

NOV 28 1980

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**
 THIRTY-FIFTH SESSION
 Official Records*



FIRST COMMITTEE
 41st meeting
 held on
 Monday, 24 November 1980
 at 3 p.m.
 New York

UN/SA COLLECTION

 VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 41ST MEETING

Chairman: Mr. NAIK (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 34 TO 37, 40 TO 42 AND 44 TO 48 (continued)

Draft resolutions were introduced by

Mr. Kirca (Turkey) - A/C.1/35/L.37
 Mr. de la Gorce (France) - A/C.1/35/L.42

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
 A/C.1/35/PV.41
 24 November 1980

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 34 TO 37, 40 TO 42 AND 44 TO 48 (continued)

Mr. KIRCA (Turkey): I have the honour and pleasure of introducing, on behalf of its sponsors, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.37.

Several of my colleagues will recall, or I am sure are aware of, the animated discussions which we had two years ago on the same text. At that time the resolution was adopted by a vote of 126 to 9, with 1 abstention. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.37 sincerely believe that such a text can be adopted this year by consensus, because two years ago there was no objection of principle to resolution 33/91 G, but it was said by its opponents that it was too early to raise this question. Obviously, this is not the case now.

If we compare the text of the original resolution with the draft resolution that I have the honour of introducing in the Committee, it will immediately be realized that the two texts are nearly identical. In fact, there are cosmetic changes in the new text which only improve the meaning of a compromise text finalized under the pressure of time at the session devoted to disarmament matters by this Committee two years ago.

The first question to be asked of the sponsors will surely be the following: why do you feel the need to repeat the same resolution? The answer is very simple. In operative paragraph 2 of resolution 33/91 G, the Committee on Disarmament was requested:

"... to consider the modalities of the review of the membership of the Committee and to report on this subject to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session".

In the two previous years the Committee was not able to conduct that review, and in the annual report on its 1980 session the Committee says that it

"will, at an appropriate time, conduct a review of its membership and report on the results to the General Assembly". (A/35/27, para. 73)

(Mr. Kirca, Turkey)

Before the second special session devoted to disarmament we have only the thirty-sixth regular session of the General Assembly ahead of us. So the Committee will have a last chance next year to make a detailed report on this subject to the General Assembly. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.37 believe that in these conditions this item should be included in the provisional agenda of the next regular session.

I shall now present a brief analysis of the cosmetic changes that the sponsors have made in this text. The first preambular paragraph was taken without a change from the original resolution and repeats a formula contained in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament. The second paragraph is also a repetition of the original, with these minor improvements: first, instead of saying "in accordance with" the sponsors prefer to say "as acknowledged by"; and secondly, there is a small addition to this paragraph taken from paragraph 28 of the Final Document, of the words "the duty to contribute to". By that small addition the sponsors have in mind giving emphasis to the fact that all States have not only the right to participate in disarmament negotiations but also the duty to contribute to them. I think that that addition alone is enough to reflect adequately the very constructive approach of all the sponsors.

The third preambular paragraph replaces the long original one by making an over-all reference to the whole text of resolution 33/91 G. The sponsors think that this shorter reference will give much coherence to the text, which in fact repeats the formula contained in the Final Document.

The fourth preambular paragraph is a new one and takes note of the relevant section of the rules of procedure of the Committee.

The last preambular paragraph is exactly the same as the original last paragraph of the preamble to resolution 33/91 G.

Having made that comparison, it will be concluded that the preamble to resolution 33/91 G and that to the new draft resolution are nearly identical.

(Mr. Kirca, Turkey)

I shall now briefly analyse the operative part.

Operative paragraph 1 is new and takes account of the lack of results reported by the Committee in the review of membership. I am sure that all the experts present here will appreciate the neutral wording of this paragraph, which does not contain any expression of regret although two years have elapsed without the Committee's being able to fulfil the task assigned to it by the General Assembly.

Operative paragraph 2 was taken from the original resolution, with the addition of the words "to continue". In fact, one should notice that that addition is also a very neutral one which does not express any desire for haste or any impatience or dissatisfaction with the existing state of affairs.

Operative paragraph 3 is exactly the same formula as contained in the original resolution. It was also left unchanged because of its very sensitive nature and, in our view, reflects a happy consensus reached two years ago by all the participants in the informal and formal negotiations.

