

**United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

*Official Records*



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1582nd**

**MEETING**  
(*Closing meeting*)

Monday, 10 June 1968,  
at 3 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 28: Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons ( <i>concluded</i> ): (a) Report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament .....	1
Completion of the Committee's work .....	8

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

**AGENDA ITEM 28**

**Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons (*concluded*)**

**(a) Report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (A/7072 and Add.1-DC/230 and Add.1; A/7080; A/C.1/959-960, A/C.1/963; A/C.1/L.421/Rev.2 and Add.1-5)**

1. The CHAIRMAN: Firstly, I should like to inform the members of the Committee that Liberia has become the forty-eighth co-sponsor of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.421/Rev.2 and Add.1-5.

2. Secondly, and as agreed by the Committee at our last meeting, I shall put the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.421/Rev.2 and Add.1-5 to a vote, having in mind rule 129 of the rules of procedure.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Tunisia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago.

*Against:* United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Albania, Cuba.

*Abstaining:* Uganda, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), France, Gabon, Guinea, India, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Spain.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 92 votes to 4, with 22 abstentions.*

3. The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the first speaker on my list in explanation of vote, I should like to inform the members of the Committee that the documents of the First Committee concerning the discussion of item 28 (a) will be available, as usual, to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament in Geneva.

4. Mr. de LAIGLESIA (Spain) (*translated from Spanish*): The Spanish delegation has listened with great interest to the debate in the First Committee on the draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. I should like to state that the points of view of my Government on that draft were clearly expressed in the memorandum of 8 February 1968 submitted to the co-Chairmen of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament<sup>1</sup> and, later on, in my statement of 16 May [*1569th meeting*].

5. We are convinced that the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is necessary to the peace of the world and constitutes an important step in the process which should lead us to achieve general and complete disarmament. We have said so repeatedly, and I should like to stress this point once again.

6. We are not unaware that efforts have been made to improve the text contained in the Report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament<sup>2</sup> and that both the draft resolution adopted and the draft treaty attached to it, which were submitted by the representatives of the United States of America and the Soviet Union on 31 May of this year, contain significant modifications. In spite of this, however, we still believe that the treaty could have been more in keeping with the desires of the many delegations which, in a constructive spirit and with great objectivity, have expressed views of great interest in the course of the debate.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1967 and 1968*, Document DC/230 and Add.1, annex IV, sect. 35.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, document DC/230 and Add.1.

7. We agree with the representatives of many countries who have stated quite clearly that, in their opinion, it is doubtful whether the negotiations initiated with a view to obtaining a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons have reached what may be termed the critical stage, and that we should therefore consider that the text annexed to the resolution adopted can still be amended so as to gain almost unanimous acceptance.

8. Our objections to the measures in the draft treaty still stand, for the most part, although we recognize that the changes introduced in articles IV and V constitute notable progress. With regard to the sentence "... and to undertake effective measures in the direction of nuclear disarmament" in the ninth preambular paragraph of the treaty, although we consider that it somewhat strengthens the provisions of article IV, we do not believe it substantially alters the meaning of the treaty so far as general and complete disarmament is concerned.

9. Finally, the Spanish Government has carefully examined the final paragraphs of the preambles to the draft resolution and the draft treaty in which the obligations imposed by the United Nations Charter upon its Member States are mentioned. It is the opinion of my Government that these additions still do not solve the problem of the guarantees which Spain, in view of its special situation, requires. If our security is not to be endangered, a treaty of such importance as that which we are discussing here must include in its text provisions that can be applied immediately and which guarantee full credibility to the effect that the signatory nuclear Powers will not attack or threaten with atomic weapons the Parties to the treaty not possessing such weapons. Thus, the treaty should provide that, if another nuclear Power not party to the treaty should attack or threaten any of the non-nuclear-weapon Parties, the signatories possessing atomic devices would react appropriately. We believe these measures should be expressly set forth in the text of the treaty.

10. For all the above-mentioned reasons the Spanish delegation has abstained in the vote that has just been taken for adoption of the draft resolution concerning the draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

11. In conclusion, I should like to express the hope that, at the Conference of the Non-Nuclear Weapon States to be held at Geneva beginning on 29 August of this year, it will be possible to achieve results that will further the process of leading us to a general and complete disarmament under effective international control; promote the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, particularly in the countries where such energy can have the most favourable effects; and allow the study of solutions which may effectively help to strengthen the security of all countries. As everyone knows, Spain supported resolution 2153 (XXI) of 17 November 1966 and was a member of the Preparatory Committee which drafted the report concerning the convening of that Conference.

12. Therefore, we believe that this Conference can accomplish very interesting work which, we believe, might facilitate the settlement of a number of problems that will undoubtedly arise when the time comes to carry out the provisions of the treaty on non-proliferation.

13. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): Chile voted in favour of the draft resolution which the Committee has just adopted on the understanding that the signing and ratification of the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons by my country will depend on its signature and ratification by a sufficient number of States which Chile consider qualified.

14. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): In its statement in the First Committee, on 20 May, our delegation expressed its observations, its concerns and its hopes. We then said:

"... (Algeria) a firm supporter of an agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, could not subscribe purely and simply to the text of the draft treaty in its present form unless it dispels at least some of its misgivings.

