

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1643rd
MEETING**

Tuesday, 17 December 1968,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| Agenda items 27 and 96: | |
| Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (<i>concluded</i>) | |
| Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: Final Document of the Conference (<i>concluded</i>) | 1 |

Chairman: Mr. Piero VINCI (Italy).

AGENDA ITEMS 27 AND 96

Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*concluded) (A/7189-DC/231, A/C.1/L.449/Rev.1)**

Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: Final Document of the Conference (*concluded) (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/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.452, A/C.1/L.456, A/C.1/L.458, A/C.1/L.459/Rev.1 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.460 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.462 and Add.1)**

1. The CHAIRMAN: Members of the Committee will have noticed that in the general summary, draft resolutions which were tabled have been withdrawn, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/L.450 and A/C.1/L.451. In order to put the Committee in a position to know exactly which draft resolutions it is called upon to pronounce itself, I would give the floor to the representative of Lebanon.

2. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon): Last week the representative of Cyprus in introducing the revised draft of which he is a co-sponsor, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/L.449/Rev.1, said he was doing that in response to the observations which were made by some delegations in this Committee and in the light of some consultations he has had with other delegations outside this hall.

3. The delegation of Lebanon was one of those delegations which the representative of Cyprus consulted, and we are very appreciative of the fact that he was kind enough to reconsider the first draft which he had submitted to this Committee and to come up with the revised draft in document A/C.1/L.449/Rev.1. We were of the opinion then that the draft, as submitted, was very wide in scope and that there are certain organs of the United Nations concerned dealing with the problems we have referred to in this draft, namely, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the question of economic development.

4. While we admit that there is a link between them and disarmament, we were nevertheless all of the opinion that,

* Resumed from the 1640th meeting.

for many reasons, those subjects could better be dealt with in particular organs and the committees. For his understanding, the delegation of Lebanon is very thankful.

5. I asked for the floor this morning in order to make a few comments on the draft resolution in its revised form. Of course, the preambular paragraphs are part and parcel of any resolution. They sort of prepare the ground for the operative section. I submit my remarks specifically to operative paragraph 1, sub-section (a). In that draft the Disarmament Commission, as soon as it reconvenes some time in the future, is being requested to give studied consideration to the problem of disarmament in its relations to international security through the United Nations, with a view to an integrated solution.

6. This is not a new concept. Some delegations find that such a proposal entails certain constitutional difficulties, and in the mind of some, it might amount to a revision of the Charter, while for others such constitutional difficulties do not arise. Definitely, they did not arise in the mind of the representative of Cyprus, nor do they arise for the delegation of Lebanon. We find that such a request is definitely constitutional; moreover such a concept has been treated in the work of the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations in the past, and it is now being treated in the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, for disarmament is intimately linked to security and one cannot treat one without treating the other.

7. As a matter of fact, in the draft resolution submitted to us the other day by the representative of Pakistan in document A/C.1/L.458, if one were to read operative paragraph 7, sub-section (a), one would see that the Disarmament Commission would be requested, if it meets in 1970, to consider disarmament and the related question of the security of nations. It cannot be argued that the concept of the security of nations is alien to the concept of international security. We submit that when we speak of the security of nations we are speaking of international security, because the two are one, and they cannot be separated because there is no individual security for any nation unless it is approached and conceived within the framework of an international security system. This is why we think that all those who have spoken in this Committee have accepted such an approach, and we do not think it is alien to the work of the Disarmament Commission.

8. I would cite a few other examples besides the draft I have referred to. I should like to quote what the representative of the Soviet Union had to say on 28 November:

"There is no doubt that security and disarmament are so closely linked that they are two parts of one single whole."* [1624th meeting, para. 14.]

* Provisional English version taken from the interpretation.