As the Committee had already made arrangements for non-member States to participate in its work and as we had taken note of that fact in the preamble, we consequently dropped from the new draft resolution operative paragraph 3 of resolution 33/91 G. In this respect, the First Committee will notice that nothing that recalls in one way or another the long procedural debates of this year in the Committee relating to the participation of non-member States finds a place in this new text. Obviously, we care about the implementation of the arrangements made for the participation of non-member States; but the sponsors thought it would be wise not to make any reference to or give any hint of the difficulties met by the Committee on this subject during its 1980 session.

Finally, there is a cosmetic change in operative paragraph 4: we have replaced the words "to express views" with the term "to participate". In fact this wording is taken from rule 36 of the Committee's rules of procedure and, in our view, makes clear the idea and reflects faithfully the established practice.

(Mr. Kirca, Turkey)

In conclusion, may I say that the sponsors of this draft resolution merely ask the Committee on Disarmament to continue to consider this question in keeping with the recommendation made by the General Assembly, because the first review of the membership will be made and completed during the second special session on disarmament, which will be held in less than two years.

The question of principle, namely, the right of all States to take an active part in disarmament negotiations, was settled by consensus at the first special session; accordingly, rule 2 of the Committee's rules of procedure clearly states that "the membership of the Committee will be reviewed at regular intervals".

In these circumstances the sponsors strongly urge the First Committee to adopt the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.37 unanimously as a sign of further recognition of the legitimate concern of all States, big and small, with regard to the continuing arms race and the growing military threat, which severely affect their economic and social development.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of France to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.42.

Mr. de la GORCE (France)(interpretation from French): On behalf of the delegations of Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Kuwait, Mexico, the Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zambia and France, I should like to present to the First Committee today under agenda item 44 (j), a draft resolution entitled "Programme of research and studies on disarmament," A/C.1/35/L.42, of which these delegations are sponsors.

This draft resolution has resulted from the recommendations contained in General Assembly resolution 34/83 M, adopted in 1979 on the advice of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies.

Following those recommendations and as noted in the report in document A/35/574, the Secretary-General has held the necessary consultations with the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), the organization within which the new institute is to be set up, with the Centre for Disarmament and with other interested parties. As a result of those various consultations and in conformity with the resolution of 8 April 1980 unanimously adopted by the Board of Trustees of UNITAR, the Institute for Disarmament Research was thus established on 1 October 1980 within the framework of UNITAR in Geneva on the basis of an interim arrangement to last until the next special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. Its Director has now been appointed, and I should like to take this opportunity to express my congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Liviu Bota, whose competence and experience are a valuable token of the Institute's future success. I am in a position to assure the new Director that he can count on the active co-operation of the countries that supported the 1978 draft resolution establishing the Institute for Disarmament Research.

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

Finally, I note that the composition of the Institute's Advisory Board, the body entrusted with directing its programmes, is in the process of being completed. The Board, aside from those who are automatically members of it, because of their functions within the United Nations system, will be made up of outstanding persons from various regions of the world, with universally recognized authority in disarmament matters.

Like UNITAR, the Institute for Disarmament Research is an organ of the United Nations. It is also an integral part of the structural renovation and relaunching of initiatives in disarmament matters that resulted from the tenth special session of the General Assembly. For both these reasons, it deserves our attention and encouragement. An autonomous body funded by voluntary contributions, its influence and scope of action will largely depend on the support given it by Member States. The French Government, for its part, has undertaken to place at the new Institute's disposal a specialist in disarmament matters and to pay his salary. It will contribute some \$250,000 to meet the cost of initial operations and also to finance an initial inventory of research already accomplished or under way on the whole range of disarmament problems. The French Government hopes that this gesture will be followed by others, and that it will lead other countries or institutions to contribute, either in funds or in some other manner, to the programmes the Institute will be undertaking.

We are sure that the work of the new body will contribute to furthering research and studies on disarmament and to working out new approaches to well-known problems. It will be called upon to study, most often in a long-term perspective, the problems for disarmament that are or will be created by developments affecting the international community, as well as by technological progress. This is one of the Institute's specific roles to which we attach great importance.

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

The Institute's programme for the next two years should be established by the Advisory Board in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the tenth special session. It is clear that such a mandate cannot be carried out other than in close co-operation with the Centre for Disarmament and the Committee on Disarmament. In that respect, we hope that the Institute's funds will be used advisedly to carry out all or part of certain research projects with which the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies has been concerned and which are mentioned in the Secretary-General's report in document A/35/575.

