

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



UNITED NATIONS
CENTRE FOR DISARMAMENT
DEPARTMENT OF
GENERAL AND SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS
Reference Library
Distr. GENERAL
A/CONF.35/PC/SR.4
7 August 1967

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE CONFERENCE OF
NON-NUCLEAR-WEAPON STATES

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 6 July 1967, at 3.30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Consideration of General Assembly resolution 2153 B (XXI)
(A/CONF.35/PC/L.4) (continued)

PRESENT:

| | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|---|
| <u>Chairman:</u> | Mr. NABWERA | (Kenya) |
| <u>Rapporteur:</u> | Mr. LAI | (Malaysia) |
| <u>Members:</u> | Mr. FIGUEROA | Chile |
| | Mr. NYAMWEYA | Kenya |
| | Mr. AZNAM | Malaysia |
| | Mr. GAUCI | Malta |
| | Mr. MOHAMMED | Nigeria |
| | Mr. MIRZA | Pakistan |
| | Mr. MACKENHENIE | Peru |
| | Mr. AZNAR | Spain |
| | Mr. MTINGWA | United Republic of Tanzania |
| <u>Secretariat:</u> | Mr. NESTERENKO | Under-Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs |
| | Mr. FREY | Secretary of the Committee |

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

Mr. LAI (Malaysia), Rapporteur, announced that, with the assistance of the Secretariat, it would be possible to draw upon the relevant current material of the various United Nations organs dealing with disarmament. In accordance with United Nations practice, it would be advisable for the papers which the Committee might request to be presented by the Rapporteur, who would act as a link between the Committee, the Bureau and the Secretariat. He hoped to produce a list of well-defined subjects which might lend themselves to treatment by the Secretariat, and would consult the members of the Committee and the Secretariat. The list would, of course, remain open and any suggestions made in subsequent meetings would be taken into account.

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) supported the Rapporteur's suggestions. The Committee should ask the Secretariat to prepare three main documents, corresponding to items 1, 2 and 3 of the agenda outline suggested by the Bureau, which would enable the Committee to define specific items for inclusion in the Conference's agenda. The documents would be particularly useful if it was decided to prepare an annotated agenda.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume its consideration of the draft agenda.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta) proposed that the words "including the establishment of nuclear free zones" should be added at the end of the new sub-item 2 (b) adopted at the previous meeting. He also suggested the insertion of a new sub-item 2 (c), to read: "Action by non-nuclear-weapon States to promote an international convention prohibiting the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons against countries that have unconditionally renounced the possession of such weapons".

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) said that he could accept the Maltese representative's constructive suggestions, on the understanding that the sequence in the agenda of the sub-items concerned would remain open. The text suggested for sub-item 2 (c) could equally well be inserted under item 4.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should provisionally adopt the wording suggested by the Maltese representative.

It was so agreed.

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) proposed the insertion of a new sub-item 2 (d), to read: "Provision for bilateral and multilateral inspection on a reciprocal basis of nuclear establishments for peaceful purposes in the non-nuclear-weapon States". The principle of inspection had long been a basic element of disarmament plans. An inspection system would, of course, involve difficulties, but they could be solved by the Conference.

It was so agreed.

In reply to a question from Mr. GAUCI (Malta), Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) observed that it was essential to the Conference's work to distinguish between non-nuclear States and non-nuclear-weapon States. A State could possess nuclear reactors and employ nuclear technology on a large scale for peaceful purposes without possessing nuclear weapons.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider item 3.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta) proposed the insertion of a new sub-item 3 (b), to read: "Assistance to non-nuclear-weapon States in the implementation of programmes connected with peaceful uses of atomic energy". The present sub-item 3 (b) should become sub-item 3 (c), and the words "the benefit of" should be inserted after the word "for".

It was so agreed.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider item 4.

In reply to a question from Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan), Mr. LAI (Malaysia), Rapporteur, explained that item 4 had been included because the Bureau felt that some form of institutional machinery associating both nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States would be needed to implement any decisions the Conference might take.

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) said that implementation would be one of the most important matters before the Conference. There were various possible implementation methods: for example, existing United Nations organs could be used, and in that connexion it would be necessary to consider the potential roles of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Four of the five nuclear-weapon States were members of the Council, which could thus constitute an institutional link between them and the non-nuclear-weapon States. The Conference's decisions could also be implemented through an international convention or conventions. In that case it

/...

