotiate on an equal basis with sovereign States. Therefore the United Nations has every right to protect the interests of those people.

72. What is involved in the resolution we have here is to have a report from the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament as soon as possible. Since the task has been given to that Committee, my delegation will vote in favour of the resolution on the elimination of foreign military bases [A/C.1/L.418], with the understanding that this is not interpreted as our having withdrawn our reservations.

73. I should like now to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/L.420. I think it would be best to wait until the report on the negotiations is made, or the revision of the resolution comes before this Committee for consideration.

74. With regard to resolution A/C.1/L.414 and Add.1-2, I should like to state that the delegation of Liberia will support that draft resolution.

75. Before I close, may I associate my delegation with those delegations which have extended condolences to the delegation of Australia. I ask that delegation to convey to the Government and people of Australia our sincere condolences on behalf of our Government, the Republic of Liberia, for the tragic misfortune which befell them yesterday. We were greatly surprised to hear of this accident. It would seem this year that the world is facing this same situation. There have been many heads of State who have passed away during this session. We ask the peoples of those countries to bear up and have faith that everything will continue to work on their behalf.

76. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): As the First Committee prepares to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/L.414 and Add.1 and 2, my delegation would like to explain how it proposes to vote. Since Algeria is a signatory of the Moscow Treaty, my delegation has always supported all measures likely to promote general and complete disarmament. We feel that it is neither just nor logical to note with regret the fact that all States have not yet adhered to the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, signed in Moscow on 5 August 1963. There has been no noteworthy progress towards a solution to the problem of disarmament, and it is difficult to see how certain countries could commit themselves to suspending the tests when a new arms race seems to be starting and the Moscow Treaty is still only a partial instrument, five years after its signature.

77. Again, my delegation cannot agree that all States should be called upon to suspend tests so long as the rights of one of them continue to be ignored and the security of its territory is increasingly threatened.

78. For all these reasons my delegation will abstain from the vote on this draft resolution.

79. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/L.420, my delegation intends to vote in favour of it, in view of the substantial changes just made in the text; but we would like to express reservations in respect of operative paragraph 1 concerning the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee [A/6817], and also in respect of operative paragraph 3.

80. Mr. KONDA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*translated from French*): I have asked to speak in order to give a brief explanation of our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.416, concerning the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Last year, the Democratic Republic of the Congo abstained in the vote on the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons because we felt that it was secondary to the more important questions of general and complete disarmament and more particularly the elimination of nuclear weapons.

81. On this occasion we are prepared to support this draft resolution. Our vote should not, however, be interpreted as a change of attitude on my Government's part with respect to this question.

82. Before concluding, I should like to associate my delegation with those that have expressed condolences to the Government and people of Australia on the tragic death of their Prime Minister.

83. The CHAIRMAN: Before we adjourn, I should like to inform the Committee that the Secretariat has received revisions to the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.416 and A/C.1/L.420.

84. I give the floor to the representative of the Byelorussian SSR.

85. Mr. SKOBELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): Now that we have concluded our exchange of views on the problems of general and complete disarmament and partial measures for attaining it, my delegation too would briefly explain its attitude towards the resolutions before the First Committee.

86. To begin with, I should like to express our satisfaction at the fact that the Maltese representative has taken into account the trend of the discussion and withdrawn his draft resolution. As we understand it, the situation now is that General Assembly resolution 2162 B of 5 December 1966, expressing the will of the United Nations, remains fully in force. The text, firstly, unconditionally recognizes the practical value of the Geneva Protocol prohibiting the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons; and, secondly, stresses the urgent need for accession to the Protocol by States which have so far failed to do so—first and foremost among them being the United States, which uses forbidden

types of weapons in its aggressive war against the Viet-Nameese people—and also the need for strict observance of the Protocol by all States.

87. The efforts of the United Nations have been bearing fruit, and this is noted in the draft resolution submitted by a group of countries, which was prepared with the active participation of Poland [A/C.1/L.413], and which we support. The purpose of this draft is to popularize widely the Secretary-General's important report on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and the security and economic implications for States of the acquisition and further development of these weapons.

88. My delegation also supports the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.414 and A/C.1/L.418. The first of these texts instructs the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to give priority to the consideration of preparing a treaty banning underground nuclear testing. We have taken into account the statements by the Swedish and other delegations that national means of controlling the observance of such a treaty are fully adequate. The second draft recommends to the Eighteen-Nation Committee to resume consideration of the question of the elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The importance of this matter was repeatedly stressed during the debate in our Committee. We hope that these bases will be removed wherever they exist, including Thailand—in the interests of all peoples, including the people of Thailand, despite the statement made by the representative of Thailand in the exercise of his right of reply.