The 34 delegations submitting draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.42 today express the hope that it will be adopted by consensus. This decision, like those we took in 1978 and 1979 on the same subject, will, we are convinced, inaugurate a fruitful future for the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

Mr. VELISSAROPOULOS (Greece) (interpretation from French): We have just heard the representative of Turkey, Ambassador Kirca introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.37, of which we are also a sponsor.

My delegation obviously fully shares his views on the need for a periodic renewal of the composition of the Geneva Committee. In fact, in 1978 we sponsored a resolution on the same subject, and we had no reason not to do so today.

(Mr. Velissaropoulos, Greece)

The reasons behind our taking this position stem from the principle that disarmament is everyone's concern - a principle embodied in the Final Document of the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament.

In our view, it should be ensured that interested States can participate in the negotiating body at regular intervals on the basis of rotation of membership.

As pointed out by Ambassador Kirca, two years have elapsed since the adoption of resolution 33/91 G, and work on this question has made no progress. Therefore, we must tackle this matter to ensure that the forthcoming special session can proceed to the first review of the membership of the Geneva Committee on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce the following additional sponsors of draft resolutions: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, A/C.1/35/L.35; Syrian Arab Republic and Sierra Leone, A/C.1/35/L.37; Spain, A/C.1/35/L.39; Morocco, A/C.1/35/L.40; Philippines and Sierra Leone, A/C.1/35/L.42.

The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.32/Rev.1. This draft resolution has 34 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 38th meeting of the First Committee on 21 November 1980. I have received no request from any Member State to explain its position before the Committee takes a decision on this draft resolution. May I inform the Committee that the sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed a wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution without a vote. .

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.32/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action upon the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.40. This draft resolution has 16 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the 36th meeting of the First Committee on 20 November 1980. I shall now call on the representative of the Netherlands, who wishes to explain his delegation's position before the Committee takes a decision on this draft resolution.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): Speaking on behalf of the nine member States of the European Community and of Greece, I should like briefly to draw attention to certain aspects of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.40, on the report of the Disarmament Commission.

The nine member States of the European Community and Greece have decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.40, subject, however, to the following comments which are offered in a constructive and positive manner.

It is our feeling, in relation to operative paragraph 1, that it is slightly incorrect to endorse without qualification the report of the Disarmament Commission, which at the time it was adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission contained in its annex certain passages that had not been agreed upon.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

Although we are glad that it has proved possible in the meantime to reach agreement on those parts of the report relating to the declaration of the 1980s as the second disarmament decade, we nevertheless feel that it would have been more appropriate to take note of the report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L/40 would imply that the Committee on Disarmament would have to finish its work on the comprehensive programme of disarmament in its spring session of 1981 with a view to enabling the United Nations Disarmament Commission to consider that programme in its session immediately following the spring session of the Committee on Disarmament. It appears to us that this time-frame may turn out not to be entirely realistic, although we appreciate the intention of the sponsors, which is to make it possible for the United Nations Disarmament Commission to consider the comprehensive programme of disarmament before it is submitted to the second special Assembly session devoted to disarmament.

Notwithstanding the comments I have just made, the nine States members of the European community welcome the work accomplished by the United Nations Disarmament Commission so far, and accordingly have no difficulty in voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.40.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform the Committee that the sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.40 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.45. As members are aware, this draft resolution has eight sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 38th meeting of the First Committee on 21 November 1980.

I should like to inform members of the Committee that the sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

(The Chairman)

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.45 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their positions at this stage.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the third operative paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.45, the delegation of the USSR would like to state that, as is known, the delay of the entry into force of the SALT II Treaty is not the fault of the Soviet side. As in the past, the Soviet Union is in favour of the immediate ratification of the Treaty and the consequent entry into force of the obligations contained in it, which apply to both parties.

Mr. BALETA (Albania)(interpretation from French): The Albanian delegation wishes to state that it dissociates itself from the consensus which seems to have emerged on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.45. My delegation's attitude is based on a number of reasons.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

The Albanian delegation voted against resolution 33/91 C of 16 December 1978 to which reference is made in the present draft resolution. At the time of the adoption of resolution 33/91 C, the Albanian delegation stated that, as far as it was concerned, there was no question of taking note with satisfaction of the demagogic views held on strategic arms limitation by the leaders of the two imperialist super-Powers. Events have confirmed our opinion that the two super-Powers contradict their statements by their actions in the area of the limitation of strategic weapons, as well as in every other area.