(Mr. Mirza, Pakistan)

would be necessary to decide whether the convention should be drawn up under United Nations auspices and what relationship, if any, should be established between the implementation machinery provided for in the convention and the United Nations system. Sub-items covering those and other related matters should be inserted under item 4.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) agreed that a number of sub-items would have to be inserted under item 4. In his view, they should correspond to the three main ways in which the Conference's decisions could be implemented, i.e., through an international convention or conventions, through the General Assembly and through the Security Council.

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) pointed out that the tentative cost estimates of the Conference (A/CONF.35/PC/L.4) were based on the assumption that there would be no more than two meetings a day. He very much doubted whether that would be sufficient. The Conference was to consider three main topics of capital importance and discussion was likely to be prolonged, the more so if nuclear-weapon States were represented. Two committees would have to be set up, in addition to the Credentials Committee and the General Committee, and allowance should therefore be made for four meetings per day and the estimates revised accordingly.

The question of pre-conference documentation was also highly significant. The participants would, in the main, be developing countries lacking nuclear expertise. If they were to hold their own in debates with nuclear-weapon States, whose delegations would be advised by nuclear experts, they must have adequate documentation. A panel of six to eight expert consultants might therefore be engaged to prepare three papers on the three main topics. The papers should be ready some twelve weeks in advance of the Conference to allow Governments time to formulate their comments. An estimate of the additional cost involved should be prepared for approval by the General Assembly.

An early decision by the Committee was required on the association of nuclear-weapon States with the Conference. Once it had been decided whether they were to participate as observers or full members, the Committee could consider preparing rules of procedure for recommendation to the General Assembly. If it was decided that nuclear-weapon States should participate in the Conference on an equal footing,

/...

(Mr. Mirza, Pakistan)

the Chairman could consult them informally to obtain their views on such matters as the agenda of the Conference.

The Committee's report must be as comprehensive as possible since it would be the last to be submitted to the Assembly before the Conference and issues omitted would not benefit from discussion by that body.

Mr. FREY (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to the statement in paragraph 3 (h) of document A/CONF.35/PC/L.4 that the extent to which additional temporary staff, including consultants, would be required could not be estimated at the present time since it would depend upon decisions to be taken by the Preparatory Committee. While it would have been possible to model the tentative cost estimates of the Conference on those of similar conferences, it was more realistic to await the agenda of the Conference. There would be no difficulty in revising the cost estimates once the Secretariat had more specific and comprehensive instructions.

The CHAIRMAN said that the estimates in document A/CONF.35/PC/L.4 were acceptable until such time as the Committee was in a position to give the Secretariat more detailed guidance.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that the scope and complexity of the subjects to be discussed at the Conference were becoming increasingly apparent and implied that various committees would be needed, working separately and concurrently with the plenary Conference. The latter would account for two meetings per day and the only alternative to making provision for more meetings would be to prolong the Conference.

One of the most important assumptions the Secretariat had made in preparing the estimates was that the Conference should be at Headquarters or Geneva. He would like to know what factors had led to that assumption. The tenor of the debate had indicated that the venue should be left flexible.

Mr. FREY (Secretary of the Committee) said that, in the absence of an official invitation from a Member State, it was the usual practice to base the cost estimates of conferences on the assumption that they would be held at Headquarters or Geneva. The Secretariat had made tentative and unofficial inquiries

(Mr. Frey, Secretary of the Committee)

as to the cost of holding the Conference at one or two other sites, although there was so far no indication that any State would invite the Conference. The question of an alternative venue and of the frequency and number of meetings might be referred to the Under-Secretary for Conference Services for a detailed statement at a later stage. In that connexion, the working paper which the delegation of Pakistan had offered to prepare would be most useful.

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) explained that the working paper in question was to be restricted to the agenda of the Conference; it would not deal with matters such as its duration and cost. Specific items on which the Preparatory Committee should now take a decision were: the association of nuclear-weapon States (a decision on which many other decisions depended), the final agenda of the Conference for approval by the General Assembly, tentative rules of procedure and a request to the Secretariat for revised cost estimates in the light of the instructions to be submitted by the Committee.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that the five items enumerated by the Pakistan delegation were a useful basis for further discussion. The Committee should proceed to take them up at its next meeting.

The CHAIRMAN said that it would be difficult to reach a decision at the present stage. It was his understanding that the Bureau would prepare an agenda for the Conference on the basis of the ideas advanced during the debate.

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) said that all five items could be decided on in a very few meetings.

After a short discussion, the CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the intensive informal consultations taking place in connexion with the Middle East situation, the Committee should next meet after the conclusion of the current emergency session of the General Assembly.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.