

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
38th meeting
held on
Friday, 18 November 1977
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 38th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)
(Vice-Chairman)

later: Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 38: INCENDIARY AND OTHER SPECIFIC CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE THE SUBJECT OF PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE FOR HUMANITARIAN REASONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 40: URGENT NEED FOR CESSATION OF NUCLEAR AND THERMONUCLEAR TESTS AND CONCLUSION OF A TREATY DESIGNED TO ACHIEVE A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 45: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: CONCLUSION OF A TREATY ON THE COMPLETE AND GENERAL PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR-WEAPON TESTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 51: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued):

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY;
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 52: SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT: REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 53: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/32/PV.38
21 November 1977

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 38, 40, 45, 49, 51, 52, 53 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: As members of the Committee will recall, when we adjourned the meeting before lunch today we were dealing with draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.7 relating to the agenda item entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". We were in the process of having delegations explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. DHAN (India): The position of the Indian delegation in regard to Pakistan's draft resolution concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia needs to be placed on record. The Prime Minister of India has categorically stated that India is opposed to nuclear weapons and has no intention of exercising the nuclear-weapon option. India's interest in nuclear technology is only for peaceful and development purposes, and India will not allow that limited interest to be impeded in any way.

India remains opposed to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and similar agreements that are discriminatory.

(Mr. Dhan, India)

Secondly, in the light of that policy, my delegation has examined the draft resolution introduced by Pakistan. In our view the whole world should be free of nuclear weapons. Subregionalization of our concept of a world free of nuclear weapons will not only be inconsistent with our global approach to that question but will also divert it from a universal to a subregional or regional concept.

Thirdly, in our opinion, regional nuclear-weapon-free zones will not help to combat the nuclear threat to the world at large; on the contrary, they provide an advantage to nuclear-weapon States, since nuclear weapons and their delivery systems are, after all, intercontinental in nature. Therefore, we remain opposed as in the past to South Asia, an artificially restricted area, being declared a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

We wish also to place on record that, in view of our strong reservations regarding Pakistan's proposal, we cannot agree to co-operate in its implementation. However, there are other countries in South Asia which may have different views. We shall therefore abstain from voting.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.7 under agenda item 45, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

The draft resolution was adopted by 71 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. ASHE (United Kingdom): It was with great regret that my delegation felt obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.7 setting out a thoughtful proposal by Pakistan on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. We believe that the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones can make a useful contribution to international efforts to reinforce nuclear non-proliferation, and we therefore support the general principle.

However, we have long subscribed to certain criteria, which are now widely accepted, governing the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Two of those principles are, first, that the decision to form such a zone should be taken freely and voluntarily by the States in the region concerned, and secondly that such zones should be set up with the agreement of all the States of the region. We believe that those criteria have universal relevance as much for our own geographical area as for any other. In view of those criteria it does not therefore seem to us appropriate that the General Assembly should recommend the establishment of any particular zone when the opposition of a State or States of the region concerned has been made quite manifest. That is why, though having the greatest sympathy with the efforts of the Pakistani delegation, we have felt unable to give our support to this proposal.

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): The Swedish Government has often expressed its support of regional initiatives aiming at disarmament, including nuclear-weapon-free zones. An active co-operation among all States of the region must, however, be the basis for such regional commitment. When the States have been able to agree and a nuclear-weapon-free zone has been clearly defined, it will be appropriate for the General Assembly to confirm the establishment of that zone.

The Swedish Government would welcome the submission next year of a draft resolution supported by all States of the region. At the present stage, however, the Swedish delegation was not in a position to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.7 and therefore abstained in the voting.

Mr. YEO (Malaysia): My delegation supports in principle the concept of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world. We believe that it not only serves to curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons but at the same time induces countries to seek mutual restraining measures that would help create confidence and stability in the region concerned. Our support is also in conformity with the objectives of our proposal for the establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South Asia. It is for this reason that my delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.7.

(Mr. Yeo, Malaysia)

However, while giving our support, my delegation nevertheless feels that acceptance by all the States of the region concerned is essential, and, this can only be achieved through prior consultations and negotiations. We hope that it will be possible for such consultations to take place in order to secure the unanimous support of all the countries in the region for the proposal.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): My delegation wishes to explain its favourable vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.7 which has just been adopted.

My delegation fully understands the desire of many of the countries concerned not to allow South Asia to be nuclearized and instead to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region. We consider that the establishment of such a zone would contribute to the achievement of the over-all objective of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as well as to the peace and security of South Asia.

My delegation supported the adoption of the draft resolution. We consider it indispensable, however, that agreement be reached among the countries concerned within a reasonable time and at the latest before such a zone is established, first, to reach a common understanding among not only the countries in the region but major world Powers as well on such important issues as the detailed concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone and the limits of the zone; secondly, to establish an effective safeguards system embracing inspection and verification; thirdly to ensure that a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia is consistent with the principles of international law, including the principle of freedom of navigation on the high seas.

My delegation considers it desirable also for the countries of the region to become parties to the existing treaties relating to disarmament, in particular, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the partial test-ban Treaty and the sea-bed Treaty, in order to maintain and promote peace and security in the region.

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

Finally, my delegation hopes that all the countries concerned will continue their efforts to achieve their objective of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Mr. CHAMPENOIS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): My delegation was not able to take part in the vote and I should like it to be taken into account that had we been able to be present we would have abstained. I should like to explain the reasons for that abstention on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

My country supports, in general, the idea of nuclear-weapon-free zones as well as all efforts to secure disarmament or arms limitation on a regional basis. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones can contribute, providing certain conditions are fulfilled, to strengthening security while effectively lessening the risk of nuclear proliferation. It was therefore with regret that my country would have abstained in the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan. In fact, Belgium remains true to the position of principle it has always adopted on this question. It considers that it is not opportune for the General Assembly to recommend, by a majority vote, that a denuclearized zone be established in any given region when this runs counter to the views expressed by one or more States of that region.

The study undertaken two years ago on nuclear-weapon-free zones proved that certain generally applicable criteria must be met if such zones were to be established; first, the decision must be taken in all sovereignty on the initiative of the States of the region; secondly, that decision must be shared by all the States of the region. In this case, and this year again, those criteria do not seem to us to have been met.

In the circumstances, my country can only confirm its attitude of abstention since we continue to hold a position of principle favourable to the establishment of a denuclearized zone in South Asia.

Mr. MASOODI (Thailand): My delegation was not able to be present during the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.7. Had we been in the room, my delegation would have voted^{ed} in favour of that draft resolution.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): Having been unavoidably absent from my place during the vote, I should like to request that an abstention be recorded in the name of Ireland in this connexion.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I only wish to say that had we been present during the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.7 we should have abstained.

Mr. ELIAV (Israel): Had Israel been here during the voting, our delegation would have abstained in the vote on the draft resolution and I hope this will be duly recorded in the proceedings of the Committee.

Mr. JAZIC (Yugoslavia): If the Yugoslav delegation had been present when the voting took place on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.7 we would have abstained, for the same reasons as we gave last year.

Mr. OAISA (Papua New Guinea): Had the delegation of Papua New Guinea been present during the voting we would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.7.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): My delegation was not present when draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.7 was put to the vote. If my delegation had been present it would have abstained.

Mr. KONDE (Guinea) (interpretation from French): I should like it to be placed on record that had the delegation of Guinea been present during the voting it would have voted in favour of this draft resolution.

Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia): I regret very much that I have to encroach on your time, Mr. Chairman. I only wish to record the observation of the Liberian delegation that had we been present we would have voted in favour of the draft resolution, and I should like it to be so recorded.

Mr. SCOURINHO (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): My delegation regrets that we were not present at the time of the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.7. We should like to emphasize that had we been present we would have abstained.

My delegation wishes to add that we are pleased with the efforts undertaken to create a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. We believe that these efforts will contribute to lessening the nuclear threat weighing over the States of the region and in general lessen the proliferation of nuclear weapons. However, such a plan, in the opinion of my delegation, must meet with the assent of all the States concerned in the region. This criterion seems not to have been met and it is for this reason that my delegation felt that it should abstain on this draft resolution.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I merely wish to state that I was not present when the vote was taken and also to place it on record that had I been present I would have voted "yes".

Mr. ABDUL RAHMAN (Sudan): I am sorry that my delegation was not present during the vote. If we had been present, we would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The statements by delegations not present during the voting will be duly noted. This concludes the explanations of vote after the vote. However, in another context, the representative of Pakistan has signified his wish to speak, and I now call on him.

Mr. SATTAR (Pakistan): Yesterday, before and after the adoption of the resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.8, on strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, the representatives of Canada, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States made statements in explanation of their votes. Similarly this afternoon, the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, Sweden, Malaysia, Japan, Belgium, the Lao People's Republic and others, particularly India, have made explanatory statements on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.7.

Some of the points that were made call for clarifications which, as the sponsor of the two draft resolutions, the Pakistan delegation considers necessary to provide.

The representative of the United Kingdom said in his statement yesterday that:

"The widest possible accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons would provide the best ... assurance for all parties."

(A/C.1/32/PV.35, p. 49-50)

The Pakistan delegation begs to differ. Nor is Pakistan alone in the belief that the Non-Proliferation Treaty does not contain adequate assurances for the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States. Notably, the delegation of Sweden expressed the view here that the existing assurances of non-use of nuclear weapons were not adequate. A large majority of the members of the Assembly have, by endorsing resolution 31/189 C last year, and the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.8 yesterday, supported the view that the non-nuclear-weapon States should be provided with stronger assurances for their security. As a country which was among those that from the beginning actively advocated the idea of a non-proliferation treaty, Pakistan has held the conviction that for the success of such a treaty it was necessary to take certain other measures simultaneously. These should include measures to safeguard the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

We noted with appreciation that the United States Government is receptive to the need for measures to enhance the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States and that the United States Government recognizes that:

"Some type of assurances regarding the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States could very well complement global non-proliferation efforts." (Ibid., p. 43-45)

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

The negative guarantee is, in our view, an essential element in the approach to the prevention of the proliferation of the nuclear weapons. Such a guarantee would reduce the apprehensions of the non-nuclear-weapon States and thus strengthen their determination not to acquire nuclear weapons for **their** defence.

