



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda items 27, 28, 29, 94 and 96:
Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*)
Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*)
Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*)
Memorandum of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament (*continued*)
Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: Final Document of the Conference (*continued*) 1

Chairman: Mr. Piero VINCI (Italy).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Galindo Pohl (El Salvador), Vice-Chairman took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEMS 27, 28, 29, 94 AND 96

Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7189-DC/231, A/C.1/L.443, A/C.1/L.444 and Add.1-8, A/C.1/L.445 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.446, A/C.1/L.448/Rev.2, A/C.1/L.449)

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7189-DC/231, A/C.1/L.447 and Add.1-3)

Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7189-DC/231)

Memorandum of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament (*continued*) (A/7134, A/7223, A/C.1/974, A/C.1/L.443)

Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: Final Document of the Conference (*continued*) (A/7224 and Add.1, A/7277 and Corr.1 and 2, A/7327, A/7364, A/C.1/976, A/C.1/L.449-452)

1. Mr. RONAN (Ireland): I should like to explain the position of my delegation in regard to the draft resolutions

on the Final Document of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States. The Conference was convened to consider the following and other related questions: (a) How can the security of the non-nuclear States be best assured? (b) How may non-nuclear Powers co-operate among themselves in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons? ; and (c) How can nuclear devices be used exclusively for peaceful purposes? The Conference met in Geneva from 29 August to 28 September last and its work and conclusions are outlined in document A/7277 and Corr.1 and 2.

2. My Government interpreted the terms of **reference** of the Conference as indicating that its objectives could best be attained by first securing the entry into force of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII), annex).

3. The relevant clause in the declaration of the Conference would appear to bear this out:

"The Conference recommends that, pending the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, steps be undertaken urgently with a view to reaching agreements on various collateral measures.

"4. In this context, the Conference has noted the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which was commended by United Nations General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII). The Conference considers that the Treaty should be followed up by measures of disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament." [See A/7277 and Corr.1 and 2, para. 17 (V).]

4. It is implied here that only when the non-proliferation Treaty is in force can there be follow-up measures on disarmament. It is therefore of the greatest importance that the non-proliferation Treaty be ratified and enter into force at the earliest possible date. My delegation would have expected that any draft resolutions dealing with the work of the Conference of the Non-Nuclear-Weapon States would have contained a clause urging ratification of the non-proliferation Treaty and the question of our co-sponsorship of any draft resolution on this subject would be conditional on the inclusion of such a clause.

5. The fact that the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States was held so recently and that it dealt with complex questions including the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States and matters relating to co-operation in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy means that both Governments and the international organizations, particularly the International Atomic Energy Agency, to which its recommendations were addressed will need some time for reflection and consideration of the issues involved and how best any further consideration of those questions should be

pursued. Above all, any follow-up action should not in any way, even unwittingly through possible psychological effects, result in delays in securing the entry into force of the non-proliferation Treaty.

6. In the view of my Government further consideration will be required on the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy with an obligation on the nuclear Powers to make the use of nuclear energy freely available, which would promote the success of the non-proliferation Treaty, and on the development of a system of collective security which will guarantee non-nuclear-weapon States against any form of attack. The prior entry into force of the non-proliferation Treaty would in the view of my delegation greatly facilitate further consideration of such questions.

7. Of the draft resolutions which have been submitted on this subject, the approach in A/C.1/L.450 is the one which commends itself most to my delegation and it shall have our support. This draft resolution will ensure that consideration will be given by Governments and the international organizations concerned to the work and recommendations of the Conference of the Non-Nuclear-Weapon States and that the Secretary-General will submit a comprehensive report on the information supplied by those concerned for consideration at the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly. My delegation believes that it would be premature before then to decide on follow-up measures. For instance, draft resolution A/C.1/L.451 in operative section II, paragraphs 1 and 2 would decide "to convene the United Nations Disarmament Commission" and have the Secretary-General consult Member States on their preference for such a meeting, "either not later than July 1969 or after the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly and before March 1970".

8. In our view, this approach would prejudice the question whether or not a meeting of the Disarmament Commission should take place at all and we do not think that such a decision can be taken until the next session of the General Assembly, following careful consideration of all aspects of the question, including the Secretary-General's report, the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, progress on the entry into force of the non-proliferation Treaty, the feasibility—from the political point of view—and the prospects of success of a meeting of the Disarmament Commission.