9. The representative of the United States, speaking before that time, namely, on 19 November, stated in this Committee:

"... we believe that the United Nations remains the best hope for achieving security on a universal basis, for any attempt to erect separate universal security guarantees alongside the United Nations framework would be subject to the same factors which have inhibited the further development of the United Nations security system itself. Furthermore, if such a universal security structure were created, even partly outside and in apparent competition with the United Nations, it would lack the legal framework provided by the United Nations Charter—a legal framework which protects the sovereign equality and general interests of all Member States." [1611th meeting, para. 67.]

10. We do not believe that the proposal of the representative of Cyprus is intended to fall outside the United Nations régime. It falls, as we interpret it, and as we understood it, within the United Nations Charter régime and within the security provisions provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and in the work of the various organs. That is why we take this position and why we believe that when a draft resolution is submitted one has to have time in order to consider it in all its aspects and one has to go thoroughly through it. When the representative of Cyprus submitted his draft resolution, I am sure he did not have enough time to consult each delegation or the various groups represented in this Committee. I am sure many of them would have certain comments on almost every paragraph or most of the paragraphs. I know that some time today we have to conclude our work on the items concerning disarmament.

11. The representative of Cyprus will have, if at this stage he does not press this draft resolution to a vote, ample time to establish contacts with the various groups and with the various schools of thought. He will have time to explain his position, to argue with those who see that there are constitutional implications, and to defend his point. If he sees that during the next year there are grounds for reintroducing this draft resolution he will be within the exercise of his sovereign right, as a representative of a sovereign State, to do so.

12. Because of the friendly relations which exist between my country and his country, and because of the close co-operation which has always existed between his delegation and my delegation, I do appeal to the representative of Cyprus, in order to help this Committee in expediting its work, not to press his draft resolution to a vote. I do this with the assurance to him that we view his position with sympathy, and we appreciate very much the reasons which prompted him to submit this draft resolution for consideration by the First Committee.

13. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Austria, who has asked to speak in connexion with the appeal made by the representative of Lebanon.

14. Mr. HAYMERLE (Austria): In the course of the past debate, a great number of delegations have submitted proposals or suggestions to the Committee on possible action which the General Assembly might take on the basis of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States.

15. The co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.458 are confident that that draft resolution, which is the result of long and very serious efforts on behalf of many delegations, does now incorporate the greatest possible number of the various proposals made in this Committee.

16. As the Committee is aware, draft resolution A/C.1/L.458 incorporates in particular the various ideas which its co-sponsors had previously proposed in draft resolutions A/C.1/L.450 and A/C.1/L.451.

17. We feel, however, that the new compromise draft resolution also comprises most of the concepts which motivated the representative of Cyprus in presenting his delegation's draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.449/Rev.1. We are sure that if a session of the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations were to be convened in 1970 in accordance with operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.458, the Disarmament Commission would give thorough and studied consideration to the problem of disarmament and to the related questions of international security. This is, indeed, the mandate envisaged for the United Nations Disarmament Commission in operative paragraph 7 (a) of draft resolution A/C.1/L.458.

18. While fully appreciating the commendable proposal by the representative of Cyprus, the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.458 would like to join the representative of Lebanon in the hope that the representative of Cyprus will be in a position not to insist that his draft resolution be put to a vote.

19. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I sincerely appreciate the statement by the representative of Lebanon in the sense that he understands the purpose, meaning and importance of the draft resolution that I had introduced. I am also grateful to the representative of Austria for what he has said with regard to the meaning of paragraph 7 (a) of draft resolution A/C.1/L.458.

20. Indeed, if we compare this draft resolution with the previous draft resolutions of the separate co-sponsors which joined in this draft resolution, we see that there was not then this paragraph, that is, that the Disarmament Commission, when it convenes, would consider disarmament in its relation to the question of the security of nations. I take it that when we speak of the "security of nations" we mean international security. The reason I used the term "international security" in my draft resolution was that that is the accepted term appearing in the Charter. However, I understand, and have already stated, that the "security of nations" means "international security".