We have also not failed to note that the United Kingdom will keep its policy in regard to the security concerns of non-nuclear-weapon States under regular review. We hope that other nuclear-weapon States which have not so far found it possible to support the draft resolution will also review their policy in the light of the continuing security concerns of non-nuclear-weapon States.

The representative of the Netherlands said that his delegation was not completely satisfied with the formulation of the draft resolution in regard to the security guarantee. The Pakistan delegation values his comment, particularly in view of his country's positive approach to this problem. We intend to seek more specific suggestions as to how the present formulation might be improved in order to make it more satisfactory. Our objective is that the nuclear-weapon States should give an undertaking not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. We are flexible as to the precise formulation and will be receptive to proposals which might meet the concerns of the nuclear-weapon States and most of their allies, which have so far not found it possible to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

We hope that the consultations will produce positive results and that at the special session of the General Assembly on Disarmament it may be possible to find a formulation that will command the widest possible support of the world community.

We would like now briefly to clarify the position in regard to some of the comments that have been made on the draft resolution concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia which has just been adopted.

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world has long been recognized by the General Assembly as one of the measures which can contribute most effectively to the objectives of non-proliferation and the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States members of

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

such nuclear-weapon-free zones. The concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone also in South Asia, has been endorsed, in principle, by the General Assembly since 1974. The fact that the large majority in favour of the draft resolution now includes another nuclear-weapon State, as well as some other States which abstained on such resolutions in past years, will certainly provide encouragement to Pakistan and to other States of South Asia that believe that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia will contribute significantly to the strengthening of the security of the States of the region, promote mutual confidence and lead to other beneficial measures for the improvement of good neighbourly relations among them.

(Mr. Sattar, Pakistan)

Some representatives have emphasized the point that voluntary co-operation among the States of the region is necessary for the establishment of the proposed zone. The Pakistan delegation is aware of this necessity. On its part, Pakistan has held consultations on a bilateral basis with some of the States of the region, and we will be more than happy if consultations can be held on a collective basis among all the States of the region.

It has been stated by the representative of India that South Asia is an artificially restricted area for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Of course, if the objective is to provide for the inclusion in the zone of such other neighbouring non-nuclear-weapon States as may be interested in participating in the zone, we certainly have no objection. We do not have any exclusive or narrow approach. In our opinion, the South Asian region is large enough for the establishment of the zone. Also, we take note that the representative of India has once again emphasized the commitment of the Government of India not to exercise the nuclear option. We particularly take note that India has not cast a negative vote. We hope that this augurs well for the success of further efforts to achieve the objective of denuclearizing South Asia.

Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation was absent from this room when the voting took place on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.7. Had we been present, we would have voted in favour of that draft resolution.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): I should like to make a brief comment on the remarks just made by the representative of Pakistan.

Most of his observations were devoted to draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.8, which was disposed of yesterday, and I should have thought that comments on an item already disposed of by the Committee were not perhaps strictly in order.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.7, which continues to be under the consideration of the Committee, I should like to reaffirm the position of my delegation on the proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the subregion of South Asia.

Indeed, the series of explanations of vote to which we have listened after the vote has made it quite clear that it is inadvisable to bring this matter to the United Nations without prior consultations and prior agreement among the regions of the States concerned. Indeed, the representative of Belgium said in his explanation of vote that it was not suitable for the General Assembly to recommend a nuclear-weapon-free zone to regions concerned.

In the same manner, Ambassador Fisher of the United States, in his explanation of vote yesterday, had mentioned that the United States favoured establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in appropriate regions of the world. And I repeat, the word used was "appropriate" and not "various" regions of the world.

We remain, as before, opposed to South Asia, an artificially restricted area, being declared a nuclear-weapon-free zone, and I should like to repeat that, in view of our strong reservations regarding that proposal, we cannot agree to co-operate in its implementation.

The CHAIRMAN: With those statements, we have concluded item 45, having dealt with the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.7, relating to the question of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Mr. TOWO ATANGANA (United Republic of Cameroon) (interpretation from French): I should like it to be recorded that if my delegation had been able to participate, at the beginning of this morning's meeting, in the voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.29, it would have voted in favour of it.

The CHAIRMAN: That will be duly recorded in the verbatim records of the Committee.

That concludes the business that was left over from our morning meeting, and the Committee will now be able to move on to the other disarmament items with which we still have to deal today.

It would be my intention - and I think this can be accomplished, as I said at the start of the morning meeting - to deal with all the remaining disarmament items this afternoon. I think it would be the common wish of the Committee to try to avoid, if possible, an evening meeting, and I would suggest that it would perhaps be preferable to envisage continuing this meeting perhaps until 7 o'clock. I believe that with the co-operation of delegations we will be able to finish our business by that time.

To help in that endeavour, I would suggest that we deal with the remaining items in the following order: first, item 52, relating to the special session; second, item 53, relating to the World Disarmament Conference; third, item 51, under general and complete disarmament, the draft resolution (A/C.1/32/L.13) relating to the periodical on disarmament; fourth, also under the item of general and complete disarmament, draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.28, relating to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT); fifth, items 40 and 49, cessation of nuclear-weapon tests; sixth, the item on general and complete disarmament relating to the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); and, lastly, the item relating to incendiary weapons, dealt with in draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.29.

(The Chairman)

Before the Committee proceeds to its consideration of the item on the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, I call on the representative of New Zealand, who I understand has an important statement to make in the context of items 40 and 49, relating to the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests.

Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to make a procedural statement at this stage which I hope will expedite the work of the Committee. Some delegations may have been surprised that draft resolutions A/C.1/32/L.23 and L.20, which were submitted some days ago under agenda items 40 and 49, have not been introduced in the Committee. The reason for that is that there have been some rather protracted and intensive negotiations aimed at reaching agreement among the sponsors on a single draft resolution which would be submitted under both agenda items and which would, it was hoped, command a very wide measure of support.

I am glad to say this afternoon that those negotiations have been successful. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.23 wish to announce that they are prepared to withdraw their draft on the understanding that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.20 will at the same time withdraw theirs, and that a new jointly agreed draft resolution will then be submitted immediately. The new draft resolution is to be submitted under both items. It is my understanding that this new draft resolution - which I note is just being distributed to members - will receive the support of the three nuclear-weapon States which have been negotiating on the question of a nuclear test ban in Geneva.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you and the Committee will be able to accept the procedure I have outlined, which I believe will lead to a successful outcome of the Committee's work on this important question at the current session.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the representative of Poland wishes to address the Committee on the same item.

Mr. PAWLAK (Poland): I should like to express on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.20 our satisfaction that as a result of intensive negotiations among the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/32/L.20 and L.23, it has been possible to agree upon the text of a single draft resolution under agenda items 40 and 49.

(Mr. Pawlak, Poland)

The positive outcome of the negotiations confirms once again that given good political will on the part of all interested parties it is possible to overcome existing difficulties and differences in the common interest of promoting the cause of disarmament.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.20 wish to announce their withdrawal of it.

The CHAIRMAN: With the statements of the representatives of New Zealand and Poland the business of this Committee this afternoon will be greatly facilitated.

I draw the attention of the Committee to the new combined draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.37, which the Committee will consider at the proper time.

I believe that it would be wise for the Committee now to continue consideration of the item relating to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and to follow the order which I suggested earlier. That procedure would also give delegations time to become familiar with the new combined draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37.

I now invite the attention of the Committee to agenda item 52, entitled "Special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament" and to draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.11. That draft resolution has financial implications which are dealt with in documents A/C.1/32/L.34 and L.35. Draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.11 has been sponsored by 58 delegations and was introduced in this Committee by the representative of Sri Lanka on 10 November 1977.

The resolution on the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was adopted by consensus at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly and the sponsors of the present draft resolution have expressed the wish that it also be adopted by consensus.

I understand that the representative of Argentina, who is Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session, wishes to make a statement.

Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to make some brief remarks with respect to document A/C.1/32/L.34, which sets out the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution on the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, contained in document A/C.1/32/L.11.

Among those financial implications, we read the following in paragraph 2 (b) (iii):

"Preparation of verbatim and summary records (Verbatim records for the plenary session, summary records for one meeting in the morning and one in the afternoon in respect of the Committee of the whole)."

Those financial implications were prepared by the Secretary-General no doubt taking into account existing standards. However, the provisions made for this type of special session lack precedents, since this will be the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament ever held by the United Nations. Therefore, while it is understandable that the Secretary-General has prepared a statement of financial implications on the basis of existing standards, I believe that the precedent that is applicable for this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is the one that we have of the General Assembly and the First Committee. That would mean that the plenary meetings of the special session and the meetings of its main and only Committee would receive the same coverage with respect to verbatim records as do the plenary meetings of the General Assembly and the meetings of the First Committee.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

I have had talks on this with several delegations - lack of time prevented me from consulting all delegations - but I believe that I am stating the view of all sectors if I say that for the special session devoted to disarmament the general feeling would be that both the Assembly itself and the single Committee should be provided with full verbatim records.

As regards the single Committee, it seems quite possible from our discussions in the Preparatory Committee, that it will set up subsidiary bodies for which no provision has been made in the document on financial implications. If such subsidiary bodies are set up we might provide summary records for them.