9. If, as it appears, the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.451 are prepared to envisage postponing a meeting of the Disarmament Commission until early in 1970, then we do not see why they could not agree that the whole question be debated and decided upon at the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly, and in our view it will not be before then that the information and other elements necessary for taking a decision on convening the United Nations Disarmament Commission will be available.

10. The non-nuclear States in the view of my delegation can best contribute to the objectives of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States by signing and ratifying the non-proliferation Treaty as speedily as possible, and it may be recalled that article VIII, paragraph 3, of the Treaty provides for five-yearly reviews by conferences of its operation. In the cases of the non-proliferation Treaty and

the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States there is opportunity for continuity of discussion in the annual debates here in the First Committee. In all the circumstances therefore, my delegation could not agree that a decision should be taken at this session on convening a meeting of the Disarmament Commission. Moreover, the terms of reference of such a meeting as set out in draft resolution A/C.1/L.451 are not such as would commend themselves to my delegation, and we do not think that general agreement would be reached on terms of reference at this session.

11. Just as my delegation will support draft resolution A/C.1/L.450, for the reasons given, I regret that we shall have to oppose draft resolution A/C.1/L.451.

12. Mr. BURNS (Canada): As I listened to the statement just made by the representative of Ireland, I found many distinct resemblances to what I am about to say myself, but I assure the Committee that there was no collusion beforehand between Ireland and ourselves to adopt a specific stand together. That just happened.

13. As the Canadian delegation is one of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.450, which we are happy to learn the delegation of Ireland will support, we believe it appropriate for us to state briefly how we see the differences between that draft resolution and the other three draft resolutions on the same subject.

14. The draft resolutions on this agenda item constitute responses to the invitation extended in resolution N of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States [*ibid.*] to the General Assembly to consider the best ways and means for the implementation of the decisions taken by the Conference and the continuity of the work undertaken. I suggest that draft resolution A/C.1/L.450 comes closer to being a precise response to that invitation than does any of the other proposals.

15. The proposal submitted by the representative of Cyprus in document A/C.1/L.449 extends far beyond the scope of the discussion at the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States and still farther beyond the fields covered by its resolutions. The Canadian delegation would welcome an integrated solution for the interrelated problems of disarmament, collective security, peaceful settlement of disputes and economic development, as all delegations doubtless would. However, we doubt that a solution is likely to be found through the labours of any expert committee since these vast problems are not technical in nature.

16. Turning to resolution A/C.1/L.451, submitted by Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Italy, Pakistan and Yugoslavia, I should like to acknowledge the spirit of compromise and conciliation displayed in the negotiations between our two groups. There are passages in each draft resolution which owe their origins to the other group, and there are of course many parallel passages. However, as our discussions proceeded, it became increasingly clear that we were unable to reconcile our differing views as to what was meant by implementation of the decisions of the Conference. Nevertheless, the Canadian delegation does not exclude the possibility of agreement on the terms of a resolution as a result of further consultations.

17. To our group it seemed that an orderly and effective procedure would be to ask the Secretary-General to transmit the resolutions of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States to the various international bodies concerned, to ask those bodies to report to the Secretary-General on the action taken by them and to ask the Secretary-General to prepare a comprehensive progress report on the basis of that information. We would then be in a position to consider the state of implementation at the next session of the General Assembly. There did not and does not appear to us to be any requirement or justification for any additional body or committee to concern itself with these matters. Indeed, we would remind the First Committee that a proposal for an *ad hoc* committee failed to be adopted by the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States itself. It is therefore only fitting that when we are concerned with implementing decisions of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States we should avoid creating any such body. We are confident that the Secretary-General will be able to give us a full and faithful picture of the situation next autumn.

18. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.451 includes a proposal that the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations, might meet not later than July 1969 when it would concern itself with, among other things, international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We find it difficult to see how a meeting with such an agenda, taking place at that time, could fail to cause confusion. Our impression is that at least some of the international bodies concerned will not by then be in a position to report on the action they have taken in response to the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States resolutions. The prospect therefore would be that the Disarmament Commission would report its findings on action taken and those findings would be at variance with the comprehensive report of the Secretary-General which would come along later to the General Assembly and would be based on fuller information. Such an arrangement in our view is unlikely to assist the consideration of these issues by the next session.