"Algeria is concerned about the following points: the specific disarmament measures which must, in one form or another, complement any non-proliferation treaty; the peaceful uses of nuclear science, from the research stage to the production of fissionable materials; consideration of the joint and concerted grievances of the non-nuclear Powers; and lastly, the application of a suitable procedure by which the interests of all States, whatever their level of development, can be harmonized." *[1571st meeting, paragraphs 86 and 87.]*

15. We also stressed the need for effective dialogue as the only way to secure the participation of States and encourage their voluntary accession to the treaty.

16. Some amendments which we considered of subsidiary importance were submitted by the sponsors to both the draft treaty and the draft resolution the Committee has just adopted. We feel we must in all fairness admit that these amendments bore out the validity of some of the constructive remarks many delegations had made. The changes undoubtedly prove what we have tried to emphasize here, namely, that despite some eloquent and earnest arguments to the contrary, the treaty can still be improved upon.

17. Does this mean that the improvements affected so far have made acceptable what was hitherto not acceptable? The new paragraph concerning reaffirmation of the principle of the non-utilization of force gives rise to two considerations on our part: on the one hand, the inclusion of such a principle in the preamble alone seems to reflect a certain mental reservation with regard to its effective implementation. We are convinced of this when we recall the fate of this principle—conceived as one of the bases of the United Nations Charter—throughout the course of international life. On the other hand, there can be no doubt that the advent of the nuclear bomb has added another dimension to the concept of the non-utilization of force. We cannot without fear entertain the idea that the nuclear weapon might be used in a conflict—when its use would of course be called legitimate defence—against a Power employing only conventional weapons. This shows how little effect the amendment just mentioned might have.

18. We do not want to dwell on the ninth preambular paragraph. Our delegation has tried to show how useful it would be for any non-proliferation treaty to contain specific provisions dealing with concrete disarmament

measures. Satisfaction with an expression of intent in this area, although welcome, would seem to reveal an impulsive reaction or a hasty evaluation of the realities of this world. On the other hand, we feel we must express our appreciation of the wording of article IV, paragraph 2, though it is perhaps regrettable that the non-signatory Powers are to be excluded from this peaceful discussion.

19. In short, it would be honest to admit that in the final analysis the agreement which has just been reached concerns those countries that are already living in the nuclear era. To see this, we need only compare the nature of the changes that have been agreed to and the level of development of the countries which submitted them. Despite a certain haste, and some exclusions, and despite a certain prejudice against a free confrontation of all points of view, we are among those who share the firm hope that the discussion which is now ending is but one of the first—the very first, indeed—in a series of efforts to draw up finally a body of conventions which will be both acceptable to all and universally implemented.

20. Moreover, it is worth while to consider an important fact, namely that those who have decided to approve the resolution we have passed have not thereby undertaken to sign, let alone ratify, the draft treaty. Their attitude in that respect merely appears to be different from the attitude of those who, while not rejecting the draft treaty, have expressed their difficulty in subscribing to the draft as amended. This fact may, if we wish to learn all we can from this debate, increase the possibilities of future discussions, mainly in the Security Council and at the conference of non-nuclear Powers. If, on the other hand, the lessons that can be gained from our work are regarded with disdainful condescension, we must beware lest what has so far been a crack becomes a real rift.

21. Mr. ETIANG (Uganda): With much regret, my delegation has had to abstain from casting an affirmative vote on the revised draft resolution [*A/C.1/L.421/Rev.2 and Add.1-5*] which has now been adopted by this Committee and under which the General Assembly would command the draft non-proliferation treaty. I say “regret” because Uganda’s record in previous disarmament discussions either in the United Nations or in the Organization of African Unity has been that of accord with any genuine effort towards ridding the world of any scourge of war, the most dreadful of which is now the use of nuclear weapons.

22. In our general statement of 13 May 1968 in this Committee [*1566th meeting*], my delegation presented what we genuinely felt to be the loop-holes which the much-quoted General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX) had warned against. In that statement, we expressed the hope that during this Committee’s deliberation on this item the Powers principally concerned with the drafting of the treaty would reconsider the numerous amendments put forward by other delegations for inclusion in the treaty. The question of equitable mutual responsibilities between the nuclear Powers and the non-nuclear Powers and the question of security guarantees for the latter, together with the economics of the nuclear energy aspects of the treaty, were uppermost in our mind. While my delegation has been encouraged by the amendments submitted to the treaty since it made its policy statement, it has not found those

amendments significant enough to allay the misgivings it expressed earlier, or for that matter the misgivings of many other delegations.

23. Let it not be understood here that Uganda demands of the nuclear Powers exactly what the draft treaty demands of the non-nuclear States. Our view regarding equitable responsibilities is that they should be proportionate within the context of existing international political facts and the spirit of goodwill and sovereign equality of the Member States participating in these deliberations. In that respect, we are unable to find satisfaction in the amendment to the preamble to the effect that parties to the treaty should declare their intention at the earliest possible date to effect measures in the direction of nuclear disarmament. This call should have been specifically directed to the nuclear Powers and thus somewhat comply with the first principle, regarding vertical proliferation, enunciated by General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX).

