



CONTENTS

	Page
Organization of work .....	1

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

*Organization of work*

1. The CHAIRMAN: Members may recall that last Friday, at the end of the 1502nd meeting, I informed the Committee that it was my intention to propose as the next item, item 91: Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, and that the position which I took then was in accordance with the statement which I had previously made when the Committee had discussed the priorities of items [1496th meeting]. Therefore, the question before the Committee at this stage is my proposal regarding the second item, namely, that we should consider item 91, on the denuclearization of Latin America.

2. I call on the representative of Cambodia on a point of order.

3. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, I asked to speak in order to raise a point of order. Since we still do not have a draft resolution on the question of the peaceful uses of outer space, the Cambodian delegation formally proposes that the Committee immediately decide the question of extending invitations to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Government of South Korea.

4. As a matter of fact, we already have before us a draft resolution submitted by twelve countries [A/C.1/L.399] and amendments to it, Cambodia being one of the sponsors of the amendments [A/C.1/L.400]. My delegation feels that a prompt decision by the Committee will enable representatives of the two parties concerned to be in New York in time to take part in our discussions on the Korean question when our Committee comes to it.

5. The Cambodian delegation is hopeful that the Committee will adopt its proposal, in the interests of the order and efficiency of our work.

6. Mr. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, as you know, my delegation made an attempt to revert to what you yourself had proposed, at the previous meeting, feeling that a better method was involved. It was decided otherwise, and we did not press the point. Nevertheless, as the Cambodian representative has just pointed out, the discussion on the problem at hand is now completed, but we have no draft resolutions before us.

In order to avoid what has happened before, we feel that it is urgent for the Committee, before going on to consider other agenda items—to which our delegation has no objection—to take up the important procedural matter just mentioned by the representative of Cambodia. It can be quite quickly decided.

7. If, as would seem normal, the Committee decides that there is to be no discrimination between the two delegations, that of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and that of South Korea, and that invitations should be extended, it should be done at once in order to enable the two delegations to be here in time.

8. For that reason, my delegation fully supports what has just been said by the Cambodian representative, and it sincerely hopes that the Committee will decide in favour of his proposal.

9. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) (*translated from French*): My delegation sees no reason why we should put off till a later date the discussion concerning invitations to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea, as interested parties, to take part without the right to vote in the discussion of the Korean question. It has been agreed that this Committee will discuss the various aspects of the question in the near future. Elementary rules of courtesy demand that those invited be apprised of our decision some time ahead and not at the very moment when they should be leaving for New York. From the procedural standpoint, we see no reason why the matter of invitation should not be settled now. Since the Committee's agenda is open with regard to priority of items, there is nothing to prevent us from dealing with the procedural aspect of the Korean question, it being understood of course that the substance of the problem will be considered according to the order to be established. My delegation therefore supports the motion submitted by the Cambodian representative.

10. Mr. CHIMIDDORJ (Mongolia) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that this is an appropriate time to raise this procedural matter concerning the simultaneous and unconditional invitation to be addressed to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea to take part in the discussion of the questions relating to Korea.

11. The position of the Mongolian People's Republic is quite clear and it has been explained more than once in recent years at meetings of our Committee. We consider that the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea must be invited to take part in our debate on questions relating to Korea.

12. Accordingly, the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic fully supports the proposal of the representative of Cambodia for an immediate decision on the question of the invitation of the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea. If we take a just and timely decision on this matter we shall be able to put an end to the blatant injustice committed in recent years and to debate successfully questions affecting Korea.

13. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation deems it its duty to give its full support to the proposal just presented by the representatives of Cambodia, Mauritania, Mongolia and Romania, to the effect that the First Committee should immediately, at today's meeting, examine this important question and reach a decision on addressing an invitation to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea to take part in the debate on questions relating to Korea.

14. We consider that proposal both timely and urgent. We hope that other delegations will show a spirit of co-operation and understanding in coming to an effective decision on this matter and that, in this way, when the time comes, we shall be able, when we examine the substance of the question of Korea, to have in the Committee the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea. That would undoubtedly help us to move ahead in this matter and to adopt a completely fair and objective approach to it.

15. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): My delegation had hoped that this Committee might have reached prompt agreement to proceed in accordance with the proposal made by the representative of Chile at our first organizational meeting on 13 October [*1495th meeting, para. 86*]. That proposal, everyone will recall, found general support among Committee members, including the delegation of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, it was a proposal which coincided, at least in its initial phase, with the precise order of business as proposed by the Chair itself.

16. The United States remains entirely prepared to proceed, and to proceed promptly, with the Committee's business on the basis of the Chilean proposal, which would have us now turn our attention at this stage to the subject of a Latin American nuclear-free zone.

17. It has now been suggested that the Committee should instead take up the question of seating Korean representatives.

18. It does no service to the cause of accuracy, the merits of this particular issue, or the intelligence of the members of this Committee to argue or assume that the question of inviting representatives of Korea is a mere procedural question or a question that could be disposed of quickly and without considerable differences of view. Every member of this Committee knows well that the question of seating Korean representatives has given rise to both lively and sometimes very lengthy exchanges of views in the past. By way of illustration I might recall a few of the chapters in this Committee's history in devoting itself to this particular issue.

19. In 1961 the First Committee spent four days and seven meetings in discussing this question; in 1962 it devoted two days and three meetings to the question; in 1963 and 1965, two days; and while some members might not have been present at those earlier sessions, I think most here in this room will remember that just last year the Committee spent four days and five meetings discussing the question of invitations. Furthermore, there is no reason at all to believe that this year the differences of view on this question will be any less strong, or that the time required to air those views and come to a decision will be substantially different from our experience in the past.

20. I raise this point merely to emphasize that if the Committee should decide at this stage to take up this one aspect of the Korean question, as proposed by the representative of Cambodia, we will not, of course, be undertaking a simple, bland or brief debate on the procedure. On the contrary, it would inevitably mean deferring for some time our consideration of the next item, which, it seems to be the general view, should be the question of a Latin American nuclear-free zone. For this reason alone, my delegation believes it would be better to defer until a subsequent time the consideration of the proposal made this morning by the representative of Cambodia.

21. Secondly, my delegation believes strongly that if we are to take up the question of inviting representatives of Korea to participate in our debate, whether at this stage or at some future stage, we should do so only as part of the process of setting the order in which the Korean question as a whole shall be discussed—that is, in the process of deciding when the substantive issue of the United Nations role and responsibility in Korea is debated in this Committee.

