



CONTENTS

Agenda item 8:	
Adoption of the agenda ( <i>continued</i> )	
Second report of the General Committee . . . . .	1

**President:** Mr. Emilio ARENALES (Guatemala).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Åström (Sweden), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

**Adoption of the agenda (*continued*)\***

**SECOND REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE  
(A/7250/Add.1)**

1. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to consider the second report of the General Committee.

2. In paragraph 1 of the report the General Committee recommends the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the twenty-third session of the General Assembly. That item is entitled "Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: Final Document of the Conference". I refer members to document A/7224. In paragraph 1 of its report the General Committee further recommends that the item be allocated to the First Committee "on the understanding that during the consideration of the item the Chairman of the First Committee would consult that Committee on the advisability of referring to the Second Committee those parts of the report of the Conference which might be of interest to the Second Committee".

3. Mr. FARACE (Italy): The General Assembly has been asked to consider the report of the General Committee, which met this morning and endorsed a proposal made by the Secretary-General for the inclusion in the agenda of the present session of the report of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States [A/7277] which was held in Geneva last September.

4. I have no doubt that the General Assembly will unanimously adopt the recommendation of the General Committee together with the suggestion that the item be referred to the First Committee, the political Committee.

5. Since Italy had the privilege of participating in the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States and of playing in it, we believe, a constructive role, the Italian delegation wishes to speak, briefly but whole-heartedly, in support of

those recommendations. We feel that the Conference, despite the very limited time at its disposal, devoted its energy and attention to a preliminary consideration of the complex and far-reaching problems which confront mankind in the nuclear era. The results of the Conference, which are incorporated in its report, although, as I said earlier, of a preliminary nature, are very significant and deserve the most careful examination by the General Assembly which will have to consider "the best ways and means for the implementation of the decisions taken by the Conference", as indicated in resolution N and in the Declaration O contained in the Final Document of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States [*ibid.*, p. 17] unanimously adopted at Geneva on 28 September.

6. We believe also that the two main categories of problems tackled by the Conference, namely, security and disarmament on one hand, and peaceful uses of the atom on the other, are still to be considered for the time being from a political point of view; we feel, therefore, that it is appropriate for the two matters to be examined by the First Committee, without excluding the need for consultation with the Second Committee on the follow-up to be given to the problem concerning peaceful uses. The recommendations of the General Committee are therefore, in our view, very relevant and we trust that they will meet with the unanimous consent of the General Assembly.

7. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendation of the General Committee which is to be found in paragraph 1 of its second report [A/7250/Add.1].

8. May I take it that the General Assembly approves this recommendation of the General Committee concerning the inclusion and allocation of the item entitled "Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: Final Document of the Conference"?

*It was so decided.*

9. The PRESIDENT: The Chairman of the First Committee will be informed of the General Assembly's decision.

10. We now come to paragraph 2 of the General Committee's report. I would draw the attention of representatives to the request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda submitted by Italy [A/7221]. Since the sponsor of this item has decided to withdraw his request, it remains for the General Assembly only to take note of it. As no representative wishes to speak on this point, may I take it that the General Assembly takes note of paragraph 2 of the report of the General Committee now before us?

*It was so decided.*

\* Resumed from the 1676th meeting.

11. The PRESIDENT: We shall now turn to the recommendation of the General Committee contained in paragraph 3 of its report. This paragraph relates to the question of the allocation of agenda item 92 entitled "One day of war for peace". The General Assembly has already decided to include that item in its agenda. The General Committee recommends that the item be referred to the Second Committee. Does any member wish to speak on this point?

12. Mr. PINERA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): I shall be very brief. This morning I listened to the debate on this item—"One day of war for peace"—in the General Committee which agreed to propose that the item be referred to the Second Committee [*A/7250/Add.1, paragraph 3*].

13. I wish to be quite frank. In the first place, as I understand it, what the General Committee has made is a simple proposal and the Assembly can decide. The Assembly decided to include the item in the agenda as 92 [*1676th meeting, paragraph 115*], but has not yet allocated it.

14. With regard to this item, which I agree is of great importance, I must say first of all that in the opinion of my delegation the title, at least in some languages, is not the most appropriate; I say this in all sincerity. What does "*Una jornada de lucha en pro de la paz*" mean? I understand its deeper meaning; that we should sacrifice one day's fight, or "one day of war", as, I believe the English version says, if I am not mistaken, for peace. But the title is ambiguous. In English it is "One day of war for peace". I know the title is no longer open to discussion because it has been approved, but it is very disconcerting to anyone who sincerely loves peace. It would seem that, if we wish to promote peace, we have to encourage more days of war in order to make a contribution to peace. This is very worrying. The English version is quite a shock. In the Spanish version the word "*guerra*" (war) has been replaced by the word "*lucha*" (fight), and I am certainly glad to be Spanish-speaking since I can talk of a day's fight for peace. And that is something I understand. "*Una jornada de lucha en pro de la paz*" means simply a day's work to achieve peace. Thank God I am Spanish-speaking because in English in title—and I am truly sad to have to say so—"One day of war for peace"—and I am reading from the second report of the General Committee—is open to serious misinterpretation.

15. We can accept "A day's fight for peace", and my delegation would stress that it is the Spanish version that it approved. So much for an item which has already been discussed and which the Assembly has accepted, but which I felt bound to mention today so as to make clear my delegation's interpretation of its meaning in Spanish.