24. Regarding the proposed security guarantees, my delegation expressed its apprehension over their mode of application. I wish to reiterate here our doubts about the efficacy of the Security Council action envisaged in the treaty in the light of the Council’s record on peace-keeping operations. On the other hand, we have our own fears concerning the implications of trusting in advance our security defence to another Power under such Power’s own terms which are yet to be spelled out. In that connexion, the unique aspects of a nuclear attack as distinct from a conventional attack should not be forgotten. My delegation’s view on this matter, therefore, is that such security guarantees intended for safeguarding non-nuclear States from nuclear attack should be preventive rather than corrective. In other words, the only meaningful security would be to forestall a nuclear attack, as any help coming after nuclear bombing would certainly be too late. Along this line of thought, my delegation subscribes to the idea that nuclear Powers should make declarations on the non-use of nuclear weapons against those States which do not have any. That, indeed, would be in conformity with the General Assembly request embodied in resolution 2153 A (XXI). While the nuclear Powers would be engaged in consideration of this, the non-nuclear Powers would avail themselves of the opportunity of the projected August conference to spell out their terms for security guarantees which, after all, concern them. The results of those two exercises would then form the basis for joint negotiations during, say, the next regular session of the General Assembly.

25. Many speakers in this debate have contended that the treaty, having been the product of international negotiation, could not be expected to be as perfect as it should be. On the contrary, my delegation holds the view that a treaty of this nature, which is to bind sovereign States parties to it, would stand better chance of effect if as many views as there are intending parties to it were reflected in it. This point in fact was ably and eloquently put by the representative of Malaysia in his speech delivered on 8 May 1968, when he stated:

“We have heard it said here that in an imperfect world we should not expect a perfect treaty. With due respect, that is not the point. Indeed, in a perfect world we would not need a treaty. The question surely should be whether

we could have a better treaty than this." [1563rd meeting, para. 35.]

26. Finally, on the instructions of my Government, I have to state that Uganda supports the principle of this treaty. Our abstention should not be taken in any way as prejudicing our further consideration of the treaty through its expected procedure of implementation. However, those considerations of ours will be guided in the light of the amendments to the present draft which we, together with many other delegations, have stated to be requisite. We sincerely hope that the resumed session of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament will take this observation into account.

27. U SOE TIN (Burma): The delegation of Burma abstained from voting on the draft resolution commending the text of the draft treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In explanation of its vote, the delegation of Burma would like briefly to put on record its position on the issue of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the reasons for its inability to join others in commending the text of the draft treaty.

28. The delegation of Burma would like to reiterate unequivocally that Burma shares the general concern and anxiety felt by the world community regarding the dangers to humanity inherent in the outbreak of war involving nuclear weapons and is as eager as others to see the world relieved once and for all of the threat of a nuclear or thermonuclear war.

29. Burma is a non-nuclear nation in the strict and literal sense. It has neither the financial resources nor the necessary technology to produce nuclear weapons, nor does it possess even a nuclear reactor for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. What is more, it does not have the will to develop or to acquire and possess nuclear weapons. It renounces war as an instrument of national policy and is devoted to the ideal of peace and friendly co-operation among nations, founded on international justice and morality. The treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons thus has no immediate practical effect as far as Burma is concerned. Nevertheless, considering the important political, moral and psychological impact a viable, effective and equitable treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons can have on disarmament and anticipating the invaluable contribution it can make towards an international *détente* and to the safeguarding of world peace and security, Burma has consistently supported all efforts made in that direction both at the General Assembly and in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. In close co-operation with the seven other neutral members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, Burma participated in the formulation of the joint memorandum<sup>3</sup> that formed the basis of the oft-quoted resolution 2028 (XX), enumerating the five principles intended to serve as guidelines for the negotiation of an international treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

30. Burma also co-sponsored resolution 2153 A (XXI), while giving its full support to resolution 2145 (XXI).

Having done so, Burma scrupulously observed the provisions of those resolutions throughout the negotiations on the draft treaty on non-proliferation in the Eighteen-Nation Committee. It has carefully avoided taking any action which could be interpreted as an infringement of the provisions of resolution 2149 (XXI) and, considering the special nature of the negotiations, has even refrained from taking any individual initiative that could impair or retard the attainment of an early agreement. We have, however, offered, in an objective and constructive manner, our views and suggestions within the limits of the provisions contained in the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. We had expected that the negotiations for the draft treaty would assume the form of broad-based, multi-party dialogues and would lead with certainty to further tangible steps towards nuclear disarmament. We had hoped that the two super-Powers could at least agree on some specific measures of commitment as an exercise in self-restraint which would result in the scaling down of their own nuclear armament programmes and eventually stop and reverse the whole order of nuclear escalation. In this, we are not unaware of the existing realities of the world situation; but in order to break the present near impasse on nuclear disarmament and bring the disarmament talks into the proper perspective we had hoped the first step would be taken by them. As they already possess an enormous over-kill nuclear capacity themselves, such a step would not materially affect the security of those Powers but it would, on the other hand, help reduce or even remove the sense of compulsion to catch up on the part of the remaining nuclear Powers now outside the scope of the negotiations.

31. To our regret, the negotiations did not turn out that way. The final text of the treaty now before the Committee no doubt introduces a number of concrete formulations in the form of treaty articles relative to the development of peaceful nuclear activities in non-nuclear weapon countries, international scientific and technological co-operation to promote such development, internationally acceptable procedures for sharing the benefits of the peaceful applications of nuclear explosive devices, etc. For these we are grateful to the nuclear Powers.

32. But, on the main issues of effective measures towards nuclear disarmament, safeguards and security guarantees, we are constrained to remark that the present treaty text does not reflect the mandate given by the General Assembly in its resolutions 2028 (XX) and 2143 (XXI) and falls far short of the objective. The non-nuclear countries have been confronted with a case which, in effect, says that the nuclear menace is so imponderable that the nuclear Powers must be induced to reverse the nuclear arms race and agree to some measures of self-restraint. On the question of security guarantees also the non-nuclear nations have been offered the option that could lead to a nuclear retaliation. Our objective is not one of engendering nuclear retaliation between one nuclear Power and another. A nuclear holocaust in any form could bring dire consequences to mankind. Only a solemn declaration on the part of each of the nuclear Powers, sanctified under United Nations aegis, that at no time and in no circumstances will it be the first to use nuclear weapons, can save the world from a nuclear disaster.