22. May I suggest that logic be our guide and that the past experience serve as a constant reminder. The close inter-relationship of the question of inviting representatives of Korea and the question of the United Nations role and responsibility in Korea is clear both from the exercise of logic and from experience. The decision on inviting representatives of Korea to join our debate and under what circumstances is a decision that cannot be—and never has been—divorced from the deeply substantive question: does the United Nations wish to continue to exercise the role and the responsibility which it has carried for two decades with regard to seeking a peaceful means for bringing about the unification of the people of Korea?

23. That is the essence of the problem we confront today. It pervades all aspects of the Korean problem—the invitation to representatives of Korea, as well as the debate on proposals concerning the future of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea or the responsibilities the United Nations has assumed in Korea. That essence is clearly reflected in the two draft resolutions relating to the invitational problem; and I say “two” draft resolutions quite consciously, fully aware of the fact that, in a strictly formal sense, there is only one draft resolution before the Committee, that sponsored by twelve countries, including the United States—but having in mind the obvious fact that the amendments proposed thereto by five delegations really

constitute presentation of quite a distinct second draft resolution to this Committee.

24. And it is precisely because the essence of the problem pervades all aspects of the debate that this Committee, in the past, has considered both the invitational aspects and the question of substantive resolutions as an integral whole.

25. It is precisely for the same reason that my delegation strongly believes that any decision relating to the timing of the debate on an invitation to representatives of Korea can be but a part of the larger decision—that relating to the timing and order in which the entire problem of Korea will be debated in this Committee.

26. To sum up, Mr. Chairman, the United States fully supports your proposal that the Committee now proceed to take up the question of the Latin American free zone; and noting that your proposal has priority, we would hope that you would proceed to put it to a vote so that the Committee can decide on how to proceed with its business.

27. Mr. BELOKOLOS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): My delegation has asked to speak in order to give its full support to the proposal of the representatives of Cambodia, Mauritania, Romania, Mongolia and the Soviet Union that the Committee should today, without delay and without waiting for a substantive debate on item 33, decide to invite both parties concerned to take part in the discussion on the questions relating to Korea, that is to say, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea.

28. In supporting such a proposal, we are guided first of all by the need to ensure a fruitful debate, by the demands of justice and by respect for the rights of the Korean people. We know that the General Assembly has been debating the "Korean question" for many years. But with what results? We can only note with regret that that has not only failed to contribute to a solution but has hampered the unification of Korea and further aggravated the situation.

29. The question therefore arises whether we can be guided by methods which had obviously failed completely and led us nowhere. Can the questions relating to Korea be generally discussed with the participation of only one side while the other side is completely ignored? The only correct approach would be finally to grant to the representatives of the People's Republic of Korea too their lawful right to state their views on a matter which is of vital interest to them.

30. Yet it appears that the delegation of the United States of America is trying once again to obstruct such a solution, by invoking old arguments.

31. We and many others understand the true reasons why the United States, in defiance of common sense, continues to put forward all kinds of discriminatory conditions and pretexts in order to prevent an objective and businesslike debate on this item on our agenda. At the present purely procedural stage in the discussion, we did not want to touch on the substance of the matter. But we should like to stress that the position of the United States can be

construed only as a desire to prevent, at any cost, a solution which would be in the interest of the Korean people itself. The United States once again shows that it is afraid to hear the voice of the representative of free and socialist Korea, that it is again trying to perpetuate the division of Korea and to maintain its troops in South Korea.

32. In supporting the proposal of the representative of Cambodia, we are acting in the interest of practical expediency and of the successful work of this Committee. Everybody will remember that, paradoxical as it may seem, the discussion of questions relating to Korea has throughout the history of the United Nations debates on Korea always been relegated to the end of the session, literally just as the curtain falls. The result was that, even if the Committee had decided to invite both parties to take part, one of them, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would have been deprived of the physical possibility of arriving here, since there would have been only a few hours left before the end of the session.

33. In 1967 more favourable conditions seem to obtain as far as an early debate on Korea is concerned. That is why we must already ensure that the necessary conditions are created for a comprehensive and objective discussion of this matter by deciding now to invite both parties.

34. All those present will remember that in 1966 several delegations raised the question in advance, before the substantive debate on Korea, and everybody will well remember that that procedural proposal met with the decisive opposition of the delegations of the United States and some other countries. To prevent a favourable solution of the question of the invitation of both parties, those delegations used the pretext that the Committee had already decided on the order of priority and that to examine a proposal concerning the invitation a two-thirds majority would be required. Everyone will remember those tiring and lengthy debates which took up several meetings.

35. But now the situation is quite different. On adjourning the meeting on Friday, the Chairman announced that the general debate on outer space was concluded and that until draft resolutions were submitted the discussion would be suspended. He also proposed that the Committee should take up the item on the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. But the Committee has not yet taken a decision on that proposal, so that the proposal of the representative of Cambodia is in no way an infringement of the order of priority. The question of an invitation should be decided at this meeting.

36. Mr. JIMENEZ (Philippines): Inasmuch as the Chilean proposal to give priority to the item on denuclearization has gained general support in the Committee, my delegation supports the Chairman's proposal that the Committee should consider that item now. The Committee has not yet decided on the priority of the items before it, and it would not be in the interests of orderly procedure for it to consider the invitation question at this stage. Because the Committee has not decided upon the priority of the Korean question, my delegation believes that it would not be desirable to take up the question of invitations now. In our experience, that question cannot be discussed merely in one or two days. Our experience has also shown that there is

always the substantive aspect which comes into question whenever this matter arises. Therefore, my delegation would prefer the proposal of the representative of Cambodia to be deferred to a later date.

37. With regard to the argument that an early decision is necessary to facilitate the arrival in New York of the delegations to be invited, we must not forget that we are now living in a jet age. I do not think that any difficulties will be encountered in that respect by the delegations concerned.

38. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (*translated from French*): My delegation supports the Cambodian representative's proposal. We have listened to the representatives who have spoken earlier and we entirely share the view that our Committee should take a decision here and now on extending an invitation to the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. My delegation therefore strongly supports the Cambodian proposal.

39. My delegation considers the arguments for rejecting that proposal to be unfounded. There is no reason why the Committee should not take a decision on the principle of the invitation here and now.

40. The Committee has before it a draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria and other delegations, as well as some amendments to it submitted by Cambodia and other countries. Thus, we already know what we have to face when we come to discuss the substance of the Korean question. Every member of the Committee is familiar with the question, and thus there is nothing to prevent us from taking a decision on the invitation forthwith. Naturally, those who are not in agreement with that view want the Committee to postpone discussion of the procedural matter to a later date; but that could prove disastrous, and as experience has shown, it would inhibit open and frank discussion. Hence I feel that that matter should be settled fairly quickly under circumstances enabling everyone to express himself freely and the Committee to adopt a resolution accordingly.

41. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): The Algerian delegation joins with the delegations which have preceded it in supporting the motion submitted by the Cambodian representative. The first concern of anyone who has taken part in the Committee's work is that it should approach the problem of invitations frankly. This being so, it is inconceivable that we should discuss that important question, affecting as it does a people's future and unity, without that people's representatives from the North and from the South being present and taking part on an equal footing in a discussion that affects their common future.

42. We therefore deem it necessary that this Committee should immediately extend an unconditional invitation to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea.

43. Mr. UCMOTO (Japan): My delegation was somewhat surprised by the proposal made by Cambodia that the Committee should consider at this stage the question of inviting the representatives of both the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to partici-

pate without the right of vote in our discussion on the Korean question.

44. As we see it the present factual situation is as follows. We have on our agenda three separate substantive items dealing with Korea. It has been decided by the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the General Committee, that those three items should be grouped together and considered under the title: the Korean question, which is item 33 on the agenda. The Committee has not yet reached a decision on the order in which it will consider the remaining items on our agenda. More precisely, we have not yet determined when and in what order in relation to the other items we are going to take up the Korean question. In our view, the matter of extending invitations to North and South Korea—although perhaps basically procedural in character—cannot be entirely divorced from the substance of the Korean question. In other words, the matter of the invitation is a part of the whole; it is one aspect of the Korean question. I for one would find it extremely difficult to avoid any discussion of or reference to the substance if this Committee were now to find itself embarked upon a discussion of the proposed invitation.

45. There is every reason to believe that many other delegations would find themselves in the same situation. So far as my delegation is concerned, we consider that it would be premature and illogical for the Committee at this stage, before we have even determined the order of the remaining items on our agenda, to take up the matter of initiating invitations. In our view, not only would it be premature and illogical to do so, but also we would run the grave risk of embroiling the Committee in a prolonged procedural wrangle, involving at this stage not only the matter of invitations but also the broader procedural question of the order of items.

46. This would be confusion worse confounded and would further delay substantive consideration of the items of great importance, including Korea, which are on our heavy agenda.

47. For these reasons, and because we honestly hope that we can begin working on the next item on our agenda in a businesslike and harmonious way, my delegation is opposed to the idea of taking up at this time the question of invitations to the Republic of Korea and North Korea. I do not wish, however, to seem inflexible. On the contrary, once the Committee has determined the order of the remaining items or, more specifically, once the Committee decides when it is going to take up the substance of the Korean question, we could consider the question of invitations sufficiently in advance—say a few days before that question comes up—to allow time for the issuance of invitations, travel, and so on.

48. My delegation supports the Chairman's intention to propose that the Committee should take up item 91 as its next item.

49. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): I wish to express my delegation's support for the proposal made by the representative of Cambodia. In past years we have had discussions very similar to the present one, and I should therefore like to make a few comments on the item "Organization of work".

50. In my opinion, the Cambodian representative's suggestion, apart from being a question of simple justice, is also the only really orderly way of discussing the items allocated to this Committee, and particularly those relating to Korea. For example, the United States representative gave a brief history of the debate on this question in the Committee; but from his version of the facts certain aspects emerge which support the Cambodian suggestion. He pointed out that in some years we took two days, in others three, in others four. But he did not say that this was all in December, during the last few meetings of the Committee; nor did he point out that during the days in question the Committee was busy working on a task—incidentally a ridiculous task—trying to discuss certain substantive questions relating to the Korean peninsula while at the same time deciding who was to be invited to participate in that substantive debate. I need not stress that those who are to be or might be invited are at the other end of the earth. He also failed to point out that much of the discussion which took up four days of our work last year was due to his delegation's fanciful unwillingness to see that thirty-eight was more than thirty-seven.

51. Once again, on the pretext of a desire to safeguard the order of our deliberations, the Committee is now expected to believe that the rational, logical and just procedure is to discuss certain substantive questions on Korea at the same time as, or immediately after, we discuss who is to be invited to the debate on those questions. Clearly, the very word "invitation" implies a prior decision, which the Committee has to take before embarking on a discussion of the substantive questions, to invite or not to invite certain persons not here present. There is no need to insist that the purpose is not the most efficient organization of the Committee's work nor the best way of discussing the problems of Korea. The purpose, purely and simply, is the perpetuation of what for more than a decade has been imposed on this Organization, namely the arbitrary and unjust exclusion of the party most properly interested in this problem, namely, the Government of the Korean people, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. To break with this tradition, this ugly manoeuvre which vitiates the work of this Committee every year, my delegation unreservedly supports the Cambodian proposal.

52. Mr. SHAW (Australia): I shall endeavour to confine myself briefly to the procedural point which is under discussion.

53. My delegation also was surprised this morning by the move to introduce an early consideration of part of the Korean item. In our meeting of Friday last, 20 October, [1502nd meeting] we had understood that the consensus was that the Chairman would this morning propose that we should proceed with the question of the denuclearization of Latin America. We had supported the consideration of that item as the next item on our agenda, and we continue to support it. We are surprised, therefore, to be confronted by a move to introduce not this item, but another item because, in our view, it is quite impossible to say that one aspect of the Korean question can be considered apart from the whole aspect of the Korean question. The Korean item is one item on the agenda and when it comes up for discussion it will be discussed as an item.

54. Many of us now present were here last year and remembered two or three days of debate simply on the order of the agenda. We then remember a few more days of debate on this question of invitations, and the whole of the discussion of the Korean question last year was vitiated and prolonged unnecessarily by procedural points such as the one that is being taken up today.

55. I do hope, Mr. Chairman, that we can help you to reach an orderly method of doing our business, that we can take up one item and discuss it, and then agree to take up another item and discuss that; but I should say that if there is to be an agreement today that we discuss one aspect of the Korean item, this will lead, I think, to quite a considerable debate, because the Korean item is one question, and the question of invitations is integrally linked up with what sort of Korea we are talking about—why there should be two Koreas. We must go back to the history of the North Korean aggression of 1950. We must go back to the United Nations determination to resist it—and the successful determination. We must go into all these things. We cannot separate one part of the item from another.

56. Having said that, I want to make it quite clear that so far as my delegation is concerned we are prepared to discuss the Korean question at a very early date. If it is your wish, Mr. Chairman, and the wish of the Committee that this be the next item on our agenda after the proposed discussion on the nuclear-free zone in Latin America, that is entirely in accordance with our wishes.

57. I reject the suggestion that there is any wish on behalf of certain delegations to avoid a discussion of the Korean question or to push it off to the end of our agenda. Far from it. From the point of view of the Australian delegation, the Korean question is a very important item and we want to get to the root of the wishes of those delegations which are so keen to remove the United Nations presence from Korea, to remove a United Nations presence from a place and at a time when there is increasing evidence of communist incursion from the North into the South. What is the motive behind this move?