16. Secondly, with regard to the allocation of this item, the General Committee recommended that it should be referred to the Second Committee, which surprised me, and understandably. And when I say it surprised me, I mean that I was struck by the fact that none of the Committee Chairmen showed any great enthusiasm for this item. It is somewhat significant that in the General Committee—and it is not improper for me to say this because I am not quoting anyone—I never do—but merely giving my own interpretation—the Chairman of the Second Committee would have preferred not to be given that item, at least so it seemed to me.

17. And no other suggestion has been made today. Others were made when this item was discussed some weeks ago; it was suggested that it be referred to a political committee.

18. I do not wish to reopen the debate. The General Committee, which is very representative of the Assembly, has recommended that it be referred to the Second Committee and, I do not think it would be fitting that my delegation, although it has the right, should ask for a review in order to have the item transferred to another Committee.

19. But since it is with the Second Committee, I should like to make a suggestion—and I think I have a right to do so, although I do not have the rules of procedure before me, indeed I am not concerned with the rules—and it is that this item should be considered jointly with another which is also before the Second Committee and which has been approved on points of principle. The Second Committee has been given item 40 which, after the allocation to committees, became item 8 in the Second Committee, entitled "Conversion to peaceful needs of the resources released by disarmament". I know that the resources released by disarmament are not quite the same idea as a day's work for peace, but they do not conflict.

20. You, Mr. President, as representative of Sweden, spoke in the Second Committee on this item and put forward the suggestion, which is now being given serious consideration, that an effort should be made, as I understand, to make this item more specific. If to this very broad item, with its wide-ranging title "Conversion to peaceful needs of the resources released by disarmament", we add this other concept of a day's work for peace, the result would be that, in the Second Committee, under two separate items, we would have a debate on what is essentially the same subject though viewed from slightly different aspects.

21. Could we not—I ask you, Mr. President, who know the rules so well—recommend that these two items be combined and that, when they are considered in the Second Committee, like item 40 at the [*1191st meeting*], in accordance with your suggestions and the many others which will surely be forthcoming, these items be given a more precise, more specific meaning, leading to perhaps more modest, but certainly more immediate results? Referring to the Second Committee the item entitled "One day for war for peace" will not—and I wish to be realistic—lead to the slightest progress, any more than the allocation to it of the item entitled "Conversion to peaceful needs of the resources released by disarmament". Why then do we not combine these two items or discuss them together in order to reach some conclusions, perhaps of narrower scope, but perhaps more concrete and of greater practical significance for those who will be affected by these transfers from war to peace, from disarmament to development?

22. I think that, without losing sight of the general idea, the Second Committee could agree to combine the two items, taking into account your inspiring suggestions, and make definite progress in less time in precise though more limited fields. But we cannot in all sincerity speak of narrower scope or less time when we are dealing with two items which in practice entail the conversion of instruments of destruction to instruments of construction.

23. This then is my suggestion: that the two items should be combined, taking into account also—although this cannot be reflected in the title—some of the suggestions that you, Mr. President, made in the debate at the [1191st meeting] of the Second Committee and which various delegations took up.

24. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon): My delegation agrees with much of what has just been stated by the representative of Chile. We consider that the item in its present form is an excellent slogan; but, like many slogans, it fails to convey what is really intended. "One day of war for peace" can mean many things, but certainly it does mean in broad outline what item 40 of the agenda, which has been allocated to the Second Committee, intends to convey; that is, the transfer to peaceful purposes of resources released from disarmament.

25. As regards the suggestion made by the representative of Chile, my delegation would like to make the observation that it is not for the General Assembly to give a particular interpretation to this slogan or to indicate to the Second Committee how it should deal with it. I think that it is best left to the Second Committee which, I am sure, would realize that there is no point in separating this item from item 40, but that it would lead to a much more useful discussion if the two were combined.

26. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*translated from French*): My delegation has no intention of going back on a decision which has already been taken by the General Committee. From the outset, we have stated publicly and in talks with other delegations that whatever decision might be taken by the General Committee we would willingly accept it.

27. A short while ago, the representative of Chile raised the question of the ambiguity of the title of the agenda item. I agree with him, but being myself neither English nor Spanish speaking, I feel it may be helpful to refer him to

the French version of the title, which is perhaps a little clearer, and also to the explanatory memorandum issued by the delegations of Cambodia, Gabon and Madagascar on 24 September 1968 [A/7183/Add.1].

28. With regard to the suggestion to combine this item with item 40, "Conversion to peaceful needs of the funds released by disarmament", my delegation cannot entirely agree. This is a specific item and it is desirable that the Second Committee should decide what to do. Should this question be considered simultaneously with item 40? Should it be considered before item 40 or after it? That, I think is a matter for the Second Committee, as the representative of Ceylon has already pointed out.

29. The PRESIDENT: Does any other representative wish to speak at this point? We have listened to statements made by the representatives of Chile, Ceylon and Madagascar. In his statement, the representative of Chile has suggested that the possibility exists for the General Assembly to recommend to the Second Committee a certain way of discussing this item. We have heard comments on this point by the representatives of Ceylon and Madagascar. No formal motion is before the Assembly concerning this. We have taken note of what has been said by representatives.

30. May I take it that we can now proceed to take a decision on the recommendation of the General Committee which is that this item should be allocated to the Second Committee? If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that is the wish of the General Assembly.

*It was so decided.*

31. The PRESIDENT: The Chairman of the Second Committee will be informed of the Assembly's decision on this point.

*The meeting rose at 4 p.m.*