21. With regard to the consideration of disarmament, I understand, and it is my interpretation of what the representative of Austria said, that when they speak of "to consider disarmament" they mean to have a studied consideration of disarmament in respect of that draft resolution. This does cover a part—not the whole—of my draft resolution. The draft resolution which my delegation supports was intended to lay emphasis on the need for international security, not only in respect of disarmament but in respect of the development of law and order in the international community. This is a subject which we have

close at heart because we are a small country; we are not dependent upon force, but we are depending on the United Nations in order that it might establish a degree of international order that will give security to the smaller nations so that the smaller nations, not being afraid of attack from outside, can devote their budgets and energies towards their own economic development, thus contributing to the bridging or the lessening of the wide gulf that divides them from the developed countries.

22. I hope that what has been done already in respect of this item by the introduction of the draft resolution [A/C.1/L.449/Rev.1] by Cyprus—because in a sense some of its meaning was introduced into draft resolution A/C.1/L.458 which was tabled on 13 December, whereas my draft resolution was tabled on 9 December—and the fact that discussion arose on the question of international security already pave the way for better understanding of the problem of international security in relation to disarmament; because it is true, as the representative of Lebanon pointed out and the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said, that international security and disarmament form one whole. We see, however, from the discussion which took place in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament that efforts were directed towards the aspects of disarmament and hardly any towards international security. That is the problem that arises for us—that further efforts in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament should be centred equally upon international security and not only on the various plans for disarmament. If my draft resolution has brought a sense of urgency to deal with matters of international security, I think my delegation has attained its end to a certain extent.

23. We would, in the light of this statement, and of draft resolution A/C.1/L.458, and in view of the fact that we have more time to work upon this concept, agree to the appeal made to us not to insist on pressing to a vote at this session the draft resolution. This is done in the hope that, as was suggested by the representative of Lebanon, we shall have occasion to work on this subject more amply within the intervening time between now and the next General Assembly, when we have every reason to hope that there will be further devotion to the concept of international security.

24. A further reason that makes us not press this draft resolution to a vote this year is that in any case the suggested convening of the Disarmament Commission would be in 1970 at the earliest—because in draft resolution A/C.1/L.458 the question of convening the Disarmament Commission would be decided by the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session. So there is no need to press this aspect at the present moment—not until the convening of the Disarmament Commission is decided upon.

25. For these reasons I will not press my draft resolution A/C.1/L.449/Rev.1 to a vote. I hope that it has attained its purpose and that by next year we will have a better atmosphere for achieving better results.

26. The CHAIRMAN: After the statement made by the representative of Cyprus, in response to the appeal made by the representative of Lebanon and seconded by the representative of Austria, I think it will help the members

of the Committee if I list the draft resolutions before the Committee upon which members will be called to pronounce themselves. They are:

(a) Draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.452, sponsored by two delegations;

(b) Draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.458, sponsored by twelve delegations;

(c) Draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.459/Rev.1 and Add.1, which is sponsored now by Ireland, bringing the number of co-sponsors to twenty-seven;

(d) Draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.460 and Add.1, which is also co-sponsored by Ireland and now has twenty-four co-sponsors;

(e) Draft resolution A/C.1/L.462 and Add.1, which Ireland has also decided to co-sponsor, bringing the number of co-sponsors to thirteen;

(f) Finally, document A/C.1/L.456, concerning the administrative implications connected with draft resolutions before the Committee.

27. I give the floor now in explanation of vote to the first speaker on my list, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

28. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet Union's position with regard to the draft resolutions relating to the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States, previously contained in documents A/C.1/L.450 and A/C.1/L.451, was expounded in detail by my delegation in this Committee on 9 December [1634th meeting]. Today the Committee has before it a new draft resolution [A/C.1/L.458], representing a merger of the two earlier texts by the sponsors. Having carefully studied the new draft, my delegation must say that the considerations of principle put forward in its statement of 9 December fully apply to the merged draft resolution.