33. Despite our inability, for the reasons stated above, to cast an affirmative vote on the draft resolution, our

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Supplement for January to December 1965, document DC/227, annex I, sect. E.

fundamental attitude on the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons remains unchanged. We welcome with deep gratification the solemn declaration and statements made both in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and in this Committee by the nuclear Powers of their intention to achieve the cessation of the nuclear arms race at the earliest possible date and to undertake effective measures in the direction of nuclear disarmament. We look forward to an early resumption of the talks and are hopeful that, with the impetus which we are told could be gained as a result of the treaty on non-proliferation and the resultant East-West *détente*, it will no longer be difficult to achieve agreement on further collateral measures that could lead us towards the goal of general and complete disarmament, including nuclear disarmament. For this we pledge our sincere co-operation.

34. Mr. ECOBESCU (Romania) (*translated from French*): After the positive vote taken today on the adoption of the draft resolution concerning the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, our Committee's work is nearing its end. The lengthy discussions and the negotiations on the important matter of non-proliferation which were begun in this very body and continued in the Eighteen-Nation Committee and in the United Nations Disarmament Commission, have now taken shape in an agreement which was drawn up by many States working together.

35. Looking back, we can note the various successive amendments to the initial text which was put forward at Geneva by the USSR and the United States in two identical drafts on 24 August 1967.<sup>4</sup> At various stages in the negotiations on this complex question, many States, working together in a spirit of true co-operation, offered judicious proposals for improving the text. Thanks to these contributions, every change made in the draft treaty improved it to some extent.

36. On the basis of the various suggestions put forward during the exhaustive discussions in the First Committee, the Soviet Union and the United States delegations made further improvements in the text on 31 May [A/C.1/L.421/Rev.2/Add.1 and Corr.1]. All this shows the determination of States to play a part in preparing an effective and just non-proliferation treaty reflecting the interests of the international community.

37. The Romanian Government has always favoured the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons, a measure which can have a favourable effect on all disarmament questions and on the over-all international situation. Romania considers that a non-proliferation treaty must, by its very nature, erect an effective barrier against the spread of nuclear weapons, and that it must also ensure that effective steps are taken towards nuclear disarmament, that security guarantees are provided to States which forgo the manufacture and acquisition of atomic weapons, and that all parties are allowed free access to the achievements of science and of peaceful nuclear technology.

38. The draft treaty contains clauses which we feel prevent the arming of further States with atomic weapons. These provisions are contained in Articles I, II and III.

39. An essential and universally accepted element of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons concerns the link which must exist between this measure and other measures aimed at achieving general disarmament and, in particular, nuclear disarmament. Like many other States, Romania has always held that the non-proliferation treaty, representing as it does the end of an important stage—that of preventing further States from having access to nuclear weapons—must also lead to a new and even more decisive stage when effective steps for disarmament are to be taken.

40. As a result of the efforts made by a large number of countries, including Romania, provisions were included in the non-proliferation treaty establishing the commitment of the parties—particularly the nuclear Powers—to enter in good faith on negotiations on effective measures to be taken with regard to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date, to nuclear disarmament, and to a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

41. The provisions contained in the agreement are completed by the provisions in the resolution we have adopted, according to which the non-proliferation treaty must be followed, as soon as possible, by effective measures in the field of disarmament.

42. As many other delegations have emphasized here, and as representatives of the nuclear Powers have expressly assured us, we understand this group of articles to mean that the non-proliferation treaty is in no way an end in itself, but merely a link in a chain of projected disarmament measures designed to lead to the elimination of the nuclear threat.

43. We are of the opinion that in keeping with the provisions of the resolution we have adopted, the specialized body, which is the Eighteen-Nation Committee at Geneva, must at its forthcoming session undertake, with determination and with a strong sense of responsibility, painstaking negotiations aimed at achieving steps towards disarmament, towards the easing of international tension and towards strengthening co-operation among States. We feel that the most pressing measures to be taken are the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, the prohibition of underground atomic weapons testing, the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons, and the reduction and eventual elimination from national arsenals of existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles.

44. As has been brought out during the discussions, the viability of the non-proliferation treaty is directly and closely linked to the implementation of urgent measures to reduce and subsequently eradicate the nuclear threat posed by the existence of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

45. In this connexion, we should like to stress the especially important role to be played by periodic conferences for joint verification of the way in which the obligations assumed by the parties to the treaty are being carried out, particularly as regards nuclear disarmament.

46. The question of security guarantees to non-nuclear States has been the subject of lengthy discussions both

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Supplement for 1967 and 1968, document DC/230 and Add.1, annex IV, sections 8 and 6 respectively.

during the Geneva negotiations and at this current session. Along with a large number of States, Romania has attached and continues to attach great importance to the positive solution of this question, which is of prime concern to the non-nuclear-weapon countries which have undertaken not to manufacture or acquire such weapons under the non-proliferation treaty.

47. In consideration of these legitimate demands, a clause to which we attach particular significance was inserted in the treaty reaffirming the fundamental obligations of States—laid down in the United Nations Charter—to abstain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner incompatible with the purposes of the United Nations. We understand this obligation to mean the prohibition of the use or the threat of any force whatsoever, including nuclear weapons.