I believe that this is very important because, first of all, it is in the single Committee of the special session devoted to disarmament that the most important negotiations on the decisions to be taken by the Assembly are likely to take place. Since on disarmament matters every word counts, I am sure that delegations will wish to have full verbatim records so as to know exactly what was said.

Accordingly, I consider that this Committee should by consensus adopt a decision recommending that for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which is to be held from 23 May to 28 June 1978 if, as we hope, draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.11 is adopted, full verbatim records be provided both for plenary Assembly and its single main Committee, and that summary records be provided for any subsidiary bodies established.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Argentina and Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament for his statement. I understand that it was his proposal that, in addition to the provision made in the financial implications for verbatim records for the plenary meetings and for one Committee, provision should be made for summary records for any subsidiary bodies that might be established at the special session. He suggested that this Committee might want to accept that proposal by consensus. Should the Committee do so, I think that the Secretariat will duly record the decision and act accordingly.

(The Chairman)

Therefore, before we proceed any further, I shall put it to the Committee by asking whether there is any objection to the proposal made by the representative of Argentina, acting also in his capacity as the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee of the Special Session Devoted to Disarmament.

Since there is no objection, it is so decided.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed with the consideration of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.11. As I said, the resolution on the special session was adopted last year by consensus, and the sponsors of the present draft resolution have expressed the wish that it also be adopted by consensus. Since there is no objection, it will be so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.11 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no vote has taken place, some delegations have expressed their wish to speak after the decision to explain their views.

Mr. YANG (China) (interpretation from Chinese): With regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.11, adopted by consensus, the Chinese delegation would like to say that it dissociates itself from this consensus. We should like our position to be stated in the records.

Mr. CHAMPENOIS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the nine members of the European Economic Community, I should like to make some comments on the draft resolution just adopted by consensus bearing on the special session devoted to disarmament.

These countries were very much impressed by the spirit of openness and understanding that marked the meetings of the Preparatory Committee for the special session. It is in the same constructive spirit that those of us who are members of that Committee will continue to participate in its work.

(Mr. Champenois, Belgium)

We think that the fourth session of the Preparatory Committee will be of vital importance because it is at that session that the substantive work will be undertaken consisting of the preparation of documents to be submitted to the special session devoted to disarmament. We hope that these documents will be communicated to all member countries early enough to enable them to study the documents in depth.

The nine States members of the European Community are convinced that under the enlightened and effective chairmanship of Mr. Ortiz de Rozas the Committee will fulfil its task and thus contribute to the success of the special session in which it sees an opportunity for significant progress towards general and complete disarmament.

The special session should produce and adopt by consensus, in so far as possible, a number of basic documents, including a draft declaration and a programme of action. The Nine consider that the declaration should reaffirm the absolute necessity to achieve disarmament. Indeed, in spite of the complexity of the task, there is in our view no other reasonable alternative for mankind, particularly in the nuclear field.

We must by successive stages promote general and complete disarmament under effective international control while, at the same time, establishing an international order providing for an effective structure for the peaceful settlement of disputes and for the establishment of a United Nations security force. Thus, States would only have to maintain such conventional forces as may be required to ensure domestic order and personal safety.

But this is still a remote target. In a world all too often dominated by conflict, rivalry and struggles for influence of various kinds, disarmament cannot disregard the requirements of State security, particularly when territorial integrity is endangered. The only realistic approach would therefore be to proceed stage by stage without, however, losing sight of the ultimate objective, which is, and remains, general and complete disarmament as just described. Within this context, the nine members of the European Community consider that the declaration to be adopted at the special session devoted to disarmament should lay down principles and guidelines that would make it possible at a practical level to adopt specific disarmament measures.

(Mr. Champenois, Belgium)

The Nine also consider that, along with nuclear disarmament, the international community must, as a matter of urgency, envisage ways of limiting escalation of the conventional arms race, and must do so also from the standpoint of increasing arms shipments to all parts of the world. The special session on disarmament provides an opportunity for seriously tackling this particularly difficult question. Decisions taken at the special session, particularly those concerning the programme of action, will in our view only have real practical scope if they receive, at the very least, the endorsement of the major nuclear Powers, particularly of all the military nuclear Powers. This implies, as a preliminary condition, the participation of all those Powers not only in the special session but also in any future disarmament negotiations. The structures of multilateral negotiation should therefore be adapted and conceived of accordingly. On this last point, too, the special session should lay down a line of conduct.

The nine members of the European Community wished to inform the Committee of these few preliminary thoughts with regard to the special session on disarmament. Our countries will continue to participate actively in the preparatory work. The success of the session will depend ultimately on the efforts which all members of the international community are willing to make for the sake of disarmament.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): This is not an explanation of vote. I should like to refer to a statement made by the representative of Malaysia in the plenary meeting when we discussed the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). He noted that the Director-General of the IAEA made a very interesting statement which was most informative, and of course I agree with that. The representative of Malaysia suggested that the Director-General of the IAEA should be given an opportunity also to make an informative statement to the special session on disarmament. I am raising this point so that the suggestion of the representative of Malaysia may be taken up.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the Netherlands has repeated the request made by the representative of Malaysia in the plenary meeting, to the effect that the Director-General of the IAEA should be invited to appear before the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Unless I hear any views to the contrary, I take it that it is the wish of this Committee that the Director-General should be given such an opportunity.

It was so decided.

Mr. PAWLAK (Poland): In the light of the decision just adopted by the Committee, I should like to second the opinion just expressed by the representative of the Netherlands, to the effect that the Director-General of the IAEA be invited to make a statement on the IAEA's contribution to disarmament at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

We think it would be advisable for the Chairman of our Committee to inform the President of the General Assembly that the First Committee expressed a favourable opinion on this subject.

Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): With the Committee's leave, and possibly abusing its goodwill, I should like to make a few comments as Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

First of all, I have no doubt that I am correctly reflecting the thinking of the 54 members of the Committee when I express my satisfaction at the decision just taken by this Committee in adopting the resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.11 by consensus.

I should also like to avail myself of this opportunity to express on behalf of the Preparatory Committee, and in particular on behalf of its officers, and, of course, on my own behalf, our appreciation for the most cordial and warm congratulations we received on the work of the Preparatory Committee during its first three sessions. All these favourable comments are undoubtedly a major encouragement to our work, which we promise to continue as effectively and completely as possible.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

In expressing our appreciation to one and all, I should like to mention in particular the members of the Secretariat, more especially the Director of the Disarmament Centre, Assistant Secretary-General Bjornerstedt, for the full co-operation he gave to the Committee at all times, and especially for the co-operation afforded me as Chairman.

In accordance with the resolution just adopted and the recommendation in the report of the Preparatory Committee, our fourth session will begin on 24 January 1978 and is due to conclude on 24 February. It is common knowledge that during that period we shall have to take up the most substantive and difficult part of our work, that is to say, trying to reconcile all positions stated in the Committee so as to seek to prepare documents which will deserve approval by consensus, both regarding the preamble or introduction as well as the declaration on disarmament, the programme of action and the disarmament negotiations machinery. It will be appreciated that this task will require not only total devotion but also a high level of co-operation, flexibility and a spirit of compromise, if a solution is to be arrived at.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

The Preparatory Committee already has several documents which are very valuable submitted by groups of countries or delegations individually. It is also known that other delegations are actively working in preparing new documents which will be submitted for the Committee's consideration. It is in this respect that I should like to ask your indulgence to make a special appeal at this time to all delegations working on such documents at present to have them ready as soon as possible. We cannot afford the luxury of wasting a single minute when we meet again on 24 January. Early presentation of documents will enable all delegations members of the Committee to consider the documents as thoroughly as they deserve, and then try to find a way to combine the positions of various groups so as to produce the single document that I referred to a minute ago.

There is another aspect which I believe I should also mention because it bears on the responsibility of the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee. For our work to move forward we must proceed by singling out, first, the areas of agreement and then, subsequently, the areas in which there is no agreement. That task will require comparative analysis; and to be able to do that effectively, I have suggested to the Secretariat that a kind of tabulation be prepared which will enable us to compare positions, namely, to ascertain what are the views of delegations or groups of delegations on the various items. Hence the need to have all the documents as early as possible.

At the same time, however, for that work to be done we shall need in the Preparatory Committee on 24 January the highest possible level of representation for negotiations, so that the decisions we take, while they will be adopted in principle and ad referendum in respect of Governments, will be sufficiently acceptable to ensure that we may really move forward.

At the same time as the Preparatory Committee meets, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) will meet in Geneva, starting on 31 January. No one questions the basic work of the CCD; its work is fundamental. And in this respect I believe that that would be the suitable time for the CCD to have the basic documents regarding either chemical weapons or the comprehensive test ban Treaty - *from the very beginning of its session.*

At the same time I should like to emphasize that, should that not be possible, it would be very useful if the Co-Chairmen were to consider the possibility of not beginning the session until the end of February, as is the practice in that

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

body. That is to say, if the documents are there for debate, then there is more than ample justification for a CCD session. If there are no documents to be discussed, then it would, on the contrary, be very useful for the Preparatory Committee, where essential work is going to be done, to have the active participation of delegates who are members of the CCD and are thoroughly familiar with disarmament items and, accordingly, with the items that will come before the special session.

Once again I reiterate my personal gratitude and my gratitude as Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the cordial words addressed to us during the general debate in this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador Ortiz de Rozas for his statement. I am sure that representatives here listened with the utmost attention to his words, and I am also sure that I am speaking on behalf of the entire Committee in extending to him the expression of our gratitude for the work he has done as Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the special session on disarmament, and which he will continue to do in that noble endeavour.