19. It is not easy to predict what the situation in the disarmament negotiations may be by July 1969. Present prospects are that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament will resume its work in early March 1969. So far there is no agreement to concentrate on any particular measure or set of measures. Therefore it seems likely that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament will be pursuing more than one topic. It seems doubtful that it will be desirable to interrupt those discussions just about the time when they can be expected to have gathered some momentum.

20. The Committee will understand that the two main features of draft resolution A/C.1/L.451 which we find difficult are the possibility of a meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission by July 1969 and the scope of its discussions. In addition, we find that draft resolution A/C.1/L.451 deals in rather greater detail than we consider desirable with certain resolutions adopted by the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States. As far as my own delegation is concerned, endorsement of resolution B [see A/7277 and Corr.1 and 2, para. 17 (II)] and resolutions C and D [ibid., para. 17 (III)] would not cause difficulty since we supported these resolutions at the

Conference. However, we recognize that this is not the case for a number of members of the First Committee. We ourselves do have difficulty with operative section I, paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.451 since we did not support resolution J [ibid., para. 17 (IV)] of the Conference. Similarly we have a problem with operative section IV of the draft resolution which is concerned in sub-paragraph (a) with proposals we were unable to support at the Conference. Also, sub-paragraph (b) suggests that the Secretary-General prepare a study on another agency. We feel this might place the Secretary-General in an embarrassing position, in view of the constitutional relationship between the Secretariat and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

21. We find that draft resolution A/C.1/L.452, submitted by the delegations of Bulgaria and Hungary, in contrast with draft resolution A/C.1/L.451, is unduly restrictive in its approach. We consider that the minimum which should be done with respect to the resolutions adopted by the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States is that the General Assembly should formally take note of them, as is done in the draft resolution which we have co-sponsored [A/C.1/L.450]. We also consider that due regard should be given to the fact that the declaration of the Conference was adopted without a dissenting voice. The proper action for the General Assembly, in our view, is to endorse that declaration. We also consider that there should be some response to the complaints which we have heard from several delegations to the effect that the proceedings of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament are too remote, and their discussion of them is too seldom possible for non-members of that Disarmament Committee. In draft resolution A/C.1/L.450 provision is made for the possible convening of the Disarmament Commission in 1970, by which time we would hope there would be sufficient progress in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to make a mid-term review of its work worth while.

22. In the other procedures for ensuring the implementation of the Conference decisions there are no important differences between draft resolutions A/C.1/L.450 and A/C.1/L.452. I should like to suggest, with deference, to the co-sponsors of the latter draft resolution that their text is too narrow to command very wide support. I hope that they will consider very carefully whether it is desirable or not for them to maintain it.

23. The essential issue as we see it lies between draft resolution A/C.1/L.450 and the six-Power draft resolution [A/C.1/L.451]. I have tried to show that draft resolution A/C.1/L.450 is the more practical, that it will be fully effective, that it minimizes difficulties—including the difficulties of the nuclear Powers, whose co-operation is essential—and that it will produce results. The Canadian delegation urges the members of the Committee to support this course rather than one which is likely to be disruptive and controversial, and unwelcome to the nuclear Powers.

24. Before concluding, I should like to speak briefly in regard to another draft resolution, A/C.1/L.448/Rev.2.

25. The Canadian delegation is very pleased that the sponsors of this draft resolution have agreed to the suggestion of the delegation of the United Kingdom and

have put in as a fourth paragraph of the preamble to their draft resolution the following:

“Noting with satisfaction the agreement of the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of the United States of America to enter into bilateral discussions on the limitation and the reduction of both offensive strategic nuclear weapons delivery systems and systems of defence against ballistic missiles”.

26. As we have said on several previous occasions, we regard early commencement of these talks as very essential if there is to be progress in any other measures of arms control or disarmament. We therefore feel that it is a useful complement to draft resolution A/C.1/L.448/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 12.5 p.m.