48. In addition, the resolution we have adopted contains a stipulation according to which both nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States have the responsibility to act in keeping with the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, to respect the sovereign equality of all States, and to settle international disputes by peaceful means, by abstaining from the resort to the threat or use of force in international relations.

49. This represents a forward step towards the legitimate demands of the non-nuclear States, one which we regard as constituting a recognition of the need to make additional efforts to work out a full solution of the problem of security guarantees.

50. Along with many other States, the Socialist Republic of Romania has emphasized the special importance of ensuring, under the treaty, every party's inalienable right to the completely unhindered development of scientific research in, and the production and peaceful use of, nuclear energy, to access to information on, and the achievements of, atomic science and technology, and to take part in as wide an exchange as possible of nuclear equipment and material. The relevant provisions of the non-proliferation treaty and of the resolution we have adopted, confirmed by the authoritative statements of the representatives of the nuclear Powers, are in line with the legitimate desires of the non-nuclear-weapon States to be able to take full advantage of the civilian benefits of nuclear energy.

51. We support the opinion expressed here that the forthcoming conference of non-nuclear States is called upon to play a highly important role in preparing the most appropriate methods for the practical implementation of the treaty provisions concerning these countries' wide access to the developments of the atomic age.

52. In this spirit and with this understanding of the main provisions of the treaty, the Romanian delegation, acting on instructions from the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania, voted in favour of the resolution.

53. Our vote reflects our steadfast desire to see an early end to the nuclear arms race and to undertake further effective steps towards disarmament. It expresses our hope

that this important agreement will be followed without delay by other effective measures for eradicating the nuclear threat and for achieving general disarmament. We must persevere in our efforts to erect a system of over-all security and to build a world ruled by peace, co-operation and understanding among peoples.

54. Mr. VRATUSA (Yugoslavia): The Yugoslav delegation voted in favour of the revised draft resolution commanding the non-proliferation treaty, the revised text of which is annexed to that resolution, in the sincere hope and belief that it leads us closer to disarmament and creates conditions for sharing, without discrimination, the unlimited possibilities of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

55. On 11 April of this year, in a special statement on non-proliferation, the Yugoslav Government declared that Yugoslavia considered the conclusion of an agreement to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons to be an important step, provided that it led to concrete measures of disarmament, especially of atomic disarmament. On 14 May I had the opportunity to elaborate further in this Committee the Yugoslav position on this matter.

56. Within that framework, and having in mind the well-known guidelines of the General Assembly concerning the elaboration of a non-proliferation treaty, the Yugoslav delegation, like many others, endeavoured to help bring about further improvements in the draft submitted to this Committee in order that the treaty be made acceptable to the largest possible number of countries and in order that an atmosphere of mutual confidence be created.

57. We appreciate the attitude and the sense of co-operation of the co-Chairmen of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament as well as of the sponsors of the draft resolution, in incorporating the well-known improvements, among which some of the Yugoslav suggestions can be recognized.

58. Those changes are a result of a collective effort and are of political significance. The revised draft treaty marks a further improvement in comparison with the earlier text. However, it still does not provide a satisfactory solution for some of the important questions which, in essence, are very closely associated with it. In our view, therefore, it is necessary and it should be possible, in the near future, to find, through concerted efforts of nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States, an acceptable solution for the problems that are more or less ripe for settlement, bearing in mind the numerous suggestions and proposals made and the apprehensions expressed in the discussion on the non-proliferation treaty in this Committee and earlier.

59. In this connexion I should like to emphasize in particular the problem of security guarantees. The discussion in the Committee has confirmed, on the one hand, that there exists a vital interest in the complex issues of security guarantees—passive and active—and, on the other, that not enough has been done in this respect up to now.

60. We are fully aware that lasting and effective security in the world can be achieved only through a process of disarmament, in particular of nuclear disarmament, leading to general and complete disarmament under effective

international control. Therefore we expect concrete measures on disarmament as soon as possible. In addition to that, we feel that the renouncing by nuclear-weapon States of the use and the threat of use of nuclear weapons—a request widely expressed during the debate—would constitute a logical and politically important contribution on their part to the improvement of international relations, enhancing, in turn, the realization of favourable conditions leading towards disarmament.

61. Therefore, it is just to call upon the nuclear Powers, until a general prohibition of nuclear weapons is achieved through a treaty, to make declarations on the non-use and the non-threat of nuclear weapons in conformity with the request embodied in resolution 2153 A (XXI). We hope that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament will also put this problem on its list of priorities.

62. The problem of security guarantees naturally concerns, first and foremost, countries outside military alliances, but there is no doubt that it is also a matter of utmost importance to all States. Therefore, it should be the responsibility of all, including the nuclear-weapon States. They should understand that the prospects for the effectiveness of the treaty would remain very limited were it to be based on insecurity and an increased division of the world into haves and have-nots.

63. On the other hand, the non-nuclear-weapon States would have to undertake initiatives in the ensuing period, especially at the forthcoming conference of non-nuclear-weapon States, so as to mobilize their forces for the solution of this problem as well. It is to be hoped that nuclear Powers will also, on their part, make a positive contribution towards the success of the conference.

64. In view of the foregoing, the Yugoslav delegation feels that favourable results in the voting in this Assembly will have their full and far-reaching meaning only if, in the next period of time, all forces are mobilized and directed towards an active transformation of pledges and declaration into deeds.