That concludes the consideration by this Committee of agenda item 52, entitled "Special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

The Committee may now wish to proceed to the consideration of item 53 entitled "World disarmament conference" and of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.25 which relates to it. The draft resolution has financial implications, which are explained in document A/C.1/32/L.31. The draft resolution is sponsored by the delegations of Burundi, Cuba, Iran, Jordan, Mongolia, Peru, Poland and Spain. The sponsors have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee agrees to accede to that wish.

Draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.25 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair will now call on those delegations that wish to explain their views in this connexion.*

* Mr. Hollai (Hungary), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

Mr. CHAMPENOIS (Belgium)(interpretation from French): On behalf of the nine members of the European Community, I should like to make some comments on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference in document A/32/28, as well as the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.25 which was just adopted by consensus.

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee was the subject of considerable attention on our part, and we should first of all like to congratulate its Chairman, Mr. Hoveyda of Iran, who succeeded once again in guiding the Committee's proceedings to a fruitful conclusion. I should also like to thank him for the clear and comprehensive statement in which he introduced the report to our Committee.

We should also like to congratulate the Chairman of the Working Group, Mr. Lopez-Chicheri of Spain, and all the other members of the Group for their decisive contribution to the consensus because, in the final analysis, the Ad Hoc Committee was able to approve the report as prepared by the Working Group.

We have also taken note of the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation on its future activities. We are happy to support the recommendation as reproduced in the draft resolution we have just adopted.

This is a good opportunity briefly to set forth the views of the nine members of the European Community on the question of a world disarmament conference. When this idea was put forward, we immediately decided to study it in a constructive spirit. Since then we have followed closely the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee. However, we continue to believe that any decision to convene a world disarmament conference cannot properly be examined until after the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and we do so without in any way prejudging the position that might then be adopted. We also continue to believe that a world disarmament conference can achieve significant results and have the expected impact on world public opinion only if the conference is carefully prepared and if all the major military Powers, particularly all the nuclear military Powers, participate.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes our consideration of agenda item 53.

The Committee will now take a decision on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.13 under agenda item 51, entitled "General and complete disarmament".

The Committee has before it amendments submitted by Saudi Arabia in document A/C.1/32/L.15, to that draft resolution concerning a United Nations periodical on disarmament. The second of the amendments

"Recommends that consideration be given to the making of a United Nations film candidly portraying the vast devastation wrought by the last World War and subsequent wars, and also highlighting the human tragedies and untold miseries brought about as a consequence of these wars, so that such a United Nations film could be shown in schools and universities and on television all over the world with the hope of creating a genuine aversion to all wars in the future;".

Consultations with the delegation concerned confirm that the intention of the proposed amendment was clearly that consideration be given to the making of a United Nations film rather than the actual making of such a film at this stage. As a preliminary step, the Secretariat looked into the various aspects of the amendment and came to the conclusion that the consideration of making such a film would require considerable preparatory research work before arriving at a definition of the project and identifying the other aspects implied in the amendment, and that the Office of Public Information can undertake this work in the coming months and absorb the cost within existing resources.

On that understanding the amendment in document A/C.1/32/L.15 need not be put to a vote. The Secretary-General will, at the next regular session of the General Assembly, report on the feasibility of making such a film.

If that procedure is acceptable to the Committee it will be recorded in the Rapporteur's report to the General Assembly on item 51 and reference to this decision will be made by him in introducing that report.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees with that suggestion.

It was so decided.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I think the Chairman has presented my delegation's desire to ensure that a certain study will be made by the Secretariat, and I must thank him and the Secretariat for having found out what the financial implications would be.

Inasmuch as I shall vote for the periodical mentioned in draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.13, I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that, according to the Secretary-General's report, the circulation would be very restricted in all the languages: Arabic, 1,500; Chinese, 5,000; English, 12,000; French, 3,500; Russian, 1,000; and Spanish, 3,500 - in all a total of 26,500. The periodical is designed to be read by all those who are interested in disarmament.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

Let me hasten to say that this is mentioned here as being "in highly readable form". I wish one of the sponsors who is present would tell us what is meant by "highly readable form". Should it be in a literary style? If it is statistical it cannot be highly readable because it will tell us the current facts and developments and then there is mention of bibliographies. It needs a novelist, perhaps, a man with a fertile imagination, to have a concept of disarmament and to see to it that it is highly readable. He must be an artist, a literary man. Is this the purpose, or is it just to have a periodical which it is hoped will be readable? Having spent more than three decades with this Organization I know very well that even members of special committees hardly have time to scan the documents that are the working papers of any conference or meeting. I am thinking aloud, and I should like to have some explanation from my good colleagues, who mean well,

Would these 15,000 or so periodicals in five or six languages drive home the impact of disarmament? That is the first question. The second question, as I mentioned just now, is this: would they not be restricted to a few readers, at the most? And the financial implications run into \$1 million or so. I talked to some members of the Secretariat, who were very helpful, and I found out that one meeting with verbatim records costs the United Nations close to \$14,000 - in fact, \$13,900. That was taken from the records.

I am going to surprise my colleagues by telling them that the documentary that I propose - because there is a film, and we can divide the film into a documentary and a film - will not have to be produced; it will be synthesized from the film archives that exist in all the countries that waged war against each other. Somebody may ask, why not adopt a film made by a national of one of the States that were for peace and wanted to depict the horror of war? My answer is very simple: because there is always a lurking suspicion that if one country produced a film it would slant it to suit its own purposes no matter how independent the producer might be. There is always that subconscious element in the mind of the producer, so that he would perhaps highlight certain things and not

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

concentrate on other things. That is why, when I said a United Nations film, I meant that there would be a committee which, after the artists had made the composite film, would see to it that it reflected things as they happened, without any slanting of the pictures or indiscriminate use of the scissors to cut out certain things.

I should like my colleagues to know that such a film and documentary, which I was told by experts of the Office of Public Information would not cost more than \$150,000, could be shown by television stations in every country. What is \$150,000 when the periodical, which would have a restricted circulation, would cost more than \$1 million.

Think aloud with me. Are you afraid that the people in authority, in the seats of power, in our respective countries will be prevented from creating a diversion when they find themselves in difficulties, as happened in the First and Second World Wars? We all know - I repeat this because it bears repetition - that the First World War, through which I lived, was not fought to make the world safe for democracy. Those were slogans and clichés. Nor was it fought, as was claimed by the allies, at that time the United Kingdom and France, against the German militarism of Kaiser Wilhelm. In fact, the French army was the biggest in Europe, and the biggest navy in the world was the British navy. But the people were made to believe that the Germans of those days were tyrants. And what happened? Men were marched to the slaughter-house like sheep. In fact, the war was fought against German mercantilism. After Bismarck in 1870 the Germans, since they did not have many colonies, exerted all their efforts to produce competitive goods, and the French and the British, particularly the British, were afraid that the Germans would outsell them in the markets of India and Latin America.

Those are the facts, my friends. Most of you are young, or comparatively young, and those are the facts. We witnessed them, and what I say can be substantiated by British and French as well as German historians. I do not say that the Germans were saints. They were catching up with the British and the French, and the British were very much afraid that the Germans would take a big slice of their Indian trade.

We come to the Second World War. I have mentioned this and it bears repetition. All wars need motivation, we know that, and it seems like yesterday that our host country, the United States, was raising a hue and cry against Japanese goods because they were much cheaper than American goods.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

Why? The Japanese were a modest people, and perhaps their labour unions were not as strong as those in the United States. The Japanese were beginning to out-sell American goods in the world markets, except for cars and a few other things.

Now, my first trip to the United States was in 1939, and any reference to Japanese goods was anathema - although the Japanese were producing the same quality of goods as the Americans, but 20 to 30 per cent cheaper. I do not want to go into this question by just citing platitudes, as we often are tempted to do. But as far as the facts of history are concerned, there were American historians - I wish I had brought my sources - who said that Japan was provoked time and again. Now, I do not say the Japanese were saints in their attempt to catch up in their army and navy, and the mistake they made was a boon to Mr. Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As I asked his wife - none other than Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt - who worked with me in this United Nations for eight years, "Do you know who bailed the President out of anarchy?" - because there was a depression; I saw the depression in 1929; it lasted till 1939. In 1929 I saw it in Europe; indeed, I saw it throughout the thirties. In 1939 it was playing havoc with the American economy. And what happened? The Japanese made the mistake of bombing Pearl Harbour, and the Japanese attack was a boon, a blessing. For whom? For Mr. Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Sumner Welles was sent in 1938 to see Adolph Hitler to ascertain whether the Bund which was here was a sort of Nazi organization. My British colleague will bear me out when I say that the British had their Mr. Mosley. People embraced various ideologies. Whether they are good or bad is beside the point. And, as I said to Mrs. Roosevelt, it was the Japanese and Hitler who bailed out President Roosevelt. Incidentally, Hitler told Sumner Welles: "We will not interfere in your hemisphere. Let us decide our own fate - that of Europe." But what did the Japanese do? They made the mistake of attacking the United States, and this was a diversion enabling Mr. Roosevelt to wage war. And rightly so. After all, his country was attacked by the Japanese.

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

Therefore, I claim we should go to the root of the matter and not try to produce 15,000 periodicals which will merely be circulated and not 5 per cent of them will be read. Let us go to the root of the matter. All Governments, all people in the seat of power, when it suits their purpose, resort to diversionary tactics in order to take the minds of their people off what is happening by telling them that there is a danger. It happened during the Crusades: Pope Urban II was in 1087 the temporal as well as the religious leader of Europe, when nationalism was awakening. His best propagandist was Peter the Hermit, whom he sent around Europe. He said: "Wrest the Holy Sepulchre, you Europeans, from the hands of the infidels" - meaning the people of Palestine. And the people of Palestine, whether Christian or Moslem, believed in Christ. It was a diversion. In fairness to the so-called Christian leaders, we go back to the Moslem leaders: quite a number of times they used Islam as a diversionary tactic to take the minds of their people off their troubles.

