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ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (A/CONF.35/PC/L.2)

The provisional agenda was adopted.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Committee for having elected him as Chairman. He pointed out that, under operative paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 2153 B (XXI) of 17 November 1966, the Committee's mandate was to make appropriate arrangements for convening the Conference and to consider the question of association of nuclear States with the work of the Conference and report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-second session. His own view was that non-proliferation would not become effective until the States with nuclear weapons reached agreement on a joint course of action with the non-nuclear-weapon States. He also hoped that the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament would contribute to the success of the Conference and thought that the two Conferences should be complementary. After consultation with the members of the Committee and the representative of the Secretary-General, the Chairman gave the floor to the Vice-Chairman, as the Spanish representative.

Mr. AZNAR (Spain) congratulated the Chairman on his election and assured him of his support in carrying out the Committee's task. That task was essentially positive since it involved preparing a Conference of non-nuclear-weapon States and since the Committee's terms of reference could apparently be taken to imply that it was not empowered to discuss matters of substance. The Committee should therefore not discuss complex details which would make it lose sight of its primary objective. Operative paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 2153 B (XXI) listed three major questions which constituted a sort of outline agenda for the future Conference. It was not a restrictive guideline, however, since the paragraph provided for the consideration of "other related questions"; that broadened its field of action considerably. He thought it desirable that each member of the Committee should state his country's position on the three major issues and the other related questions, but it would also be useful to ascertain the position of countries which, although Members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, were not members of the Committee. Such countries
could help in defining the agenda for the Conference and assist the Committee in preparing its recommendations. For the Committee to take informed decisions, it would be useful to know how those countries viewed the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The question of the association of nuclear States with the work of the Conference was vitally important. Those States could contribute to the success of the Conference by stating their views to the Committee and giving it the benefit of any information they had. To that end, he proposed that the Committee should consider ways of inviting the other Members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, including the nuclear States, to communicate their views to it. He believed that the nuclear States should be asked to assume specific responsibilities, although the Committee should not adopt a demagogic attitude towards them. In short, the Committee's work should be planned constructively, without any political bias, so as to satisfy every point of view. Mankind was disturbed by the problem of nuclear weapons, which was a particularly grave issue in Europe. The Conference of non-nuclear-weapon States provided an opportunity to respond to that concern and to serve the cause of peace. It would do that more effectively with a well-planned programme.

He reserved the right to speak at a later stage in the debate.

Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) said that the Spanish representative had given an excellent explanation of the Committee's terms of reference, in regard to both the organization of the Conference and the consultations to be undertaken with the nuclear States. Those were two completely different tasks. With regard to the organization of the Conference, members of the Secretariat with experience of such questions could usefully be consulted. The Secretariat, with the assistance of the whole Committee or, preferably, its officers, could immediately prepare a study dealing specifically with the organizational aspect, including the place and date of the Conference, invitations to participants, documentation, and the possibility of participation by specialized agencies.

The negotiations could not be carried out by the Committee as a whole and its officers were best able to undertake them. He did not dispute the usefulness of a preliminary exchange of views, but was anxious to shorten the Committee's
discussions and reach positive decisions quickly. He therefore proposed that the Committee's officers, led by the Chairman and working closely with members of the Secretariat, should draft a working paper on the preparation of the Conference and the administrative arrangements. The paper should specify the nature of the negotiations to be undertaken with the nuclear States to persuade them to take part in the work of the Preparatory Committee.

Mr. PIÑERA CARVALLO (Chile) agreed with the representatives of Spain and Kuwait that the Committee's task was essentially to make preparations for the Conference planned for the summer of 1968. If the Conference was to be as successful as was hoped, the greatest possible number of non-nuclear-weapon States, including those which would be able to manufacture nuclear weapons in the future, should take an active part in it. The Committee should therefore devote special attention to the question of invitations. Many delegations had abstained when the General Assembly had adopted the resolution on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the Committee might encounter some difficulties in that connexion. It was also important to gain the co-operation of the nuclear Powers. As the representative of Kuwait had suggested, the Chairman and the Rapporteur should be asked to prepare a working paper explaining the problems to be dealt with, and especially the related questions mentioned in operative paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 2153 B (XXI).