58. Thus, from our point of view, we have no wish to shirk any discussion on the Korean item and we believe that it should be proceeded with as a matter of high priority, if need be, after the item which the Chairman himself has suggested should be considered now.

59. I shall not go into the substantive part of the question, as some of the preceding speakers have done; I shall merely repeat that, in our view, if we should proceed with the item which the Chairman has proposed for us, if it is his wish to take up the Korean item in its entirety after that item, we agree. As a first part of considering the Korean item, the question of invitations should also be considered; that is logical. As has been said, if as a result of the consideration of that part there is need for a delay of a day or so for people to arrive from elsewhere, that is logical also. But we do think that on the procedural point alone, Mr. Chairman, we should be prepared to proceed with your suggestion that today we go ahead with the item dealing with denuclearization of Latin America and then consider taking up the Korean item at a later time.

60. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): Mr. Chairman, the Hungarian delegation does not object to the proposal you

have made to the Committee concerning the priority of the items on our agenda. At the same time the Hungarian delegation, in company with a great number of other delegations, fully supports the proposal made by the representative of Cambodia. We think that those two proposals are not in contradiction to each other. On the contrary, both of them are aimed at facilitating the work of the Committee, particularly taking into consideration the question of inviting representatives of the two Korean States in due time—which, in the view of my delegation, is now. We are convinced of this all the more since many representatives who have pronounced themselves against it have suggested that immediately after the next item we should have a substantial debate on the Korean question.

61. In all humility my delegation maintains the classical juridical rule that interested parties should be present at the debate on a problem relating to them. I wonder if in any of the countries represented here the legal procedure would not provide for prior invitation of the parties concerned to participate in the debate. In fact, whenever a problem is discussed in a committee or at an international conference of the United Nations it is usual for invitations to be sent out automatically. My delegation was expecting that in this case too the Secretariat would send out invitations to the interested parties so that they might make travel arrangements and prepare themselves to participate in the debate. Those representatives who are opposing this idea are contradicting this generally recognized legal and international practice. They wish to prevent one of the interested parties from participating in the debate.

62. It is not a question of time nor a question of substance that we are discussing here but merely the simple question of procedure. In a tribunal when an invitation is sent out to the parties it does not mean that the substantive proceedings are to be taken up; it is just preparation for that—a condition without which an objective, substantive debate, an examination of the case, cannot take place. The same is valid in international practice.

63. In his statement the United States representative mentioned that we are now raising one aspect of the Korean question. I do not doubt the sophisticated knowledge of the United States representative on the problem before the Committee, but I submit that we are not dealing with any aspect of the Korean question today: we are trying to prepare properly the substantive debate on it. If this Committee and the United Nations were to put obstacles in the way of inviting representatives of the two Korean States without any conditions whatever and in the fastest possible way—in other words, if we were to attach any kind of conditions to this invitation—it would tend to humiliate the sovereign State against which conditions were imposed, since the imposition of those conditions would mean discrimination against it and would constitute a violation of the principle of sovereign equality of States embodied in the Charter of our Organization. Thus the Hungarian delegation objects to any kind of prescription of the invitation such as has been raised by the United States representative in this Committee. He mentioned that in the past history of our Organization it had been proved that such debates are fruitless. I share the view expressed by the United States representative. Until now, the debates on the Korean question and on the question of invitations have

been fruitless for the very reason that the Committee has been unable to send out invitations to the two Korean States on an equal basis and precisely because of the obstructionist steps taken by a number of delegations on the initiative of the United States.

64. If the Committee wishes to have a fruitful, meaningful and successful examination of all aspects of the Korean question, the only solution before us is to send out, without further delay, a simple invitation to both Korean States as provided by draft resolution A/AC.1/L.399 and modified by the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.400.

65. I do not wish to go into the substance of the matter, but I think that the practice prevailing until now in the work of the United Nations, which from year to year has excluded one of the principal parties from the debate on this question, creates a very strange impression throughout the world. It is a new kind of concept of international relations formulated by the United States delegation.

66. If we want to have a meaningful debate we certainly need to have the most detailed information about the questions we are discussing. We should obtain all the facts presented by all the parties involved. If, on the contrary, we wish to continue this unjust practice and exclude the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from our debate, instead of promoting the unification of Korea and creating a peaceful atmosphere in that part of the world, we further antagonize the interested parties and deepen the rift between them, thus preventing a peaceful solution of the problem.

67. So the Hungarian delegation wholeheartedly supports the proposal made by the representative of Cambodia and invites all members of the Committee to endorse it and send immediately a very simply-worded invitation to the two Korean States so that they may be prepared to participate in the debate which will come up very soon on our agenda.

68. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Year after year, the Korean question comes before us, introduced not because the United Nations really wants to consider it, but because certain countries that have intervened in Korea are now anxious to shed the vast responsibility they have incurred. This applies mainly to the United States of America, which still has troops in Korea.

69. Despite Article 2 (7) of the United Nations Charter, which prohibits any United Nations intervention in the internal affairs of any State, whether or not it is a Member of the United Nations, the United States not only wants the Organization to intervene in Korea on its behalf, as it is doing, but wants it to do so in such a way that United States intervention is perpetuated and this rather sordid business can be carried on under the United Nations flag.

70. This morning we have had a very sensible procedural motion from the representative of Cambodia, requesting that at the very least, if the United Nations intervenes illegally in Korean affairs, the parties with whom it wishes to deal should be present to express their views.

71. Some delegations have apparently expressed surprise that such a matter should be discussed here, as though it

was really astonishing to extend an invitation beforehand to people who are to come before the United Nations! Why, we wonder, should they be surprised at a proposal made to extend a prior invitation to people who are to come to discuss a matter that concerns them and that, incidentally, is being discussed illegally? Why? Their reply is: because we are accustomed to having the invitation sent out at the last moment, when those concerned no longer have time to prepare to come and only one of the parties, that enjoys special privileges from the United States where the United Nations Headquarters is located, can come immediately.

72. For example, this morning we noted that some of the South Korean observers were contacting every delegation in order to arrange for their support. Where, I ask, are the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea? How can they explain their views here to delegations? They are not allowed to come because one particular country—the one that is host to the United Nations—does not allow one particular delegation even the opportunity to be present.

73. However, some delegations feign surprise very cleverly! We are not told—and I agree that such was the procedure in the past—that we shall discuss the matter of the invitation when the Korean question, in other words the triple question concerning Korea, comes up for discussion. But how? It is not only a question of distance (we are told that in this jet age a delegation can get here immediately); there are also preparations to be made, and we all know that in any country a delegation must prepare beforehand. Thus now is the time to take up this procedural matter and to settle it.

74. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that we are not opposed to the proposal you put forward this morning to discuss the question of the denuclearization of Latin America; on the contrary, we are anxious to discuss it. We have no wish to oppose it; however, in order that our discussions may proceed in an orderly fashion, the other questions must also be suitably prepared for discussion.

75. One delegation—I believe it was the delegation of Japan—argued that we could not discuss the question now because there are three items on the agenda dealing with Korea: there is the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea—and everyone knows how over ten years of debates we have assisted in the unification and rehabilitation of Korea by refusing to listen to the parties we are trying to unify; the second item is the withdrawal of United States forces; the third is the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. The delegation in question argued that once we knew in what order to proceed, perhaps there might then be occasion to send off a prompt invitation to the parties concerned, especially if the order is such that the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was concerned. But the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is interested in all three issues, for all three concern Korea, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea definitely represents the Korean people. That delegation must therefore be present. There is thus no order that can alter that.

76. In its statement this morning, the delegation of the United States of America said that this discussion was

taking up a great deal of time—something of which we are well aware—and that the matter of the invitation should therefore be discussed at the same time as the other questions concerning Korea. However, we know perfectly well that the only reason why this is being advanced is to prevent the arrival of a delegation from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The moral climate is being created to make it impossible, at the last moment, for the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to come. We are told: the Committee will hold things up for a day or two in order that the North Korean delegation can be here when the question is taken up. But why not talk about it now, instead of making the Committee wait? What kind of procedure is that, to mark time for a day or two and waste the Committee's time? The plan is simply to prepare the ground so that it can be said that it is impossible to wait and that in the circumstances the only course is to decide to make do with the parties that are present. We will thus be presented with a *fait accompli*.

77. That is discrimination planned in an unhealthy atmosphere, one of double-dealing and evasiveness out of place in a discussion of grave matters that concern a country's future.

78. We are told that the discussion of the Korean question has been taking up a great deal of time; but that is not our fault. It is not the fault of those members of the Committee who wish to extend an invitation to both parties. It is the action of those who want to introduce a discriminatory practice and to invite one of the parties.

79. How can a question of concern to two parties and, as has been said, affecting a country's unification and rehabilitation, be discussed without both parties being present so that we can ask their opinion? Obviously, it is difficult. It is clear, even to an observer not involved, that we cannot talk about unification and rehabilitation unless those we wish to unify are present. That is why we feel it is absolutely essential for the matter of the proposed invitation to both the parties concerned in the Korean question, the question of the existence or non-existence of the Commission that for ten years has been dealing with Korean unification—without achieving it—and the question of the presence or otherwise of United States troops in that country, to be settled, and for both parties to be invited. The question is of extreme importance both to Korea and to the United Nations. The United Nations cannot go on following the same old routine of keeping parties concerned with matters being dealt with here from taking part in the discussion of them. We are well aware that it is neither this Committee nor the United Nations that is responsible for this, but certain countries that bring tremendous pressure to bear and present things in such a way—as in the present instance—that decisions are taken which are disastrous for the United Nations.

80. I should once more like to ask this Committee and all its members to consider carefully the decision that must be taken with regard to the invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. You know what the United States is trying to do. It has submitted a draft resolution that rules out inviting the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. That is what it is aiming at. Hence, it is seeking means of achieving that end, and those means are both

procedural and substantive. It wants to bury, to circumvent the question of inviting the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Once again, on behalf of the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, I appeal to all delegations to weigh the matter carefully.

81. We are certainly not opposed to a thorough consideration of the question raised by the Chairman, the denuclearization of Latin America. Nor are we opposed to examining other questions. We merely want all questions to be examined in circumstances necessary and appropriate for them, in order that they may be discussed in a fitting manner. That is why I believe it necessary for the Committee to decide this very day, in order not to waste time, to extend an invitation to the representatives of both parts of Korea, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea.

82. Mr. KABANDA (Rwanda) (*translated from French*): The Committee has not yet taken a decision on the order of priority to be given the questions before us. Last Friday, at the conclusion of the 1502nd meeting, you intimated, Mr. Chairman, that the question of the denuclearization of Latin America would be taken up on Monday, in other words today. That proposal was in keeping with my delegation's feelings. Moreover, I was under the impression that the Committee had no objection to your proposal.

83. Every representative has of course the right to raise objections to a proposal or a statement of intent later on, so long as the Committee has not yet reached a decision. However, I feel that the matter raised by the Cambodian representative this morning runs the risk of leading us into an endless procedural discussion when we have other no less pressing questions to consider.

84. For that reason, my delegation would like to appeal to the other delegations to support the Chairman's proposal, namely, that we now consider the question of the denuclearization of Latin America, and perhaps later consider the advisability of giving priority to some of the other questions still on the agenda.

85. Mr. TURBAY AYALA (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): We all recognize our good fortune in having as presiding officer for the work of this Committee a man who is thoroughly acquainted with the rules of procedure of both the Assembly and the Committee. Likewise, the fact that he has the unanimous support of all the countries confirms the high and sound opinion of his impartiality. I do not doubt, therefore, that ultimately this matter will be settled as it should be settled.

86. Allow me to recall that at the last meeting, according to the verbatim records, the Chairman made the following statement:

"I have to remind the members of the Committee of the statement I made at the very end of our 1496th meeting. In accordance with the position which the Chair then took and which was upheld with no objection, I should like to inform the Committee of my intention to propose that the next item be item 91, namely, the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America." [1502nd meeting, para. 52]

87. As far as I remember, no objection was raised to the Chairman's statement, and for practical purposes it was

decided that this item would be taken up today by the Committee.

88. I have a feeling that procedurally the Cambodian representative's proposal is not in order, since the Committee has decided to consider this item, and hence the only thing we might try to do would be to set aside or reconsider what we have already agreed upon, but not to introduce an entirely different item. It might almost be said that a mere point of order is involved: discussion of the item agreed as the subject of the Committee's debate for today. Be that as it may, I do not wish to raise a point of order here, but rather to make a few remarks in a friendly spirit to the delegations in favour of taking up the question of Korea at once.

89. We feel that it is unnecessarily vexatious and unfriendly, when we are embarking on an item of such importance to a particular region of the world (in this case Latin America), when no serious controversy is involved, when there is no confrontation of the Powers, and when there is nothing in the way of a rapid disposal of the item, to try to introduce dilatory tactics such as are now holding up the work of the Committee.

90. We respect the desire of the delegation of Cambodia and others that are anxious to see some priority given to the Korean question, and we are quite ready to help to endorse this in due course and to allow ample time for it; but we do not see how it will improve the situation in Korea to bar the way for Latin America just when we are on the point of discussing a question of interest to all the signatories of the Treaty.