That is why I wanted a film to be shown in the future to youths between the ages of 12 and 25 so that they might develop a real aversion to war. Who dares say it will not have an impact on the minds of world society? Because now distances have shrunk and we live in one world. Who dares say it will not have an impact and that leaders will confine themselves strictly to the defence of their homelands and not engage in diversionary measures in order to delude the people?

There have been 30 draft resolutions - I have seen them all. With all due respect to those who sat down and drafted them, I felt that I would be a false witness if I even abstained from voting. Instead, I did not participate in the voting. As far as the consensus is concerned, I say: God bless you all: perhaps you will arrive at something. All right, have a periodical - but a film, and a documentary, that is what you should have so as to awaken the young and make them feel that they should not be sacrificed to kill their fellow-men. And then the leaders - or misleaders, depending on how they behave - will think a thousand times before adopting diversionary tactics to take the minds of their people off their economic, financial or perhaps political or social ills.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

I mention this because I hope my proposal will not be taken lightly. And, for your information, I have a temperature of 38.5° C. I have the 'flu. But what is Baroody's life? Nothing. I am dedicated to world peace, like every one of you. But methods differ. Do not worry about me: I will endorse anything, even though it may seem ineffective. But, please, I have witnessed many things in my life. I am not working for myself, nor are you, who are comparatively young. We are working for the next generation. And the audio-visual media nowadays - television and films - have a greater impact than what I would call academic, highly readable periodicals. But go ahead. I will give my consent to the highly readable periodical even though it will cost a lot of money.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

But wake up, my brothers here. Wake up. The more we talk about disarmament, the more we vote, the more surreptitiously arms are being devised. A lot of the technology of nations is being used in order to see how one nation can surpass the other in the destruction of man.

This is my message to back my amendments to the draft resolution, in the hope that next year if I am around - and if I am not around, somebody will take it up - nobody will come here and find a lame excuse for not proceeding with such a project. And if he does, and I am around, God help him.

The CHAIRMAN: With due respect, may I appeal to the members of the Committee to make their statements as brief as possible due to the known fact that we have a great deal of business to take care of.

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): Mr. Chairman, I shall comply with your suggestion and be very brief. The Swedish delegation would at this stage of our deliberations only like to express its gratitude to the representative of Saudi Arabia, Ambassador Baroody, for not pressing to the vote the amendments in document A/C.1/32/L.15. We are satisfied because we believe that this action of Ambassador Baroody will help to get resolution A/C.1/32/L.13 adopted.

As the Chairman pointed out, the Secretariat will during the coming year consider the interesting and thought-provoking question that Ambassador Baroody has drawn to our attention and report next year to the United Nations General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: My understanding is that there is no other representative who wishes to speak at this stage. As that is the case, I take it that the Committee is ready to take up draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.13 pertaining to agenda item 51, entitled "General and complete disarmament", and we shall now proceed to take a decision. The draft resolution is sponsored by 11 delegations and was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 33rd meeting of this Committee. It has financial implications, which are set forth in document A/C.1/32/L.36.

(The Chairman)

The sponsors have expressed the desire that the Committee should adopt the draft resolution by consensus. If I hear no objections or other proposals, I shall take it that the Committee wishes so to proceed.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak at this stage.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): My delegation is very happy to be part of the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.13. In being part of the consensus we have also taken note of the report of the Secretary-General in document A/C.1/32/L.36 on the financial implications of the draft resolution. With reference in particular to paragraph 4 of document A/C.1/32/L.36, my delegation would like to recall that in resolution 31/90, adopted last year, on the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, operative paragraph 3 does in part oblige the Secretariat to recruit staff for the proposed Centre for Disarmament on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

My delegation would also like to recall that in our statements during the general debate on the disarmament items in this Committee, we had said:

"... we note ... that the geographical spread has been neither numerically nor qualitatively equitable ... as far as Africa is concerned. We look forward to the redress of that glaring imbalance ..."

(A/C.1/32/PV.11, p. 30a)

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

I hope that this observation, as well as the requirement of operative paragraph 3 of resolution 31/90, will be borne in mind in connexion with the implementation of the draft resolution we have just adopted.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I wished to speak in order to express my delegation's pleasure at being part of the consensus reached by this Committee on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.13. In expressing this pleasure we wish to note, however, our disappointment that it was not possible to amend the resolution in order to include in it the provision for the making of a film as suggested by the representative of Saudi Arabia.

I wish to take this opportunity to record the fact that if the Saudi Arabian amendment had been pressed to the vote my delegation would have voted in favour of it for the simple reason that we should not have a periodical that will have only an elitist circulation; we should reach as many people as possible. In this respect I should like to mention that disarmament is the prerogative of the entire world and not of only part of it. We believe that a film would have served a better purpose than a periodical of limited circulation. However, we look forward to the submission of the Secretary-General's views at the next session in order finally to determine this question.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

On the question of the financial implications of the draft resolution just adopted by consensus, I should like to associate my delegation with the remarks just made by the representative of Nigeria and to stress in particular that, as set out in paragraph 4, due consideration should be given to geographical representation in the expansion and recruitment of personnel for the new office.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.13, under agenda item 51.

The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37, under agenda items 40 and 49. This draft resolution was introduced a short while ago by the representatives of New Zealand and Poland.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): My delegation has no objection to considering these two agenda items at this stage. However, my delegation is faced with a new situation with respect to taking a decision on the draft resolution. The draft resolution is a new one; it is not a Rev.1 or a Rev.2 of any previously introduced draft resolution. It has a completely new format. My delegation, and I imagine many other delegations, would need some time to consider it and to receive instructions from their Governments. I understand that the draft resolution has been the subject of intensive consultations among some delegations. The Indian delegation was not a party to those consultations, and I imagine that many other delegations as well were not parties to those consultations.

In the circumstances, I would suggest that a decision on this new draft resolution be deferred until we have had the required 24 hours notice in which to consider it.

Mr. YANG (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Before we vote on the various draft resolutions under the items on a nuclear test ban, the Chinese delegation wishes to state briefly its consistent position in this regard.

We have noticed that, in their statements, the representatives of many countries condemned the two super-Powers for their frenzied development of

(Mr. Yang, China)

nuclear weapons behind their glib talk about nuclear disarmament and for their refusal to undertake the obligation not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones. They voiced their strong dissatisfaction with the super-Powers' behaviour of stepping up their policy of nuclear threat, nuclear blackmail and nuclear monopoly and of intensifying their arms expansion and war preparations. They resolutely called on the super-Powers to come forth with actual deeds instead of engaging in deception by empty words. We support these legitimate desires and demands.

China has consistently stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. The Chinese Government has stated on numerous occasions that China will not be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time and in any circumstances. The Soviet Union and the United States, which possess huge quantities of nuclear weapons, must openly undertake the obligation that they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time and in any circumstances and will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones; that they are to dismantle all their nuclear bases on foreign soil and withdraw all their nuclear armed forces, nuclear weapons and their means of delivery from other countries. This is the first step towards the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. Willingness to take this first step will be a touchstone of the sincerity to carry out nuclear disarmament.

However, the two super-Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, are trying their best to evade the real issue by refusing to accept these reasonable proposals while stepping up their campaign to propagate the so-called "comprehensive nuclear test ban" and "non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" in an attempt to maintain their position of nuclear monopoly and nuclear blackmail. It is common knowledge that, more than 10 years ago, when the two super-Powers had conducted enough tests in the atmosphere, they produced the "Partial Test Ban Treaty" in order to prohibit others from carrying out nuclear tests in that environment and to legalize underground nuclear tests which they deemed necessary. In recent years, with their hectic schedules of underground nuclear tests nearing conclusion, they concocted the

(Mr. Yang, China)

"Threshold Test Ban Treaty" in an attempt to fool the public. At present, they are clamouring for a so-called "Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty", a "Moratorium on Peaceful Nuclear Explosions", the "Cessation of the Production of Nuclear Weapons" and so on and so forth. The tunes are different, but the objective is the same. To put it bluntly: when they had the need, they went all out for tests without any prohibition; but once they have concluded their tests, they produce test ban treaties of all descriptions. This is an outright attempt to set up a fraud by exploiting the desire for peace on the part of many countries so as to enable the super-Powers to maintain their nuclear superiority and to have a free hand in carrying out nuclear threat and nuclear blackmail against countries with no, or few, nuclear weapons.

The Chinese Government has reiterated time and again that we are compelled to conduct limited nuclear tests and to develop nuclear weapons and that we do so entirely for the purpose of self-defence. We are ready at all times to halt our nuclear test, but that can happen only on the day when the two super-Powers and all nuclear countries completely prohibit and thoroughly destroy their nuclear weapons, and definitely not before.

Basing itself on the above position, the Chinese delegation will, as we have always done in the past with similar resolutions, vote against draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37. At the same time, we wish to enter our reservations on those paragraphs in the other draft resolutions on disarmament which contain references to the "Non-Proliferation Treaty" or "nuclear test ban".

(Mr. Yang, China)

Finally, we wish to point out that the racist régime of South Africa is preparing for the manufacture of nuclear weapons in order to strengthen its reactionary rule and to intimidate and threaten the African countries and peoples. This has met with the strong condemnation and opposition of the African countries and peoples. We resolutely support their just position in this regard.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the representative of New Zealand would like to make a further statement in introduction of this draft resolution.

Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): I certainly would not wish to object to the request of the representative of India for more time to consider the draft resolution if that is his wish. But, if it is agreeable, I might now say a few words about the substance of the draft resolution which I have not yet had an opportunity to do, and the representative of India might then be able to ponder on my explanation as well as on the draft resolution.

My delegation was, originally one of the sponsors of the draft contained in document A/C.1/32/L.23, which was also sponsored by Australia, Austria, Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Sweden and Venezuela. That draft has now been withdrawn in favour of A/C.1/32/L.37.

I have already expressed my Government's views on the question of a comprehensive test ban in my statement in the general disarmament debate, and on this occasion I can be comparatively brief.

It has been our aim, and I believe that it has been the aim of all the sponsors of the draft resolution, to produce a text that is as non-controversial as possible, given our strong belief in the value of a comprehensive test-ban treaty as an important means of preventing both horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons and given also our expectation that the

(Mr. Templeton, New Zealand)

negotiations currently in progress will be completed in time for an agreement on this subject to be considered at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The purpose of the draft resolution is to offer encouragement and support to the negotiating nuclear-weapon States and to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament with that target in view. We have had in mind in past weeks the desirability of having a single draft resolution on the question of nuclear tests that would cover the subject matter of both item 40 and item 49 and that would command the widest possible support. We warmly welcome the spirit of co-operation shown by all who have participated in the consultations on this issue and who have contributed to the drafting of a mutually acceptable single text.

It will be noted that the draft resolution differs significantly in tone and content from resolution 31/66, which New Zealand joined in sponsoring last year. But the changes in language reflect changes in circumstances rather than changes in our basic position. The draft resolution this year does not contain an explicit condemnation of all nuclear-weapon tests. My delegation still considers that such tests deserve the condemnation that the Assembly has repeatedly expressed, but last year we were faced with the situation of no progress, no negotiation and little hope. This year we have a situation of active negotiation, of some apparent progress and considerable hope. In these new circumstances our aim has been to simplify the draft resolution and to concentrate on one main concern, namely, the need to speed up and complete the negotiation of a draft treaty in time for it to be considered at the special session on disarmament.

The key paragraphs in the draft resolution are thus operative paragraphs 4 and 5. Our hope, as stated in operative paragraph 3, is that a comprehensive test ban treaty might be open for signature at the special session on disarmament next year. There is not a great deal of time left between now and then if this objective is to be achieved. Operative paragraph 4, therefore, urges the three nuclear-weapon States, which are at present conducting negotiations, to expedite those negotiations with a view to transmitting the results, in the form, we would hope, of agreed proposals, to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament by the time its spring session opens at the end of January.

(Mr. Templeton, New Zealand)

It is important, as operative paragraphs 4 and 5 indicate, that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should have time for full consideration of this question with a view to the submission of a draft treaty to the General Assembly at the special session devoted to disarmament. As we see it, the language of operative paragraph 5 does not in any way limit the discretion of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to recommend to the Assembly any modifications that it may deem advisable as a result of the full consideration envisaged in operative paragraph 4 to the agreed text resulting from the negotiations of the three nuclear-weapon States.

If the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament succeeds in its important task, provision will also have to be made in the agenda of the special session to enable it to consider and to act on the draft treaty.

It will be recalled that this year the First Committee took up the disarmament items earlier than usual in its agenda. One reason for this, as I understand it, was to allow more time for intersessional negotiations and preparations leading up to the special session. The issue of a comprehensive test ban is, in our view, one pre-eminent issue on which the Assembly should pronounce itself as soon as possible in order to encourage the continuance of negotiations at a heightened pace. I hope that it will do so at an early date in adopting the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.37 by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. PAWLAK (Poland): I should like to make a brief statement on behalf of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia and my own country, which were the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.20, now withdrawn. I should like to comment on the draft resolution now under consideration in document A/C.1/32/L.37, which replaces the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/32/L.20 and L.23 under items 49 and 40 respectively.

We have just heard the statement made by the representative of New Zealand who expressed some of his views on the subject. I share many of his remarks but I should like to add some comments about the draft resolution and to underline some important provisions of that draft, which shows the practical

(Mr. Pawlak, Poland)

approach towards achieving the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests and the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

I should like to draw the attention of the Committee in particular to the operative part of the draft resolution under consideration. Special attention should be given to operative paragraphs 4 and 5, which urges the three nuclear-weapon States to expedite their negotiations on the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing and to use their best endeavours to transmit the results for full consideration by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at the beginning of its spring session, and requests the CCD to take up the agreed text with a view to submission of a draft treaty to the General Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament in 1978. I believe that all countries involved in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament will spare no efforts to draft a generally acceptable text of a draft treaty.

The CHAIRMAN: My understanding was that the representative of India had not moved formally to defer the taking of a decision on this particular agenda item and on resolution A/C.1/32/L.37. So if the Committee agrees, we might proceed to the vote, and I will first call on those delegations who would like to explain their votes.

Mr. TSHERING (Bhutan): My delegation wishes to second the proposal just made by India to postpone the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37, which has just been circulated.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair was not aware that there had been a formal proposal.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): The subject matter being dealt with in draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37 is traditionally important, and I assume that the sponsors of the draft resolution still regard it as important. If they continue to attach importance to the subject matter, I assume that they would like delegations to vote after thinking about this proposal carefully. If delegations are obliged to vote now, the result of the voting may not be as desired by the sponsors of the draft resolution.

I would therefore submit that it might be in the interests of the sponsors - if the draft resolution is important - to postpone the vote until Monday.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to remind the representative of India and other members of the Committee as well that the Chairman of this Committee informed members of the procedure he had in mind for dealing with disarmament matters. Under that procedure, if the Committee were not able to finish its work on disarmament items by tonight, then we would suspend consideration of those items from Monday on and take up the item on outer space, whereafter the Committee would revert to the items relating to disarmament.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): First of all, as one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37, I consider that the remarks made by the representative of India are very well founded.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Therefore my delegation would have absolutely no difficulty in acceding to the request to postpone the vote on that draft resolution.

Secondly, the Chairman of the Committee did in fact explain to us yesterday what his plan of work was and what his preference was. His plan of work and his preference was that we should complete all disarmament items today and then, on Monday, proceed to deal with the outer space item. In suggesting that, I believe that he was doing his duty as any good Chairman should, namely, trying to exercise pressure on representatives to speed up the work, so that we would proceed as expeditiously as possible - I am emphasizing "possible", because I believe that if the Chairman were present here in the Chair which you are now so graciously occupying in his absence, Sir, he probably would revise what he said yesterday. He would probably have a change of mind because we now have draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37 and several delegations are in favour of a postponement of the vote.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, you have already been told that when you came to draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.28 my delegation also would ask for a postponement of the vote on that draft resolution, which is the draft resolution on the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. We were going to request a postponement until the beginning of next week when you came to that draft resolution. This is because consultations have been held in order to ascertain whether, by some minor changes in the present text, we could attain a consensus or, if not a consensus, at least such a large majority as to include the representatives of the two Powers which are now engaged in the SALT talks.

Thus we would already have those two draft resolutions to be voted on early next week. On the basis of talks which I have had with a number of delegations, it is my impression that some intend to propose a similar postponement for draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2, which also has been distributed today.

For all these reasons, I would suggest that we set these three texts aside and complete work on all the others, which I believe will not give rise to any problems. Furthermore, I am certain that next week, at more than one meeting, the Chairman will inform us that he has no more speakers and then the meetings

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

will have to be adjourned an hour, an hour and a half or perhaps two hours before it is due to end - and this does not exclude the possibility of cancellations through lack of speakers. So it seems to me that on Monday or Tuesday morning or afternoon, as preferred, we could include on the agenda of the First Committee, as has frequently been done, first of all the items on outer space and then, as point 2, all remaining disarmament items. In that way we would not have to wait until the end of the week to deal adequately with the disarmament items that remained pending.

The CHAIRMAN: I would be the last to disagree with the representative of Mexico but the Chair is in the hands of the Committee, and of course the Committee is master of its own procedure.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation is ready today to take part in the voting on all four remaining draft resolutions, including draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37. However, it seems to us that the request of the delegation of India, supported by the delegation of Mexico, is well founded, and we also support the idea that the voting on the remaining resolutions should be held next week.

It seems to us premature now to agree on any fixed date, whether it be Tuesday morning or Wednesday evening. Perhaps in the light of consultations among heads of delegations the date could be determined, so that we could conclude the voting on the four remaining resolutions at one of the meetings next week.

U TINT SOE (Burma): My delegation also wishes to endorse the request of the representative of India that voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37 be deferred. We would also like some time to think over the new draft resolution.

Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I was going to speak along the same lines, to support the proposal made by the delegation of India, subsequently endorsed and expanded on by the delegation of Mexico, and supported by the delegation of the Soviet Union. With regard to document A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2, new amendments have just been circulated which need to be studied. Furthermore, as a sponsor of A/C.1/32/L.28, Argentina associates itself with the request for postponement made by Mexico. And I agree with the representative of the Soviet Union that at this stage it might be premature to set a date as to when the resolutions will be voted on. Perhaps it would be better to leave that to the Chairman to decide in the light of progress in our work.

Mr. HARRY (Australia): As one of the sponsors of A/C.1/32/L.37 and also of A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2, may I say that my delegation would support the proposal to defer the voting. In doing so, might I appeal to our colleagues from India and Bhutan in the hope that, when we do come to the vote, the deferment which I hope we will decide this afternoon will enable them to support our resolutions.