29. To begin with, this draft resolution still provides for the approval of the declaration of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States, which, it will be remembered, orients the United Nations towards the convening of another conference of such States and diverts it from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

30. Secondly, it is significant that the new draft, like the old ones, omits any reference to the Treaty, a circumstance alarming in itself. It is so abnormal that it cannot be disregarded, especially if we remember that among the co-sponsors of the draft resolution there are a good many countries which still have not acceded to the Treaty and some of which openly declare that they will not accede to it.

31. Thirdly, the draft resolution attempts to prejudge the issue by providing that all the Conference's decisions without exception, whether they are constructive or not, should be implemented. The adoption of such a resolution would mean not only that the General Assembly approves

all the recommendations in question, but that their implementation is obligatory. Such an approach is basically wrong.

32. The Soviet Union holds that these recommendations must be closely scrutinized. The Committee should begin by examining only the constructive decisions of the Conference, rather than attempt at the present session to

of the establishment of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control.

41. In this connexion, I would draw attention to the fact that at its twelfth conference, held this year, the International Atomic Energy Agency has already decided to take certain practical steps, within the framework of the

62. To turn now to the draft resolution before us, we have studied with care the important statements of Ambassador Shahi and Ambassador Eschauzier [1640th meeting], introducing and supporting draft resolution A/C.1/L.458. In particular, it is clear that this draft resolution is the product of constructive compromise on the part of many delegations in this Committee. We are appreciative of the genuine spirit of conciliation which has motivated many delegations to develop a broadly acceptable solution.

63. There is, however, one paragraph in the draft resolution which it is not possible for my delegation to support. This is operative paragraph 1, which endorses the Declaration of the Non-Nuclear Conference. The reasons we would like to abstain regarding this paragraph are the following: first, we were non-voting participants at the Non-Nuclear Conference and, by virtue of this, we did not register our views on a number of the important issues which came

that the international body should perform to facilitate, at the appropriate time, the provision of peaceful nuclear explosion services, including the processing of requests for such services.

69. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which we believe is the international organization with the appropriate mandate, experience and technical background, has begun some studies of the kind described above in its traditional role of assembling and disseminating information concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Moreover, pursuant to a resolution adopted by the general conference of the IAEA at the annual meeting in September 1968, the Agency has initiated a study of the functions it might be called upon to perform and the procedures it might follow in assuming the role of the international body contemplated in the treaty. This study, which is to be reported on at the next annual General

Mexico. My Government welcomes the initiative of the countries of Latin America in making their continent the first inhabited nuclear-free zone in the world, and we hope that all signatories of the Treaty³ will follow the example of the six which have allowed it to enter into force in their own Territories, and that all States in the region will soon become parties to the Treaty.

84. We have expressed our support in a practical form by signing Additional Protocol I and Additional Protocol II⁴ to the Treaty. We hope that other countries will follow our example and that, in particular, those nuclear-weapon States which have not yet done so will sign Additional Protocol II.

85. My delegation will reluctantly vote against draft resolution A/C.1/L.460 and Add.1. We share with its sponsors the desire to initiate as soon as possible the

89. On paragraph 7, my Government, while voting for the draft resolution, does not of course consider itself committed in advance to supporting a meeting of the Disarmament Commission in 1970. The decision on this question should, in our view, be taken by the General Assembly in the light of the circumstances at the time.

90. Mr. BURNS (Canada): I should like to explain the Canadian delegation's vote on the resolutions we have before us. As co-sponsor of three of these resolutions we shall, of course, vote for them. We would point out at this time that in our opinion resolutions A/C.1/L.452 and A/C.1/L.458 deal with the same subject, but propose to deal with it in different ways, and that therefore in our judgement if we support resolution A/C.1/L.458, which of course we do as co-sponsor, we would be unable to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.452 and in fact would be obliged to vote against it, not so much for what it

clarifying a number of points and in harmonizing the views of non-nuclear Powers on the best means of proceeding with the subject of disarmament. Because of this we see as a logical next step a negotiation based on those decisions between the non-nuclear-weapon States and the nuclear Powers, as it is the humble view of my delegation that no progress can be achieved on the subject of disarmament without the co-operation of the nuclear Powers. It does not appear to us that this co-operation would be readily obtained by seeking to impose further obligations on nuclear Powers without the non-nuclear Powers themselves accepting a certain degree of restraint. One form of acceptable restraint can be found within the non-proliferation Treaty. It is the view of my delegation that if non-nuclear States would meet on the signature and

112. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): Since references have been made here repeatedly to the resolution adopted by the General Conference of IAEA on 30 September 1968,⁸ citing it as the main reason why the representatives who have referred to it are unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/L.460 and Add.1, my delegation feels it must make certain clarifications regarding that resolution.

113. After a careful study of the pertinent records, the least that can be said in our opinion is that the debate on the adoption of that resolution does no credit to any international organization; and I will explain briefly why we feel strongly that this is so.

143. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.458 and Add.1. A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 1 of the operative part.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 84 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.

144. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Albania, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Cuba, Guinea, Mauritania, Sierra Leone, Syria.

Draft resolution A/C.1/L.458 and Add.1 was adopted by 87 votes to 8, with 6 abstentions.

145. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Hungary has asked to speak on a point of order.

146. Mr. BECK (Hungary) (*translated from Spanish*): In view of the fact that the Committee decided to give priority to the draft resolution which has just been put to the vote, the delegation of Bulgaria and my own delegation will not at present press for a vote on our draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.452.

147. The CHAIRMAN: In view of the statement made by the representative of Hungary, I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.459/Rev.1 and Add.1.

The draft resolution was adopted by 83 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

148. The CHAIRMAN: Before putting draft resolution A/C.1/L.460 and Add.1 to the vote, I shall call on the Committee Secretary to make a short statement.

149. Mr. VELLODI (Secretary of the Committee): In accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure, the Secretary-General wishes to inform the Committee of the financial implications of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/L.460 and Add.1.

150. Operative paragraph 1 of that draft:

“Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, in consultation with the States Members of the United Nations, of its specialized agencies and of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and with the co-operation of the latter and of those specialized agencies that he may consider pertinent, a report on the establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, under appropriate international control.”

151. The consultations envisaged in operative paragraph 1 may be expected to require travel by Headquarters staff to certain offices of the specialized agencies and the IAEA at a total cost of approximately \$2,500.

152. May I also in this connexion draw the attention of members to the fact that document A/C.1/L.456, which is before the Committee and which has been presented in connexion with documents A/C.1/L.450, A/C.1/L.451 and A/C.1/L.452, applies to the new draft resolution A/C.1/L.458 and Add.1.

153. The CHAIRMAN: A roll-call vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/L.460 and Add.1.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

Belgium, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Belgium, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Cuba, Denmark, France, Greece, Guinea, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Mauritania, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, Rwanda, Somalia, South Africa, Swaziland, Syria, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Algeria, Australia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 59 votes to 9, with 35 abstentions.

154. The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.462 and Add.1 and 2.

The draft resolution was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

155. The CHAIRMAN: I will now give the floor to the only speaker who would like to explain his vote after the voting. I give the floor to the representative of the United Arab Republic.

156. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic): I shall be very brief and I shall confine my explanation of vote to the draft resolution on which my delegation did not find it possible to cast an affirmative vote. I refer to draft resolution A/C.1/L.460 and Add.1. My delegation appreciates the efforts of the Council. We take note of the fact

that it has taken account of the observations made at the Geneva Conference on the draft resolutions which were submitted. We also note that the resolution envisages only the study of a preliminary report.

157. We did not find it possible to cast an affirmative vote and we abstained on the voting owing to the fact that the draft resolution did not contain adequately what we deemed to be the necessary reference to article 5 of the non-proliferation Treaty.

158. The CHAIRMAN: We have disposed of the items relating to disarmament and will take up this afternoon the item concerning international co-operation on the peaceful uses of outer space.

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.