65. Mr. ABDULGANI (Indonesia): In the conclusion of our statement on 29 May [1576th meeting], we stressed the fact that my Government would give its full attention to the revised draft resolution introduced by the representative of Finland on the same day.

66. The revised draft resolution has taken into account not only views and suggestions put forward by other delegations, but has also changed the word “*Endorses*” to “*Commends*” in operative paragraph 1; and, according to the sponsors, this change of wording will bring the draft resolution into line with resolution 2222 (XXI) adopted by the General Assembly on the treaty on outer space.

67. On the following day, 30 May, the co-originators of the draft treaty—the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States—announced changes in the draft treaty, not only in the preamble but, more specifically, in articles IV and V.

68. My Government is appreciative of this demonstration of flexibility on the part of the co-sponsors of the

resolution as well as on the part of the co-originators of the treaty, as it indicates an understanding of the positions of many delegations and is a genuine response to their reservations.

69. My Government has given its full attention to the revisions in both the draft treaty and the draft resolution. My Government feels that there are still shortcomings in the revised treaty. In particular, the problem of a fair balance of obligations between nuclear and non-nuclear States and the crucial question of security guarantees are still less clear than we would wish. There is no clear and positive commitment on the part of the nuclear-weapon States to halt immediately the continued production of nuclear weapons.

70. This crucial point, which is the core of resolution 2028 (XX), must be emphasized, and it is to be expected that the big Powers, as a kind of moral commitment and obligation, will embark as soon as possible on serious efforts to eliminate this basic imbalance.

71. With this in mind, my Government takes note of the fact that the changes and the revisions are steps forward in strengthening the provisions for sharing the benefits to be gained from the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and for further and prompt measures to halt the nuclear arms race and to limit existing nuclear arsenals, as has been stated by the representative of the United States.

72. While we consider these steps still to be modest ones, we share the view of the representative of the Soviet Union that this is a commendable approach, in keeping with the vital interests of many of us in our common desire to ensure peace and to create conditions favourable to economic and social development and to raising standards of living in the developing nations.

73. The revised draft treaty also provides the answers to several aspects we questioned and helps to allay some of our uneasiness with regard to other misgivings.

74. My Government is of the opinion that the door to improvement of what has already been achieved in this treaty should not be locked. We should like to repeat here, as has been stated positively by previous speakers, that it is our understanding that the avenues to further improvement should include the forthcoming conference of non-nuclear-weapon States as an appropriate forum for such deliberations. We should keep a receptive frame of mind as to the possibilities of that conference, as nothing precludes a further consideration of these matters at that time.

75. In conclusion, my Government has decided, after careful study of the revised draft treaty and draft resolution, to commend the treaty as a recognition of the fact that imperfection should not be the enemy of the best. My Government regards this treaty as one more link in the chain of security treaties forged by the co-operation of the big Powers, beginning with the Antarctic treaty of 1959 and continued with the partial test-ban treaty of 1963 and the outer space treaty of 1966, to all of which my Government has adhered. For this reason, we have voted in favour of the draft resolution, with the understanding that our affirmative vote does not automatically commit my

Government to signing the treaty. Our final determination will be based on our enlightened national interest and security, and will be made in accordance with our constitutional procedures.

76. Mr. SETTE CAMARA (Brazil): I have been instructed by my Government to make the following statement in explanation of vote.

77. The Brazilian delegation wishes to state the reasons which have prompted it to abstain on the revised draft resolution which commends the revised draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

78. It has been the invariable and unequivocal position of the Brazilian Government to impart its full support to all efforts conducive to the negotiation of a fair and equitable treaty which, within the broad framework of measures towards the attainment of the goal of general and complete disarmament, would effectively prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and, at the same time, foster and encourage the fullest and unrestricted use of nuclear energy in the process of the social and economic development of all peoples. Brazil has signed and ratified the treaty on the proscription of nuclear weapons in Latin America [A/C.1/946], which responds to this twofold objective.

79. In the course of the debates within the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, the delegation of Brazil had the occasion of advancing proposals, suggestions and amendments aimed at securing a more acceptable balance of the mutual obligations of nuclear and non-nuclear Powers. Furthermore, in his statement of 3 May 1968, before this Committee [*1560th meeting*], the Minister for External Relations of Brazil stated quite clearly the views of the Brazilian Government with regard to the measures and principles we would like to have seen incorporated in the draft treaty.

80. Brazil thus fully reserves its position on the text attached to the resolution which has just been adopted by this Committee. My country likewise expresses its firm intention to seize the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States opening on 29 August, at Geneva, of specific proposals aimed at safeguarding the rights and interests of the non-nuclear nations as regards the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

81. Mr. DANIELI (United Republic of Tanzania): We are now coming to an end of our debate on the draft treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. During the course of our discussion, many delegations, including my own, have expressed genuine concern and serious reservations regarding the obvious shortcomings of the proposed treaty. Several positive suggestions have been put forward which, if they had been accepted, not only would have gone a long way towards improving the text but also would have ensured the widest possible acceptance of the treaty.

82. However, we cannot but express our disappointment that these legitimate views and suggestions have not received the proper attention and close examination they deserved. Instead, we are told that because it has taken four years for the United States and the Soviet Union to arrive at an identical text of a treaty we should rush blindfolded

into accepting the proposed treaty even if it does not serve our interests. We reject this misguided and dangerous proposition. If anything, we ought to have grasped this golden opportunity and worked out a better and perfect treaty serving the true interests of all nations.

