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ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (A/CONF.35/PC/L.3)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt its agenda (A/CONF.35/PC/L.3).

The agenda (A/CONF.35/PC/L.3) was adopted.

CONSIDERATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 2153 B (XXI) (A/CONF.35/PC/L.4)

The CHAIRMAN observed that recent events had emphasized the need for the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, in order to ensure the security of all States, and for a renewed effort to achieve general and complete disarmament.

He drew attention to the tentative cost estimates of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States set forth in the note by the Secretary-General (A/CONF.35/PC/L.4).

Mr. PARDO (Malta) pointed out that, even allowing for the fact that the costs of the Conference could not be estimated very accurately until such basic questions as the number of participants had been decided, the estimates that pre-Conference documentation would comprise no more than fifty pages and that the Conference's final report would not exceed twenty pages seemed to him to be unduly low.

Mr. PREY (Secretary) said that, in drafting the tentative cost estimates, the Secretariat had had to make certain assumptions which might have to be subsequently changed in the light of the Committee's decisions on such basic questions as those to which the Maltese representative had referred. It had, in consultation with the Committee's officers, estimated that the body of the Conference's final report would amount to twenty pages, although the summary records, and the proposals and documents issued during the Conference would probably be annexed to it.

Mr. LAI (Malaysia), Rapporteur, wondered when the Conference could be held at Geneva.

Mr. NOSOK (Under-Secretary for Conference Services) said that Headquarters had suggested to the European Office that, in order to avoid a conflict of dates with the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development,
(Mr. Nosek, Under-Secretary for Conference Services)

the International Conference on Human Rights and the International Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Law of Treaties, to be held in 1968 at New Delhi, Teheran and Vienna respectively, the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States might be held at Geneva between 28 March and 19 April. However, the European Office had replied that the dates suggested by Headquarters would still entail some overlap with the Vienna Conference and that it could not therefore guarantee that the necessary language and supervisory staff would be available. In order to ensure the best possible servicing of the Conference, the European Office had suggested 12 August to 20 September, although arrangements might be made to begin the Conference in July if necessary to ensure strict compliance with the General Assembly resolution.

Mr. SHARIF (Pakistan) felt that the estimate made in paragraph 3 (c) that there would be no more than two meetings a day was low since the issues to be discussed at the Conference were so vital to the security and defence of States and their discussion would be so comprehensive and wide-ranging that the Conference might well have to set up two or more committees.

Mr. NOSEK (Under-Secretary for Conference Services) pointed out that the estimates had been prepared on the assumption that the Conference would hold only two meetings a day; if it decided to double that number, the costs of interpretation and of preparing and publishing the summary records would of course be substantially higher.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft agenda of the Conference. The Bureau suggested that the Committee should consider the following items for inclusion in the agenda:

1. The security of non-nuclear-weapon States
   (a) Security guarantees in the context of non-proliferation
   (b) Security implications of the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons
   (c) General and complete disarmament

2. The prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons through co-operation among non-nuclear-weapon States
   (a) The question of the renunciation of the production or acquisition of nuclear weapons by non-nuclear-weapon States in the context of disarmament
obligations that non-nuclear-weapon States should assume on becoming nuclear Powers, such as acceptance of a comprehensive test ban, the discontinuance of the production of fissionable materials, and a freeze on the production of delivery vehicles, which were not covered under items 1(a) and (b).

Mr. SHAH (Pakistan) said that his delegation intended to submit a working paper proposing items for inclusion in the agenda which would, inter alia, further expand the scope of item 1(a) and (b). Since the question raised by the Rapporteur was under discussion in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, the Committee should concentrate on aspects of the dangers of proliferation.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) felt that item 1(c) in the Bureau's outline was beyond the competence of the Committee. The question raised by the Rapporteur would be covered by the Maltese suggestion for a new sub-item.

Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) proposed the deletion of item 1(c).

It was so agreed.

Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) suggested that sub-item 1(a) should be worded to read: "Security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States".

Mr. SHAH (Pakistan) supported that suggestion. The phrase "in the context of non-proliferation" was not necessary.

Mr. AZNAR (Spain) said that there were two categories of non-nuclear-weapon States: those which had the possibility of acquiring nuclear weapons and those which did not. There were currently eleven countries in the former category. The two categories of States naturally viewed security guarantees from a different angle. It was important to retain the concept of non-proliferation in the agenda item in question, in order to emphasize the obligation of non-nuclear-weapon States not to try to acquire nuclear weapons.

Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) agreed that the Conference should consider all aspects of the situation, including the case of countries which had the possibility of becoming nuclear-weapon States. However, the numerous non-nuclear countries which did not have that possibility were also interested in obtaining security guarantees. The title of the Conference did not prejudge the intentions of the
participating countries. It was to be a Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States and not a conference of States which had decided not to acquire nuclear weapons. To link the discussion to non-proliferation would limit the scope of the Conference. It would therefore be preferable to use the more general wording "Security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States".

Mr. Mohammd (Nigeria) thought that, in order to determine the wording to be used, the Committee would have to decide how broad the scope of the discussion at the Conference was to be.

The Chairman said that presumably the idea of a link with non-proliferation had arisen because of the problem of security guarantees after the signature of a non-proliferation treaty.

Mr. Zollner (Dahomey) thought it preferable not to link security guarantees to a non-proliferation treaty because to link them would seem to imply that there would be no guarantees unless commitments were made regarding non-proliferation. As a first step, agreement should be reached on security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States; it would then be easier to achieve the goal of a non-proliferation treaty.

