THE Preparatory Committee for the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States this morning decided to entrust to its officers the preparation of a working paper regarding the future work of the Committee, including the question of liaison with the Geneva Disarmament Conference and invitations to both non-nuclear States and nuclear States to give their views to the Committee.

The Chairman, Burudi Nabwera (Kenya), said the Committee will meet again after preparation of the working paper and after preliminary contacts with non-members of the Committee on the ascertainment of their views.

Statements were made today by the representatives of Spain, Kuwait, Malta, Chile, United Republic of Tanzania and Pakistan.

Manuel Aznar (Spain) said the Committee should keep in mind that its task is to prepare for the Conference, and it should not go into the substance of the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

In his view, the Committee should consider ways and means of hearing the views of members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies not represented in the Committee on the agenda for the Conference. He said association of the nuclear weapon States with the Committee and the Conference itself was a matter of overriding importance.

He said the Committee should be careful not to take a demagogic attitude toward the views of any of the great Powers on this subject.

(more)

* Members of the Preparatory Committee are Chile, Dahomey, Kenya, Kuwait, Malaysia, Malta, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Spain and the United Republic of Tanzania.
Soubhi J. Khanachet (Kuwait) said there were two parts to the terms of reference of the Committee. They were to prepare for the Conference, including such matters as the date, venue, membership and preparation of papers, and the question of negotiations with the nuclear Powers regarding association with the Conference.

He suggested a working paper be prepared on these aspects by the Committee officers.

José Piñera Carvallo (Chile) said success of the Conference depended on the active participation of the non-nuclear States and the Committee should bear in mind the fact that some of those States were near to achieving a nuclear capability. The work of the Committee was made difficult, in his view, by the large number of abstentions on the resolution setting up the Committee.

Mr. Khanachet (Kuwait) suggested that the working paper also contain a provisional agenda for the Conference.

Arvid Prado (Malta) suggested that some attempt be made to define certain of the terms used in the resolution creating the Committee. What was meant, for instance, by the statement that the security of non-nuclear States should be assured? Was this security against a nuclear threat or all weapons of mass destruction?

Also, he continued, what was meant by "proliferation"? Was the term to be considered, as the representative of India has used it in the First Committee (Political and Security), to cover acquisition of more weapons by nuclear Powers or in the restricted sense of acquisition of nuclear weapons by non-nuclear States?

He hoped the Secretariat would also be able to elucidate what the Conference was to do regarding the use of nuclear devices for purely peaceful purposes.

Mr. Prado suggested that there should be liaison with the Geneva disarmament talks.

M.A. Fomu (United Republic of Tanzania) said that if the working document covered the enormous field of interpreting the term "proliferation" it would make the work involved gigantic, since this entailed both technical and political interpretations.
He said such a task could only be done by the Committee as a whole through the interpretation given in members’ statements.

S.A. Pasha (Pakistan) said the Assembly had clearly decided what the Committee had to do since the Assembly had pronounced itself on the Conference and the subjects involved. The Committee should consider venue, date, invitations and administrative arrangements.

On the question of venue, he said that unless invitations were received to meet elsewhere, it would have to be either New York or Geneva. The date would depend on the work of the Geneva Committee. As for participation, he said it was of the utmost importance that those countries on the threshold of a nuclear capability attend.

He did not think the Secretariat should be burdened with the intricacies of defining “proliferation” and “security”.

Mr. Khanacet (Kuwait) said the matters raised by the representative of Malta were important but they were not within the terms of reference of the Committee.

Mr. Prado (Malta) said he did not insist on his suggestions. However, he said the success of the Conference undoubtedly depended on a detailed agenda which he assumed the Committee would draw up.

Without that detail, he said, he feared that the response to invitations, particularly by the nuclear States, would not be too favourable.

* *** *