91. Hence, in a more constructive spirit of co-operation among all the nations, I would like to suggest to the representative of Cambodia that he agree to a discussion of our item without this interruption, in the assurance that all of us will be ready after that to give full consideration and respectful attention to the question of concern to his own and other delegations.

92. It has been said here that it would not be altogether logical to discuss the invitation to the parties to the Korean question at the same time as the substantive question, because they are different questions. The way I reason is as follows: if it seems odd to discuss the question of invitations side by side with the substance of the item, is it not odder still to discuss the invitations side by side with the denuclearization of Latin America, which certainly is a different topic? What we really have to do is discuss all the aspects of the Korean question once that question is before us for discussion. We can divide it up or discuss it bit by bit or discuss it in one piece, as those most concerned think fit.

93. To sum up, the Colombian delegation would like to see the decision taken by the Chair at the 1502nd meeting implemented, since it will facilitate the work of the Committee. If we now take up the Korean question, it means that the Chair has gone back on its decision, and that for no apparent reason we are changing over from one item to a different one from that decided upon, and an item for which the delegations were not prepared.

94. I therefore trust that the impartiality of the Chairman and the good sense of the delegations will enable us



immediately to take up the question of the denuclearization of Latin America, which is of importance to all of us and particularly to the countries which are signatories of the Treaty.

95. The CHAIRMAN: Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I feel that it is necessary to clarify the situation for the representative of Colombia, especially in the light of what he said at the very end of his statement. Either he was not present at the opening of the meeting or he misunderstood the Chairman through the interpretation, which I doubt very much.

96. The position of the Chairman was very clear. I did not change that position. At the opening of this meeting, I proposed that the Committee take up item 91 as the next item.

97. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand): We have heard a great deal quite recently from the representative of Bulgaria about orderly procedure. My delegation is certainly not against order. But we fail entirely to see that it is particularly orderly for a concerted attack to be mounted in this manner against what seems to us to have been a very reasonable proposal made by the Chairman.

98. Mr. Chairman, in clarifying the remarks made by the representative of Colombia, you have cleared up the situation about what you proposed this morning. In my understanding, last week there was a general feeling in the Committee that we might take up item 91, but there was no agreement on it. But you, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of order, gave very full notice that you would propose at the present meeting that item 91, the denuclearization item, should be taken up. This, it seems to me, was in response to a general feeling in the Committee.

99. But now, this morning, we are quite suddenly confronted with a suggestion from the representative of Cambodia that the Committee, far from taking up item 91—and the representative of Colombia has told us very eloquently what an important item that is—should take up the question of an invitation to the representatives of the Republic of Korea and the North Korean régime to participate in the discussion on the Korean question.

100. Any proposal seriously put forward to facilitate the work of this Committee of course merits our very full consideration. But in this particular case we are taken aback by the contention that some have advanced—that this suggestion now put forward is quite straightforward, merely procedural, and that we might just dispose of it without much further ado and indeed without much reflection: and this as a result of a proposal hastily advanced—at least hastily to my delegation, for I had not heard of it over the weekend—against your suggestion, Sir.

101. The question of invitations to participate in the discussions of this Committee, even without vote, is surely very far from being a simple procedural one; and to judge from the precedents, as so many representatives have pointed out, it is very unlikely that it will be disposed of briefly. Certainly it will not be disposed of without an examination of questions of substance.

102. The issue of an invitation to take part in these deliberations in this Committee is not simply a mechanical

matter. We might ask ourselves, for instance, if a proposal to have representatives of the illegal Smith régime in Rhodesia present during discussion of the Rhodesian item in the Fourth Committee would be accepted in that Committee as a purely procedural one and without question. Everyone knows, because of past history, that there have at times been very prolonged discussions both in the Assembly and in the Security Council on such proposals; and it is quite clear—indeed, the very debate this morning shows that it is quite clear—that a decision to extend an invitation to participate in our deliberations here is indeed of the greatest significance. For one thing, it raises the basis on which the invitation is to be extended. That in turn raises the question of the nature of the régime or authority or Government to which it is proposed to issue such an invitation, and that is not likely to be resolved without an analysis of the whole past history of the question. Indeed, all of us here know that the Korean question has been discussed in this Assembly from its very first years, and that there are important issues of principle that arise as to the responsibilities of our Organization and the direction of its efforts.

103. We would certainly agree that these issues must be discussed at an appropriate time, and for our part we would certainly welcome a full and timely consideration. I stress this point because some representatives who have supported the Cambodian proposal have suggested that only if it is accepted now can full discussion of all the issues be assured. But that is, of course, just not so.

104. For all these reasons, my delegation would therefore support the suggestion which you, Mr. Chairman, have made, that we should now consider item 91. We would regard it as entirely appropriate, should this course be generally acceptable, that the Committee might now establish a date on which the Korean item should be taken up. We for our part would be prepared to see it immediately follow item 91.

105. Finally, I should like to make one point about the question of how long it would take for North Korean representatives, if they were to be invited, to get here. The representative of the Philippines made the suggestion that in this jet age it does not take very long. On the other hand, it has been said that the representatives of the North Koreans must prepare for the debate here. I imagine, myself, that any representatives of the North Korean régime who may come here would not have very much difficulty in doing just that; and I may say I have noticed this morning that quite a number of people in this room have not had much difficulty in preparing quite considerable speeches on an issue suddenly raised.

106. Miss BROOKS (Liberia): The Committee is engaged in a long discussion of what my delegation considers a simple procedural matter. If the question involved is whether or not the Committee will be willing to hear representatives from both or either side of the peoples of Korea, then it is simple; there is no conflict between the proposal you, Mr. Chairman, have made and that of taking a simple decision.

107. I should like to refer to the practice in one of the main Committees which might have some bearing on a case

of this kind. When applications are made by petitioners to be heard before that Committee, the applications are circulated to the members of the Committee, regardless of what topic they are discussing; and before they proceed to take up the particular agenda item the question is disposed of by having the Committee take a decision either accepting or rejecting the proposal.

108. I think this is a simple procedural matter, and if we adhere to that procedure I think we can get ahead with our work.

109. Mr. ESCHAUZIER (Netherlands): At the 1496th meeting many delegations, including my own, expressed their opinions on the order of priority of the items on our agenda; and on that occasion it appeared to me that at least some kind of tacit consensus had been arrived at. At that stage my delegation expressed its preference for the proposal, put forward by the representative of Chile to take up the matter of the denuclearization of Latin America, and we maintain that position.