Mr. IAI (Malaysia), Rapporteur, pointed out that the matter of security guarantees had been raised only recently, in connexion with the efforts being made to reach agreement on a non-proliferation treaty. Some nuclear Powers would be willing to provide guarantees only in the context of such a treaty. The Bureau had thought that the item should be discussed in the narrower context of guarantees for countries which chose not to become nuclear Powers.

Mr. Shaht (Pakistan) said that the discussion of the item should not be linked to the idea of a non-proliferation treaty. If a number of countries refused to accede to a treaty, a nuclear danger would still exist. In any case, the treaty would not embody guarantees. The question of guarantees was becoming ever more important, as technological progress increased the number of nuclear Powers and potential nuclear Powers. Regardless of its intentions, a country remained a non-nuclear-weapon State until it actually acquired nuclear weapons.

Mr. Pardo (Malta) pointed out that guarantees were not the only way of assuring the security of the non-nuclear States and that some States would not
accept the idea of security guarantees. The importance of the Conference would be enhanced if it could also consider the other ways of achieving that goal, which included unilateral disarmament and declarations of permanent neutrality. He suggested that item 1 (a) should read: "Security guarantees and other methods of assuring the security of non-nuclear-weapon States".

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should provisionally decide to adopt that wording.

It was so agreed.

Mr. SHAH (Pakistan) said that his delegation could agree to that provisional decision. It felt, however, that it might be preferable for the sub-item to consist of an enumeration of points rather than a general formula.

The CHAIRMAN invited comments on sub-item 1 (b).

In reply to questions from Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) and Mr. SHAH (Pakistan), Mr. LAI (Malaysia), Rapporteur, explained that an expert group appointed by the Secretary-General was preparing a report on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and on the security and economic implications for States of the acquisition and further development of those weapons. The Bureau had therefore included in its outline two items on the security and economic implications of the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons. It was hoped that other studies would be made on the same subject.

Mr. FREY (Secretary of the Committee) provided some general information on the study which would be ready in the autumn.

Mr. SHAH (Pakistan) said that the report would undoubtedly be a most useful background document for the Conference. He was not sure, however, whether the subject should actually be included as a sub-item in the agenda. The Conference would not be required to take any substantive action on the report; it would simply take note of it and commend it to the attention of States.

Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) thought it would be more logical for the sub-item to be part of item 2. The implications of the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons were one reason for preventing the proliferation of such weapons. If, however, the topic was retained in item 1, he would prefer it to be the first sub-item and to be worded: "Security implications of the non-production and non-acquisition of nuclear weapons".

/...
The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should provisionally decide to delete sub-item 1 (b).

It was so agreed.

Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said that delegations should have the possibility of suggesting other sub-items for item 1 at a later stage.

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) expressed doubt as to the advisability of retaining sub-item 2 (a); its inclusion would unduly enlarge the scope of the Conference's work and the question of renunciation of the production or acquisition of nuclear weapons by non-nuclear-weapon States would, in any case, be covered by the conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty, a matter to which the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament was according high priority. He also reserved his position regarding the inclusion of sub-item 2 (b), although he felt that studies on the economic implications of production and acquisition of nuclear weapons by non-nuclear-weapon States would undoubtedly provide the Conference with useful background material.

Item 2 should include sub-items relating to ways in which the non-nuclear-weapon States could co-operate to increase their security, both independently of the nuclear Powers and as a supplement to guarantees granted by those Powers; for example, reciprocal inspection through bilateral arrangements. His delegation would make further suggestions along those lines in its working paper, and there were other, similar ideas which the Conference could fruitfully discuss, such as the concept of the non-nuclear club which had been put forward by Sweden some years before but had never been fully explored. In that connexion, it would be helpful if the Secretariat could prepare a short summary of the suggestions put forward in United Nations bodies regarding ways in which the non-nuclear-weapon States could co-operate to prevent proliferation and increase their own security.

Mr. PANZO (Malta) observed that the granting of security guarantees by the nuclear Powers might involve the presence of nuclear weapons on the territory of non-nuclear-weapon States. Consequently, a sub-item should be included to read: "Co-operation between non-nuclear-weapon States in avoiding the presence of nuclear weapons on their territory."
Mr. Mirza (Pakistan) supported the Maltese suggestion. Every effort should be made to avoid the presence of nuclear weapons on the territory of non-nuclear-weapon States, for that would lead to increased nuclearization and heightened international tension, thus producing results diametrically opposed to those which the Conference was designed to achieve.

Mr. Zoliner (Dahomey) said that sub-item 2 (b) seemed to be out of place in item 2; the subject of economic implications was, however, an interesting one to which the Conference should devote some attention. The security and economic implications of the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons by non-nuclear-weapon States could perhaps form the subject of a preliminary discussion at the Conference, before the agenda proper was taken up.

Mr. Shah (Pakistan) observed that the final form of the agenda would be influenced by the Committee's decisions on other matters, such as the question whether and in what way the nuclear Powers should be associated with the Conference. If those Powers were invited, they would have to participate in the Conference's deliberations to some extent, and their experience would enable them to make a constructive contribution. The Committee should also devote more attention to the matter of the documentation for the Conference. The best plan might be to have three main documents, corresponding to items 1, 2 and 3 of the agenda suggested by the Bureau.

The Chairman, summing up, suggested that sub-item 2 (a) should be retained in its present form; sub-item 2 (b) would be deleted and replaced by the item suggested by the Maltese representative. The Committee would bear in mind the possibility of proposing that the Conference should hold a preliminary discussion on the security and economic implications of the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons by non-nuclear-weapon States, as suggested by the Dahomean representative. In accordance with the Pakistan representative's suggestion, the Secretariat, after discussions with the Bureau, would prepare a short summary of the suggestions put forward in the United Nations bodies regarding ways in which the non-nuclear-weapon States would co-operate to prevent proliferation and increase their own security.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.