89. The Byelorussian delegation has already said that it supports draft resolution A/C.1/L.416 calling for the speedy completion of the work on the treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons at the resumed twenty-second session of the General Assembly.

90. Bearing in mind that draft resolution A/C.1/L.420 on convening a conference of non-nuclear States, although not yet submitted to us, has been revised so as not to hamper agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, my delegation will not oppose its adoption.

91. My delegation trusts that the resolutions which the Committee will adopt will bring us nearer to the realization of general and complete disarmament, that prime prerequisite for a peaceful and prosperous future.

92. Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I should like, at the outset, to identify the United States delegation with the statements that have been made both by yourself and other members of the Committee over the tragic and untimely death of the Prime Minister of Australia. I can do no more than say that we have lost a friend, and we feel that everyone in this room has lost a friend.

93. I am intervening now, reserving my right to intervene later on draft resolutions A/C.1/L.416 and A/C.1/L.420, but I thought, in view of the relatively early nature of the hour—I have some explanations of vote to make on some other resolutions—that I might make those now.

94. We have also before us draft resolutions A/C.1/L.413 and Add.1-4 and A/C.1/L.419, both under the item

“Question of general and complete disarmament”. I think the remarks that have already been made in the plenary cover the positions, at least on those resolutions. However, I should like to comment briefly on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.414 and Add.1-2, relating to a comprehensive test-ban treaty. My delegation supported resolution 2163 (XXI) at last year's session, and we will, of course, vote in favour of the present draft resolution, which we find a constructive approach to the problem.

95. As the members of this Committee all know, the United States strongly supports the conclusion of an adequately verified comprehensive test ban. But, while we agree with the representative of Sweden that the debate this year in Geneva on the comprehensive test ban was useful and constructive, we regret that it does not appear to us that a comprehensive test ban would be a sufficiently stable instrument unless it included a provision allowing a certain number of on-site inspections.

96. In this connexion, however, I should like to point out that every time we debate the question of extending the limited test-ban Treaty to cover underground tests, we find ourselves in this chamber confronted with assertions and counter-assertions about whether national means of detection and identification are adequate to verify compliance without on-site inspection. The weight of scientific opinion in the United States is that national means alone are not adequate for this purpose and that on-site inspections are necessary. Other nations apparently have a different view. We heard different views expressed in this chamber in the last two weeks.

97. It would seem to us that the obvious and simple solution to a problem, when we are debating a scientific fact, would be to get the scientists of our various countries together, in order that they could come to some consensus by which we might all be guided. I do not wish to belabour the point, but merely to remind the Committee that, on numerous occasions, the United States has proposed this very course of action. Unfortunately, the Soviet Union has repeatedly rejected this proposal. It is the view of my delegation, nevertheless, that until there is a consensus in the scientific community, the world-wide scientific community, concerning this question: whether national capabilities to verify compliance with a comprehensive test ban are satisfactory or whether they are not satisfactory—and this is a scientific question on which it should be possible to exchange views—until we obtain such a consensus, we will continue to argue profitlessly here and in other forums on how to achieve a complete ban—notwithstanding our common desire to obtain one.

98. Now, we continue to support efforts towards improved verification by seismic means; we continue to find useful the Swedish initiative for the nuclear detection club. This concept has received mention in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution A/C.1/L.414 and Add.1-2 and my Government will be happy to make whatever contributions it can toward improving our knowledge of the techniques of seismic detection through the exchange of information.

99. It of course goes without saying that my delegation supports the call in operative paragraph 2 for the suspen-

sion of nuclear weapons tests in all environments, but I wish to make clear that in the light of my Government's position on this matter we must take this call to mean the suspension of tests pursuant to an adequately verified treaty banning the testing of nuclear weapons in all environments.

100. I should like to comment quite briefly on draft resolution A/C.1/L.418 relating to the elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Quite briefly, the United States will abstain on this draft resolution. Although, as a matter of policy, the United States does not reject the consideration of any

serious arms control and disarmament proposal put forth by any nation, it does not consider this proposal a useful subject for discussion in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament on an urgent basis. It is not an arms control measure as such and, as we have seen time and time again, a resolution of this nature does nothing more than provide a basis for profitless polemics and propaganda exchanges which consume time badly needed in both the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and this body for important and serious proposals.

*The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.*