The CHAIRMAN, summarizing the discussion, said that members had felt that the Committee should keep strictly within its terms of reference, as set out in the General Assembly resolution, and endeavour to determine the best way of inviting other Members of the United Nations, not represented in the Committee, to give their views on the forthcoming Conference. It had been proposed that a working paper should be prepared, outlining the recommendations which the Committee would submit to the General Assembly regarding participation and the manner in which the nuclear Powers could be associated with the work of the Conference. It had also been suggested that the officers, in consultation with the Secretariat, should endeavour to specify the type of negotiations to be held with the nuclear Powers. At its next meeting, the Committee would have before it the proposed working paper and would have held preliminary discussions. The question was certainly a difficult one, and the Committee must proceed with caution.
Mr. KHANACHEF (Kuwait) suggested that the preparation of the provisional agenda for the forthcoming Conference should also be taken up.

Mr. PARDO (Malta) endorsed the suggestions which had been made. The working paper should indicate clearly the terms of reference of the Conference, because the latter could work efficiently only if its mandate was precisely defined. He had some doubts as to the exact meaning of the questions listed in operative paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 2153 B (XXI). Was "security of the non-nuclear States" to be interpreted as their protection against the threat of nuclear weapons, or against all other weapons of mass destruction? Did "proliferation of nuclear weapons" mean stockpiling of nuclear weapons by the great Powers, in accordance with the interpretation given by the Indian representative in the First Committee, or merely the acquisition of such weapons by non-nuclear States? Did the word "proliferation" also refer to preparatory production techniques, which were very close to the techniques employed for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy? The meaning of operative paragraph 1, sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), should be clarified. With regard to sub-paragraph (c), the value of the Conference from the standpoint of purely peaceful uses should be stressed. Negotiations, of which the members of the Committee were not yet fully informed, were in progress in Geneva on the delicate issue of non-proliferation. It would be useful if a member of the Committee could act as liaison officer and obtain the necessary information.

Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) endorsed the suggestions which the Chairman had summarized. If the Maltese representative's proposal to define the meaning of the word "proliferation" in the working paper was accepted, considerable difficulties would be encountered because the interpretation would be both technical and political. In his view, it would be preferable for the members of the Committee to give their views on the matter. The working paper should be drawn up solely in accordance with the suggestions made by the representatives of Kuwait and Spain.

Mr. PASHA (Pakistan) said that the resolution clearly defined the task which had been entrusted to the Committee, namely, to make the necessary arrangements regarding the date, venue and organizational details of the Conference,
and the invitations which were to be sent out. It was still too early to decide on the date or duration of the Conference, because the outcome of the Geneva negotiations was not yet known. Since no country had offered to act as host, the Conference would take place either in New York or Geneva. If the Conference was to be successful, it was essential to secure the active participation of the greatest possible number of non-nuclear States, including those which would soon be able to manufacture nuclear weapons. The Conference could have results which would benefit all mankind, and the Committee should therefore avoid becoming involved in detail in connexion with the preparation of the agenda.

Interpretation of the General Assembly resolution was a complex and difficult task, because the experts themselves were not yet in agreement. It would be better for the Committee to keep strictly to the terms of reference set forth in the resolution.

Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) said that the Maltese representative had raised some important questions. However, since the resolution of the Assembly established the terms of reference of both the Conference and the Preparatory Committee, the Conference itself should deal with those questions.

Mr. PARDO (Malta) said that he had made his suggestions because he believed that the success of the Conference would depend on the specific terms of reference to be drawn up by the Preparatory Committee. Without a detailed agenda, the response to the invitations sent out might not be very favourable.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.