110. After listening at the 1502nd meeting to your summing-up of how you intended to proceed, Mr. Chairman, I noted that no objection was raised to your suggestion and I would have thought, in those circumstances, that that silence could be interpreted as consent. I for one came to this meeting confidently expecting that the debate on the denuclearization of Latin America would be initiated promptly this morning; and I would deplore any delay because of an untimely proposal to change our agenda. The denuclearization of Latin America is an important item; it is what might be called the first regional experiment in nuclear disarmament. It is of immediate concern to the majority or, I might even say, to all States on the American continent; and I wish to add that it is also of direct interest to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

111. I would therefore hope that those representatives who have supported the proposal of the representative of Cambodia could see their way clear to desist from further challenging your own suggestion, Mr. Chairman, and to go along with your proposal.

112. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation wishes to speak in order again to draw the attention of the Committee to the timely initiative and proposal of the representative of Cambodia and, at the same time, to make a few remarks in connexion with the statements that have been made, including that of the representative of the United States of America.

113. Of course, we were not surprised that it was the United States representative who, impetuously, without giving the matter due thought, came out against the proposal that the Committee should now examine the matter of inviting representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea. We know that Washington has always taken an unobjective, one-sided and hostile attitude in this matter.

114. The representative of the United States said that in the past, when this item was being debated in the Committee, much time was spent on this matter of inviting

representatives of both parts of Korea. And he did not merely complain about this. To bear out his view, he had recourse to arithmetic. The Committee heard some statistical calculations from him showing how many meetings of the Committee were wasted in discussing this matter and when and in what circumstances that occurred.

115. The representative of the United States merely forgot one statistical element: the psychology of figures. Does not everyone here recall that there were constant lengthy meetings because of Washington's opposition to the invitation of a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea?

116. We do not speak here of the position of the United States delegation on the matter of inviting a delegation from South Korea. Washington always attends to that in good time; we may assume that this time too visas have long ago been issued to representatives of South Korea and that they are most likely already in the United States. But if it were not for the obstruction of the United States, if it were not for the sabotage of Washington's diplomats here, the question would be settled in a very short time.

117. The question of an invitation to representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea is a procedural one, whatever efforts are made here to prove the contrary by representatives of the United States and some of its supporters. Why is it now an appropriate time to discuss this matter of the invitation of representatives? The Committee, as we know, has some time on its hands since a draft resolution on outer space is not yet ready. We did not at all recommend that the order of priorities proposed by the Chairman should be changed. But the proposal of the representative of Cambodia that the question of the invitation to be addressed to Korean representatives should be discussed and decided on, in no way runs counter to the proposal of the Chairman of our Committee to deal with item 2, i.e. the Latin American item. The Chairman's proposal concerns items on the agenda, and the Soviet delegation, as we know, did not object to that proposal as a compromise. The question of the invitation to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea is not an item on the agenda, but a procedural proposal, so that no new item is being proposed, though, as we have seen, some representatives endeavoured in every way to prove the contrary.

118. We must express our deep regret that as a result of the discriminatory attitude adopted by the United States and some of its allies, which is contrary to the Charter, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has been prevented year after year from taking part in the discussions on Korea. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has been denied its most elementary right: the right to state its attitude and to make its proposals on a problem which is of vital interest to the whole Korean people.

119. Of course, in the past the absence of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has had the most negative effect on the results of the debates on the Korean question in the General Assembly sessions. The fruits of such an unworthy procedure are being reaped by

our Organization to this day. They are the continuing division of Korea, the occupation of South Korea, by United States troops, and the increase in tension in the Korean peninsula. If this illegal attitude, which runs counter to the most elementary ideas of justice, has up to now been imposed upon the General Assembly, it is a clear proof of Washington's desire to hamper a speedy and just solution of the Korean problem in order to serve its own selfish military and strategic interests. At the current session of the General Assembly the United States of America and its allies are again attempting to act arbitrarily in this matter of an invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

120. As in the past, far-fetched conditions and reservations are put forward, which, it is known, are unacceptable to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. That is how we understand the draft resolution submitted at this session by the United States and its allies in document A/C.1/L.399. Is the absence of logic and common sense not surprising in the conclusions of delegations which, following the American policy, hypocritically express their displeasure at the refusal of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to recognize unilateral decisions taken by the United Nations—decisions taken without its participation? At the same time, they strive to prevent in every possible way the participation of the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in debates on the Korean question. In point of fact; that amounts to a refusal to invite the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

121. It is well known that in the past one injustice after another has been committed against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. At the same time, attempts are made to convince us that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea must accept all those unjust requirements as the condition for its participation in these debates on a matter in which it is one of the most interested parties. Can an independent State, respecting its sovereign rights, accept such an ultimatum?

122. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea follows a peaceful and very clearly defined foreign policy, which enjoys the support and understanding of many countries. It has made many widely known proposals to restore the unity and independence of Korea, which is temporarily divided, proposals which express the deepest hopes of the Korean people.

123. As far as the United Nations is concerned, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has never opposed the principles of the United Nations Charter nor has it by its activities impaired the authority of the United Nations. In that connexion, I would draw the attention of this Committee to the statement made by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 20 October [document A/C.1/949], in which it is stated that:

“The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has constantly abided by the principles of the United Nations Charter.”

And it is rightly pointed out:

“... if it”—the United Nations—“really wants to act in conformity with its Charter, it should unconditionally

invite the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the party concerned, to participate in the discussion of the Korean question.”

124. The Soviet delegation is deeply convinced that the participation of Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the debates on the questions relating to Korea would be fruitful and useful, would lead to a more objective and effective examination of those questions, and would create a more propitious climate for the adoption of decisions on Korea by the General Assembly, decisions which would be really in keeping with the interests and desires of the Korean people.

125. On the other hand, as everyone is aware, the South Korean régime is maintained by the support of foreign bayonets and does not represent the Korean people, but is the puppet of United States imperialism, the docile tool of Washington, used in the fight against the national liberation movement in Asia. The South Korean régime takes part in the shameful aggression of the United States against the Viet-Nameese people. As this Committee is aware, that régime tried to use the United Nations flag in Viet-Nam. It is quite obvious that in drawing the Korean people to an ever-increasing degree into the aggression against Viet-Nam and into various military blocs created by the imperialists, Washington is putting new obstacles in the way of the peaceful unification of Korea, for which the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and all the Korean people work and are consistently struggling.

126. The Soviet delegation is convinced that the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea must be invited simultaneously and unreservedly, without any preliminary conditions. That is the only possible and the only just approach, excluding any discrimination and complying with the principles which should govern us in the United Nations if our Organization wants to be true to the spirit and the letter of its Charter.

127. Once again, we ask representatives to support the proposal of the representative of Cambodia, which has been supported by a number of other delegations.