With reference to the amendments just circulated by Pakistan in A/C.1/32/L.38, may I also appeal to our colleagues from Pakistan to use the next two days to join with the co-sponsors of A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 in an effort to reach an agreed text which can be presented to the Committee at the beginning of next week.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I ask for the floor to make some observations on the new text which has just been circulated and which I believe we will not consider until later. Deferment of its consideration allows me to make these observations in the hope that they will enable the sponsors of that draft to consider them and ponder them over the weekend, or whatever time they have, so that perhaps by the time we vote on the draft resolution, they may be able to express an opinion on them. I would normally of course have tried to contact the sponsors to make my brief suggestion, but considering that it is a weekend, after sitting so late on a Friday afternoon, I think everyone will be eager to get off.

In introducing the new draft, the representative of New Zealand said that the sponsors wish to be as non-controversial as possible. I think my own delegation would like to respect their wishes in that regard. But I also think that being non-controversial also implies being very clear in one's language. And that is where my brief suggestion comes in. I think the whole object of this draft of course is to emphasize the new element, which is that there are very great hopes and great possibilities for the conclusion of the comprehensive test-ban Treaty and perhaps its opening for signature during the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Bearing that in mind, therefore, I would suggest that in A/C.1/32/L.37, operative paragraph 3, the sponsors consider this very minor amendment: in the first line, insert the words "... a comprehensive test-ban Treaty ...", instead of "... such an agreement ...".

I would also suggest that in operative paragraph 4 we consider the deletion of the words "... to use their best endeavours to" in the second and third lines. In other words, operative paragraph 4 would then read:

"4. Urges the three nuclear-weapon States to expedite their negotiations with a view to bringing them to a positive conclusion as soon as possible and to transmit the results for full consideration by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament by the beginning of its spring session".

The words "to use their best endeavours" here, even though it looks innocuous, may also create certain problems because we believe that, once they reach agreement, they do not need any special endeavours again to transmit the text of the agreement to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

These are very minor suggestions which we would like to make to the sponsors. As I said, we do this in the hope that over the period prior to consideration of the draft, they would have the opportunity of considering the suggestions and perhaps deciding on them.

The CHAIRMAN: May I take it that that is the wish of the Committee, to defer action on resolution A/C.1/32/L.37 to a later stage, which will, of course, be announced to the Committee in due course?

Mr. JAY (Canada): May I request some clarification, please, without at all dwelling on the fact that I, for one, feel that I am letting down Ambassador Boaten in agreeing to postpone the target date that meant so much to him, as he suggested to us the other day. Of course, the Chairman is in the hands of the Committee, but I do believe that the Committee owes some loyalty to the Chairman. I for one would have done my best to respect his wishes with regard to the voting.

What I am asking for now is some clearer indication than I have at the moment of what lies ahead for the future. As I understand it, our friend from India asked that a vote be taken on Monday on one draft resolution; we slipped from there to votes on possibly four draft resolutions. The day slipped from Monday; somebody then suggested Tuesday, someone else blithely inserted Wednesday, and another even said more or less indefinitely. So I am not quite sure when we are going to complete our discussion and our determination with respect to the disarmament items in the Committee, and it would help me very much if I could have that clarification at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: As far as I am able, I should like to answer the representative of Canada and give him some clarification.

My understanding is that the Committee would start with outer space items on Monday, because the Chairman of the Committee on Outer Space would introduce that Committee's report; then the First Committee presumably - as the representative of Mexico has said - would find time, owing to a lack of speakers immediately after the introduction of the report, to revert to disarmament items, and we would take up the remaining items on disarmament that need action next week, most probably on Tuesday and Wednesday.

Mr. JAY (Canada): Am I to understand then that, apart from the introduction of the report of the outer space Committee, once we resume - I hope during Monday - our consideration of the disarmament items we will stick to the consideration of those items until we complete them and not see-saw back and forth between them and any other items on our agenda?

Mr. HARRY (Australia): My delegation would support the formulation of the representative of Canada. The fact that we would - as a courtesy to certain delegations that wish a little time to study the texts and prepare for voting - agree to defer the voting does not mean, in our view, that we need to defer it longer than for a fixed period to allow time for the Chairman of the outer space Committee to introduce his report. In our view, although outer space is important, it does not have the same urgency or interest for the world at large as would, for example, a draft resolution calling for the earliest possible conclusion of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

We know the circumstances of members of this Committee. I agree that we should ask the Chairman of the Committee to find time, if at all possible on Monday morning, but if not then on Monday afternoon, to proceed to the vote on these draft resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN: First of all, if I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee agrees to defer action on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Let me now sum up the situation.

I should certainly like to thank all the delegations in this Committee for their efforts and co-operation that have enabled us so far to adopt a number of draft resolutions relating to disarmament. In this connexion, however, I wish to note that there are several draft resolutions on which we have not yet been able to take action - either because the reports on the financial implications are not ready, or for other reasons.

Some delegations have asked for the postponement of action on other draft resolutions. That is the case, for example, with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.29/Rev.1, entitled "Incendiary and other specific conventional weapons...", the revised text of which was circulated this morning. On the request of its sponsors the revised text requires a statement of financial implications, and that is why the Committee is unable to take action or elaborate on it.

(The Chairman)

We have just decided to defer action on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37, on the request of certain delegations and with the Committee's concurrence.

We have also to defer action on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 under agenda item 51, entitled "General and complete disarmament", which deals with the question of proliferation. That draft resolution also was circulated only this morning.

The amendments in document A/C.1/32/L.38 have just been submitted by the representative of Pakistan.

In addition, there was a request to defer action on another draft resolution on the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT).

I ask the members of the Committee to bear all this in mind.

The Chairman would like to do his best on Monday, after the introduction of the report of the Outer Space Committee, to revert to the draft resolutions relating to disarmament items without - and here I am entirely in agreement with the representative of Canada - further interrupting consideration of them. That is the intention and understanding of the person who is sitting in the Chair at this moment.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It has been stated that the Secretariat is preparing a document on the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.29/Rev.1. Could the Secretariat inform us whether this information will be ready on Monday? If not, when will it be ready? In any event, we support the proposal that we take decisions on the remaining draft resolutions, which have been listed, together at a single meeting and not in the course of a number of meetings. Therefore it is very important for us to know when we shall hear what the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.29/Rev.1 are.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Under-Secretary-General for a clarification.

Mr. SHEVCHENKO (Under-Secretary-General, Department of Political and Security Council Affairs) (interpretation from Russian): It would not seem possible to prepare a statement of the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution concerning incendiary and other specific conventional weapons for Monday because it is a question of having a rather large and complex conference and the work of preparing this information might take a few days. It is difficult to say now when we shall be in a position to submit a statement of the administrative and financial implications but we shall be able to provide additional information on Monday.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we might revert to that subject on Monday when we have more specific clarifications from the Secretariat.

I suggest that before we adjourn the representative of Pakistan, if he is agreeable, introduces the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2.

Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): I must apologize for speaking at this very late stage in the proceedings. I shall try to be as brief as possible. I think it is important that I introduce the amendments at this stage so that when the Committee reconvenes members will have had time to take into account the considerations that have led us to move these amendments.

(Mr. Akhund, Pakistan)

My delegation spoke in the First Committee earlier and explained at some length the view which we took on the draft resolution presented then by the representative of Finland, which text has now been revised and has acquired a number of sponsors. I need not go into great detail on this text, therefore. Since then we have had a number of discussions with the author of this draft resolution. We held that discussion in a spirit of co-operation and with the object of reaching, if it proved possible to do so, a consensus, and if not a consensus then at least a position in which a draft resolution could be adopted by the Committee without dissent.

We have only just received the second revision of this draft resolution and I should not like to give a hasty reaction to it. I am glad that the proposal to postpone the vote has been accepted. This will allow us time to give draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 the careful consideration which its substance and subject matter call for. I am bound to say, however, that both in its general approach and in some of its particular provisions the draft resolution, even in its revised form, does not satisfy the norms and conditions which, in the view of my delegation, should govern international co-operation in this extremely important, indeed vital, field, as to both its economic objectives and its disarmament objectives.

The approach adopted in draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 is embodied in its twelfth preambular paragraph, which expresses anxiety lest the accelerated spread and development of nuclear technology should increase the danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is reflected in the second preambular paragraph, which expresses the conviction that:

"... the prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, especially in those areas of the world where the maintenance of international peace and security is endangered, remains an important element in the efforts to avert nuclear warfare."

Certain areas, in this view, are more dangerous than others.

Then there is operative paragraph 6 which:

"Urges States that as yet have not adhered to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in the first instance, to do so at an early date or, at a minimum, accept other arrangements" - not simply safeguards but other arrangements - "involving the application

(Mr. Akhund, Pakistan)

of safeguards to their complete nuclear fuel cycle,
that would provide satisfactory assurances to the international
community ..."

In urging States not parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to adhere to that Treaty, the draft resolution gives no consideration to their preoccupations, the reasons which have so far prevented them from acceding to the Treaty. Nor does it take account of the developments which have taken place since the Non-Proliferation Treaty was adopted. This, to say the least, is unrealistic. Even a number of States which are parties to the Treaty have on various occasions referred to its shortcomings and the need for more resolute action, especially by the nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty to fulfil their obligations in order to achieve a balance in the obligations of the nuclear and the non-nuclear States under the Treaty.