83. My delegation would also like to express grave misgivings regarding the arrogant and negative attitude of the big Powers which is often shown when we discuss matters involving international peace and the survival of mankind. This attitude has once again been clearly manifested during the current debate. When we expressed legitimate concerns about the efficacy of this proposed treaty, we were told that the only alternative for us was "to take it or leave it". We had expected the spirit of give-and-take, the spirit of accommodation and the spirit of understanding—not the bitter pill of blackmail and threat. The very few so-called amendments which have been accepted by the authors of this treaty do not take into account all the different preoccupations which various delegations have signified in this debate. They do not make any major contribution for improving the treaty; in fact they amount to nothing more than a mere smokescreen. The trend of our debate has been most unfortunate; the result has been to make the nuclear club more exclusive, to say the least. My Government refuses to be a party to this "dog in the manger" policy. For the above reasons Tanzania voted against the draft treaty.

84. My delegation would wish to point out once again that the Government of Tanzania will be ready to sign a treaty which will recommend effective measures to be taken for the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.

#### *Completion of the Committee's work*

85. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I do not intend to comment on the substance of the question before us.

86. Today we are completing our work with the adoption by an overwhelming majority of a resolution approving the draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In something over six weeks, the Committee has accomplished a large amount of very useful work. A long road lies behind us. As we proceeded along it, we had some difficult moments, and there were occasions which required great attention on the part of our Chairman and those who assisted him, the officers of the First Committee.

87. The USSR delegation wishes to note with satisfaction the highly competent direction of the work of the First Committee on the part of yourself, Mr. Chairman, and on the part of the Committee's Vice-Chairman, Rapporteur and Secretary. Whenever thorny problems were encountered or obstacles arose, the officers of the Committee quickly found the right decision ensuring the smooth, productive and effective progress of our work. I should like to remark particularly, Mr. Chairman, on your patience, experience, knowledge of the rules of procedure used in the United Nations, objectivity and desire to see that the important problem with which we were concerned was subjected to a broad and comprehensive discussion.

88. The USSR delegation wishes to express its gratitude to you and to those who assisted you.

89. The USSR delegation also expresses its gratitude to the Secretary-General and the Under-Secretary-General, who manifested great interest in the work of the First Committee from beginning to end.

90. We should also like to thank the Secretariat staff, the interpreters and the verbatim reporters, and to express our appreciation for their efforts, which enabled the Committee to carry on its work and attain its goal.

91. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): As we conclude our work, I wish to express my delegation's appreciation for the courtesy and impartiality which you, Mr. Chairman, have displayed throughout your conduct of this Committee's meetings. The functions of the Chairman are set forth in rules 108 and 109 of our rules of procedure. We all know that much more is required than even those difficult and mandated tasks if the Committee is to proceed expeditiously and, wherever possible, harmoniously. The qualities of perception, of patience, of decisiveness and of good humour have characterized the manner in which you, Mr. Chairman, have assisted this Committee to conclude its consideration of this important matter.

92. Our thanks go also to the other officers of our Bureau and to the Secretary of this Committee as well as to all those members of the Secretariat, both those in and out of public view, who have contributed so much to our successful efforts. I believe that special thanks are due to our Secretary-General and the Under-Secretary-General who have displayed such keen interest in our work.

93. The First Committee of the General Assembly has, as the vote has shown, voted overwhelmingly in favour of the resolution commending the non-proliferation treaty. This has come about after six weeks of full and free and unrestricted debate. I believe—and generally my figures are accurate, but the records of this Committee will correct them if they are not—that more than 105 statements have been made in this debate by various delegations. Some delegations have spoken more than once, but at least eighty delegations have made known their views in the general debate and others have done so in explanation of their vote. This is only appropriate since this is one of the most momentous international agreements ever presented to the United Nations.

94. This treaty is a milestone on the road to a more peaceful and secure international order. If approved by the General Assembly—as I hope and anticipate it will be since this Committee is composed of all the Members of the General Assembly—it will go far to ensure that control over nuclear weapons, with their catastrophic power of destruction, shall spread no further among the nations of the earth.

95. It will establish a new and solemn treaty obligation, especially upon the nuclear-weapon Powers, to press forward the search for nuclear disarmament. And it will facilitate the way for all nations, particularly those in the early stages of economic development, to share in the peaceful blessings of nuclear energy—without arousing fear lest that energy be diverted to nuclear weapons.

96. In all these ways this treaty will push back the fearful shadow of nuclear destruction and brighten the hopes of all nations, nuclear and non-nuclear alike, for a more peaceable world. This treaty, as revised and now reported favourably to the General Assembly, is the joint product of the deliberations of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and the Assembly's First Committee. It is a great tribute to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament which for four arduous years of negotiation laboured to reconcile the divergent views of many Governments, nuclear and non-nuclear, from all regions of the world, and it is a tribute likewise to the responsible discussion and constructive suggestions of the First Committee.

97. On behalf of the United States I wish to congratulate all here present who have helped to make possible this historic vote. It is a good augury for a more peaceful world.

98. Mr. TCHERNOUCHTCHENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): I see that after long endeavours we are approaching the end and completing an undertaking that has taken six weeks.

99. First of all, like a great many other speakers, I should like to express my satisfaction at the results of the work of the First Committee, which after a month and a half has now approved the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Both the debate and the results of the vote testify that an overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations take a favourable attitude to the treaty and that the latter fulfils its appointed purpose, namely: it stops up all the gaps and loop-holes that might allow the spread of nuclear weapons and it strengthens international peace and security. Its further significance is that, as has been said by others, it clears the way to the solution of a number of other disarmament problems. As many representatives have noted, one outstanding aspect of the treaty is that it makes provision for further applications of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, while another is the clearly expressed intention, in the words of the treaty itself:

“to achieve at the earliest possible date the cessation of the nuclear arms race and to undertake effective measures in the direction of nuclear disarmament”.