128. Mr. FAULKNER (Canada): The issue before us is a clear one of orderly procedure. The Korean question in all its aspects will of course be discussed, and apparently there is no objection to an early discussion. What is unattractive to my delegation, however, is a sudden decision to change the order of items which we had expected to follow.

129. Accordingly, my delegation wishes to support the Chairman's proposal to take up the question of the Latin American nuclear-free zone as the second item. That is also in accordance with the suggestion made by the representative of Chile at a previous meeting, which was supported at that time by Canada and by many other delegations.

130. There is another point to be made. For a variety of reasons, the First Committee was late in starting its meetings. We have a heavy agenda before us. Also, each of us has an obligation to deal with every one of these items fully and fairly. We shall never accomplish that goal with time-consuming excursions like the one upon which we are engaged at present. Therefore, in the interests of orderly

procedure and of getting through the work which we have been summoned here to do, the Canadian delegation supports the Chairman's proposal and hopes very much that other like-minded representatives will also support it.

131. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana): My delegation is very distressed about what appears to be a procedural confusion, one which seems to have created a stalemate. We have really been talking about procedural matters all morning and I am sure that we are tired of that activity. We want to move towards a discussion of substance. Perhaps we ourselves are partly responsible for this break in our work. This is a matter which goes to the very core of the question of how the work of this Committee should be organized. As yet, we have had no pre-arranged list of priorities as to which items on the agenda of the Committee should be taken first. As the representative of Rwanda said, there is no guarantee that this type of exercise will not be repeated.

132. We believe that a large number of delegations are prepared to agree to the Chairman's suggestion, that the item on denuclearization in Latin America should be the second item for discussion. On the other hand, we agree with those delegations—and particularly with the delegation of Cambodia—which have stated that that suggestion of the Chairman did not constitute a decision of the Committee. We think that the delegation of Cambodia is perfectly in order in coming here this morning and suggesting a reconsideration of the proposal made by the Chairman on 20 October.

133. We are all very nice to each other here, as you know, Mr. Chairman; we are even nicer to you, and you to us. Thus, one can well imagine that there may be a number of situations in which silence might not really be indicative of consent. Therefore I wish to appeal to you again, Mr. Chairman, to use your personal initiative and resource, in consultation with the leaders of group viewpoints in this Committee, to see if it is not possible to arrive at some order of priorities before we continue with our further work in this Committee. Otherwise, as I have said, sooner or later we are bound to have a repetition of this fruitless exercise.

134. Secondly, with regard to the proposal made by the representative of Cambodia, as I have said before, we would have found no difficulty in going along with what we thought was a mere procedural suggestion on his part. On the other hand, after going through what we have gone through this morning, and with due deference to your own status and position in this Committee, Mr. Chairman, I would appeal to the representative of Cambodia to allow us to proceed with the question of the denuclearization of Latin America. At the same time, I would appeal to those delegations which have taken an opposite viewpoint in this discussion this morning to agree that as soon as we finish discussing the Latin American denuclearization item we should take up the Korean question in its entirety. I find that it has been very difficult for some delegations here to divorce substance from procedure in discussing the Cambodian delegation's proposal. It may be difficult, but we do not think it should be impossible.

135. If we accepted the principle of deciding whether or not we wished to move a little bit beyond the position

which we have occupied in previous years and to hear at least what the other side has to say, in a genuine attempt to arrive at a political understanding if not a solution of the problem of Korea, I think that this Committee would have done some service. And here, although I should not like to take great issue with the representative of New Zealand, I do not think that we can put the Ian Smith régime and the North Korean Government in the same bracket. I do not think that there is a parallel between the two of them, but I do not wish to go into detail on this matter. I can assure him that we can take care of any suggestion about inviting Ian Smith in the Fourth Committee when the matter comes up.

136. My proposal, therefore, Mr. Chairman, is this. First I urge you to use your resources to determine an order of priority for the items in order to forestall any future exhibition of this kind of exercise in debating procedures. Second, I wish to appeal to the Cambodian representative—while accepting his right to make the proposal which he made this morning—to allow a discussion of the item on the denuclearization of Latin America. And I would appeal to the other group, which seems to be in a difficult situation in regard to the Korean question, to agree that the Committee begin its discussion of the Korean question immediately after finishing its discussion of the item on the denuclearization of Latin America.

137. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): I apologize for taking the floor again this morning, but the course of the discussion so far really makes this necessary. I should like to clarify once more the position of my delegation, which is not, as alleged by the representative of Hungary, that a discussion of the Korean seating question would be fruitless—which is not a word I used—but rather that it would be complicated and that it is intimately related to the substance of the Korean problem.

138. I am indebted to the representative of the Soviet Union for his last statement because what he said proves this far more clearly and far more effectively than anything I could have said in the theory about it.

139. I think that some confusion also exists in the minds of some delegations, such as those of the Ukrainian SSR, Bulgaria and Cuba which, by their statements, appear to impute to the United States and others which have supported a certain approach to the Korean question in the past a desire to put off the Korean item to the end of the session so as to assure that there will not be time for a debate, or so as to assure that there will not be time for adequate consideration to be given to the problem of inviting representatives from Korea to participate in the debate.

140. I reject these allegations categorically. Nothing could be further from the truth. I should just like to remind the members of the Committee that in fact it was the delegation of the United States, on 13 October [1495th meeting], in discussing the order of items which might be presented before our Committee, which gave a higher priority to the Korean question than any other delegation except India. Indeed, my delegation proposed that the Korean question should come up at a much earlier stage than that proposed by the representative of the Soviet

Union. We suggested that the Korean question be among the first three before the disarmament items came up, as opposed to fifth place in the proposal submitted by the Soviet delegation. I mention that just to clarify the point that, as far as the United States is concerned, we would consider the suggestion just made by the representative of Ghana as having a great deal of merit and certainly, for our part, we should be more than pleased to co-operate in the procedure which he has suggested, which would be that we proceed as the Chairman proposed at the 1502nd meeting, and again this morning, that we proceed now with a discussion of the treaty for the denuclearization of Latin America, and then proceed to take up the Korean question as the next item.

141. In that connexion I should like to say that I feel it is absolutely clear that there will be adequate opportunity, given the way in which the Committee will surely proceed

to discuss the Korean item, to permit full consideration of invitations to be extended and of responses to those invitations. Again Mr. Fedorenko has obliged us because he pointed out that as recently as three days ago official statements had been made in Pyongyang on the Korean question at the United Nations this fall. Therefore, I think we can assume that the North Korean régime is not unaware of the fact that debate is probable, perhaps even imminent, and that they may indeed already have made certain preparations in developing their position on it.

142. That being the case, I shall conclude my intervention merely by saying once more very briefly that I think we have just had a very wise suggestion presented to us by the representative of Ghana, and the United States delegation warmly supports that suggestion.

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*