Furthermore, since the Non-Proliferation Treaty was signed breaches of the non-proliferation régime which it sought to establish have occurred, which is common knowledge. The Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) pointed out that significant nuclear facilities in a number of countries remain outside the safeguards, not simply complete, full-scope safeguards but any kinds of safeguards whatsoever. The position regarding nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes needs no reiteration. The Treaty of Tlatelolco recognized the possibility of these being carried out outside the régime envisaged in the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The threshold Treaty between the two major nuclear Powers also recognized the possibility of carrying out nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

(Mr. Akhund, Pakistan)

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.10/Rev.1 expresses concern over South Africa, and this is none too soon. We know also of cases in which uranium has disappeared or has been hijacked in a spectacular manner on the high seas and elsewhere, in circumstances which remain mysterious to this day. There has been neither an explanation nor a denial of those events. Now, nothing of this finds expression in the draft resolution. There is no recognition given even obliquely to the fact that these breaches of the non-proliferation régime have taken place and that the non-proliferation régime which the Non-Proliferation Treaty set up and visualized simply does not exist. Instead, we are asked to share in the anxiety that the accelerated spread of nuclear technology, even under safeguards, is something which might lead to proliferation.

That is a premise and an evaluation which we are unable to share, and which I am sure many less-developed countries that have great need to develop energy sources will not share.

A problem does indeed exist; there is not the least doubt about that. And solutions are also possible, and indeed the international community is today cognizant of the danger, and not inactive in seeking solutions. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), of which my country is an active member, is engaged with our full approval and encouragement in seeking ways of strengthening safeguards against nuclear proliferation. Recently a conference was held in Washington to study various alternatives to the nuclear fuel cycle, and my country is a participant, along with many other developing countries, in this exercise.

Most of these exercises - the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the IAEA - are based on concepts of international co-operation and consent. And whatever our differences may be over particulars, with this approach we are fully in accord.

(Mr. Akhund, Pakistan)

In the last few years, however, a rather different approach has come to prevail or to find advocacy. It is based essentially on a particular, and no doubt transitory, geo-political distribution of scientific capability and nuclear know-how. It is reflected in the restrictive and coercive policies which are advocated and followed by some supplier-countries: the narrow approach advocated in the "London club" - an approach shrouded in secrecy; unilateral cut-offs of fuel supplies to countries that do not fall in line with the particular view taken by supplier-countries; even the proposal that a suppliers' cartel should be set up in order to impose a non-proliferation régime.

In speaking of restraints - and this draft resolution speaks of restraints rather than safeguards, in paragraphs 4 and 6 - we have no doubts at all about the motives which animate the sponsors of the draft resolution in their general approach; we share their concern; we share their objectives. But we fear that the language they have used is capable of giving international sanction to this restrictive and coercive approach of creating a new norm which will henceforth be used to justify measures which go beyond the NPT, which go beyond the IAEA, and which, in our view, will not prove conducive to international co-operation in this field if we take the long view.

Certainly, we consider that such an approach does not take sufficient cognizance of the interests of the developing countries - the developing countries, which are short of fossil fuels, which are confronted with economic difficulties and challenges of all kinds certainly not in keeping with the spirit of the New International Economic Order.

It is for that reason that my country has put forward a series of amendments to this draft resolution. It is not our view that on a matter of this nature, where the vital interests of all countries are at stake, and which concerns the welfare and security and safety of the world at large, an approach based on exhortations, on reproofs, on seeking to isolate countries, is likely to prove beneficial, even taking the short view.

(Mr. Akhund, Pakistan)

I heard with attention the appeal made to us by my friend Ambassador Harry of Australia. We have indeed, along with a number of other countries from the developing world, been negotiating with the co-sponsors - or some of them, at least - with a view to reaching a consensus on this or finding some way of deciding this matter without dissent. I feel that in the time available to us such efforts can be pursued, should be pursued, and may perhaps lead to a solution which would be satisfactory all around.

With those words I conclude, and I should like to commend the members of this Committee to take these considerations into account and to give thought to the amendments, which we have put forward in a constructive spirit. Certainly, we look forward to pursuing our dialogue with the co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

Mr. SMID (Czechoslovakia): Mr. Chairman, with your permission and with the indulgence of the members of the Committee, I wish to make a very brief statement in my capacity as Chairman of the East European Group concerning the representation of the East European Countries in organs dealing with questions of disarmament.

The East European regional group has on many occasions indicated its disagreement with the distribution of seats in the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament, as a result of which the Group was allotted only six of the 54 seats.

The position of the Group on this question was explained in detail in the letter from its Chairman addressed to the President of the thirty-first session of the United Nations General Assembly on 3 February of this year. That position remains fully in force.

The delegations of the East European Group agreed not to object to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.11 by consensus, in view of the appeals addressed to it by a number of delegations.

(Mr. Smid, Czechoslovakia)

At the same time they would like to express their regret that the request that they be granted two additional seats in the Preparatory Committee was not met, as is usually done in similar cases. The Group would like to express its conviction that in future adequate representation of East European countries will be provided in the composition of organs dealing with questions of disarmament.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): I shall not hold the Committee too long at this time since the hour is advanced. But I think I would need to say a few words at this point. As was said before me by a number of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2, we would have liked to have a decision taken on the draft resolution today. We regret that delays have come into the picture, but we understand the reasons for them. At the same time, the issue which our draft resolution is addressing has already been before this Committee for more than four weeks.

The original idea was presented in a draft resolution submitted in the name of my delegation alone. It has gone through a very long process of consultation and negotiation, not least with the representative of Pakistan, and we are very grateful for the co-operation which he and others have shown towards our efforts.

I think that if anyone would take the trouble of comparing the original draft resolution with the draft which now appears in the form of document A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2, and at the same time of taking into account the rather exhaustive amendments that the delegation of Pakistan offered, albeit informally, to this Committee at that time, one would see that a considerable development has taken place and that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 have gone a very long way - and I must say, to the minds of some of the sponsors of our draft resolution, which we fully appreciate - even perhaps too long a way in order to meet certain concerns which have been expressed.

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

I think this is not a matter of language or of specific formulations. The matter is really very simple. Our draft resolution addresses itself to three principal points. One of them, and the main one is the danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons for the security of everyone. And I think that that is a danger that is universally recognized in this Committee. I only need to refer to the votes that have been taken in this Committee already on a number of resolutions which tried to deal with that problem in a different way, namely, the decision on the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America, on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, and on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Now all those resolutions deal with the danger with which our resolution is dealing. But our resolution is dealing with the danger in a universal way, and we believe that that is the correct way, although the support of my delegation for the nuclear-weapon-free zones and all these proposals is well known.

The second point that we are addressing is how best to promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy. This has great emphasis in our draft resolution, and we recognize not only the right but the need of all countries to have the use of nuclear energy. At the same time I think we have to be aware that unless suitable arrangements have been made, the unrestricted and unsafeguarded use of nuclear energy leads to grave dangers. These dangers, we believe, have been very clearly underlined by the developments in South Africa to which we have made reference before and to which almost every delegation in this room has made reference.

Now the problem remains how best to guard against those dangers, how best to combine these two aims - the peaceful benefits of nuclear energy and guarding against the dangers of nuclear proliferation. We believe that the best way to do this - and the instruments already exist - is a non-proliferation treaty and the control mechanism given in that treaty, which has been accepted by the overwhelming majority of this Committee and by the international community. We believe that even for those countries which for reasons of their own have not seen it possible to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the way is open to join the effort of the international community

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

to try to guard against the dangers of proliferation of nuclear weapons which, as I said, are universally recognized, while at the same time guaranteeing to everyone the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

I have to reserve my right and the right of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 to return to these points, but this is what I wanted to say at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the representative of Sweden would like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.29/Rev.1. I shall therefore call on the representative of Sweden at this stage because it will facilitate our work next week in taking positions on it.

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): As I already announced when introducing draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.29 on agenda item 38 entitled "Incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons", our intention has been to present a revised version of that draft resolution later this week.

Consequently, I should now like to introduce document A/C.1/32/L.29/Rev.1 on behalf of the following sponsors: Austria, Egypt, Finland, Jordan, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Tunisia, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, and my own country.

(Mr. Hamilton, Sweden)

This revised version includes two elements which did not figure in document A/C.1/32/L.29, that is, decisions to hold a conference in 1979 and to convene a preparatory conference. As I already stated in my introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.29, it is self-evident that a decision to hold a preparatory conference must be included in this year's resolution of the General Assembly. Otherwise there will not be sufficient time properly to prepare the conference of 1979, concerning the convening of which there is unanimity. That unanimity has been expressed in resolution 22 (IV) of the Diplomatic Conference in Geneva as well as in the formal consultations on this question held just before the First Committee started its work this year.

As regards the decision-making process of the preparatory conference next year and the conference in 1979, I should like on behalf of all the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.29/Rev.1 to declare our common position as follows.

In matters of humanitarian concern which also have military and security aspects a careful balance must be attained. Without prejudging the decision by the preparatory conference, which has to decide on all questions of procedure, the formula must ensure that for all practical purposes, and based on previous experience in this field, decisions on substance will always be the result of the widest possible agreement. If that is not the case they will be impracticable.

It is the sincere hope of all the sponsors that this Committee can reach a consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.29/Rev.1. We know that some parties have expressed certain difficulties with respect both to what we regard as rather minor points in the text and to an understanding about the decision-making process of the forthcoming preparatory conference and the conference in 1979. However, we are of the firm opinion that these difficulties and problems could sufficiently be taken care of in explanations of vote after a consensus decision on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to outline again the procedure we shall follow in our work next week. I understand that the Committee agrees to begin its work Monday morning with the introduction of the item on outer space and to resume on Monday afternoon consideration of disarmament items - that is to say, draft resolutions A/C.1/32/L.28, L.37, and L.3/Rev.2 and the amendments in document A/C.1/32/L.38. On draft resolution

(The Chairman)

A/C.1/32/L.29/Rev.1, I think the best procedure would be to consult the Committee after we have disposed of the items I have just mentioned, and deal with it after the Committee has received final clarification from the Secretariat concerning the financial implications.

As I hear no objection, I take it that the Committee decides to proceed in that manner.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.