100. The drafting and adoption of the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons will have a place of honour in the annals of the United Nations. The significance of the treaty will become more apparent as time goes on, for it provides a new and powerful impetus to the struggle for the strengthening of international peace and security.

101. The delegations represented here have done a great honour to and shown great confidence in the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in electing its representative Vice-Chairman of the First Committee, and I wish to thank them for this once again. I made it my duty to facilitate the discharge by the Committee of its important political tasks in accordance with the lofty purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

102. It was a source of great satisfaction for me to work as Vice-Chairman together with our Chairman, Mr. Fahmi, the

representative of the United Arab Republic, who played a constructive part in our work. It was also a great pleasure for me to co-operate with Mr. Örn, our Rapporteur, Under-Secretary-General Nesterenko, our Secretary, Mr. Velodi, and the other members of the Secretariat. We are grateful to them for their assistance and their services.

103. Mr. ÖRN (Sweden), Rapporteur: I should like to join the Vice-Chairman of the Committee in thanking the members of the Committee for all the collaboration they have so generously given to members of the Bureau, thus facilitating our task to a very great extent, with the result that we have successfully concluded consideration of this item after more than six weeks of debate.

104. In electing a representative of my country, the Committee honoured Sweden for the part my Government has played in the disarmament field in the United Nations and outside it over the years. I can only add my personal thanks. To those who remarked in October about the youthfulness of the Rapporteur, I might add that I have been Rapporteur for such a long time now that I feel much older.

105. The CHAIRMAN: Members of the First Committee, with ninety-two positive votes you have made your decision to commend the treaty: the first historic treaty—and, I hope, the last—on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is a decision which you have taken after a thorough, extensive and important debate such as the United Nations has not witnessed for a very long time—a debate in which ninety-two substantive statements were made, not counting explanations of vote. As far as I can recall, there has been no debate on any other item in the field of disarmament in which so many representatives of medium and small Powers have participated with such full awareness of the complexity of the issues involved and their tremendous impact and the consequences of their contribution in debating, explaining, clarifying or seeking answers to questions of peace and security which will undoubtedly affect mankind for a long time to come.

106. You have elevated the standard of the discussion by unprecedented statesmanship. You have proved that, under the auspices of this world Organization, it is not only possible but indeed feasible, through conciliation and confidence based on frank and honest discussion, to overcome difficulties which at the very beginning might have appeared insurmountable. You entered this room on 26 April, and for a long time there was a feeling of uneasiness and doubt; but with proper understanding and good spirit it became possible for you to disperse satisfied, having taken an historic decision which could be regarded, without any exaggeration, as having far-reaching effects on issues of peace and security, economic development and scientific and technological advance. Most important of all, you have reached an understanding on an international contractual instrument within the framework of which super, big, medium and small Powers must work together if this international treaty is to mean anything to humanity.

107. I am sure that the positive decision we have taken will be hailed all over the world as a landmark and one of the crucial achievements of the United Nations. The very agreement to insert in the preambular paragraphs of the

draft treaty a quotation from Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter is clear evidence of our conviction of the sanctity of the principle of the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations. In my opinion, everything else in the draft treaty is safeguarded as long as it is related to that basic principle. The significance of that addition to the draft treaty is abundantly clear. The reference to the pertinent article of the Charter was the key and the turning point in the various efforts to bring the treaty into line with our commitments under the Charter. That in itself is symbolic of the weight of the Charter and the principles contained therein. Therefore it is fitting to remind ourselves from time to time that the Members of this world Organization should and indeed must abide by the rules of the Charter.

108. Having said that, I cannot fail to express to you my gratitude for your continuous co-operation during all the four months or more of my term as Chairman of this important Committee. In spite of the complexities of the issues involved, you have never invoked the rules of procedure. However, with your permission, I should like to exercise my right of reply, not to one or a few delegations but to all of you. In doing so I am fully aware that I am not entitled to exercise my right of reply, for that is the privilege of the members of the Committee. Nevertheless I will break the rules to tell you to what extent I am proud of your co-operation, your statesmanship, your friendship and the respect which I have for all of you.

109. Similarly, I intend to break the rules for a second time and try to explain my favourable vote on a draft resolution which, if I had the authority, I would propose, to consist of an operative part containing the following four .. paragraphs:

“1. Forcefully resists the kind words which you have repeatedly spoken about me.”

I do so because I am afraid you were generous to such an extent that I feel that if I let myself be tempted to believe all the nice things you have said about me the consequences would be dangerous.

“2. Fully recognizes the high calibre of the statesmanship and wisdom of all of you.

“3. Decides to extend, on your behalf, to my colleagues in the Bureau, the Vice-Chairman, the Rapporteur, the distinguished Secretary-General, the Under-Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs, the Secretary of the Committee and the Secretariat which helped us in our work, your appreciation, together with mine, for their excellent contribution.

“4. Deeply regrets that we are on the verge of dispersing and thus I shall be deprived of this wonderful association with you.”

110. With this very simple and sincere explanation of vote, and with your permission, I terminate the work of the First Committee at the resumed twenty-second session of the General Assembly.

111. Thank you once again for your friendship and co-operation.

*The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.*