The Albanian delegation cannot endorse the views contained in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.45, either as regards the evaluation of the nature and effects of SALT II, or as regards the appeals addressed to the two super-Powers. As we have stated on other occasions, the talks and SALT agreements in no way represent measures for disarmament or for the limitation of armaments: they are merely bargaining between the two imperialist super-Powers with a view to planning in concert their armament and the arms race in which they are engaged.

It has become the everyday practice of the two imperialist super-Powers to employ numerous manoeuvres to achieve their objectives. From time to time they put forward proposals and counter-proposals which they describe as serious and constructive. Then they carry out talks and even conclude agreements. After that, they start to level accusations at each other and end up by beginning the same cycle over again to continue their plans and to throw dust into the eyes of others.

Whether or not the SALT II agreement is ratified, whether we witness its ratification or its official failure, depends solely on the plans being hatched by the United States of America and the Soviet Union to intensify their rivalry and their collaboration to establish their domination and hegemony over the world. But neither the ratification nor the rejection of those agreements will bring about any change in the aggressive designs and intentions of the two super-Powers or in the field of disarmament in general. Therefore we do not find it just or useful to address appeals to the two imperialist super-Powers to ratify SALT II and begin negotiations on SALT III.

We are convinced that SALT II - or III or IV - will not serve the cause of true disarmament, but will enable the two super-Powers to accommodate each other in the area of their common interests.

Mr. MARTIN (New Zealand): New Zealand has joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.45 because we support the general thrust of the draft resolution, which expresses concerns that we all share. We would, in particular, wish to associate ourselves with the expression of satisfaction in operative paragraph 4 relating to the next stage of arms limitation talks the objective of which will be to achieve quantitative reductions and qualitative limitations on strategic arms.

We do, however, have difficulties with the final preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, in particular when this is read in conjunction with operative paragraph 1. If the final preambular paragraph were a correct statement of the law on this subject, it could encourage States to refrain from associating themselves with agreements until they were in a position to ratify them or accede to them. We should have preferred it if the word "presumption" in that preambular paragraph had read "expectation". Our difficulty with this paragraph becomes greater when it is associated with the time frame in operative paragraph 1.

Nevertheless, as I have said, the draft resolution is an important one, and our misgivings over those formulations are far outweighed by other elements in the draft resolution which we welcome and to which we give our fullest support.

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States of America): My delegation has just joined in the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.45. I would, however, like to make some brief observations on the subject with which this draft resolution deals.

As my Government has stated on numerous occasions, the invasion of Afghanistan after the SALT II agreement had been sent to the Senate for consideration created a serious obstacle to Senate action on ratification. The position of the current United States Administration on SALT II is well known and was spelt out in our opening statement in the Committee on 30 October. It is anticipated that the incoming Administration will be reviewing the United States position on SALT II very soon.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation has joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.45, entitled "Strategic arms limitation talks". I should like, however, to clarify the position of the Federal Republic of Germany on this issue.

My Government has on many occasions underlined its commitment to realistic measures in the field of disarmament and arms limitation which contribute to the achievement of the aim of maintaining undiminished security at the lowest possible level of armaments and military forces and include strict and effective verification measures. In the light of this, my Government has all along spoken out in favour of the SALT process and of strict adherence to agreements which have already been concluded.

The Federal Republic of Germany is convinced of the importance of further negotiations covering both strategic and long-range theatre nuclear forces. It welcomes the beginning of the Geneva talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on the mutual limitation and reduction of long-range theatre nuclear forces. It learned with appreciation that at the end of the first round of talks the two parties expressed their determination to continue their talks and that they will, at the appropriate time, consult on the specific date of their resumption.

In the view of my Government, these talks represent an important step on the road to the limitation and reduction of long-range theatre nuclear forces in accordance with the principles of parity and equality. They contribute to the continuation of the SALT process, which is of primary importance for global stability and the preservation of peace.

The CHAIRMAN: As will be recalled, it was previously decided that consideration of the disarmament items would be concluded on 25 November. However, there are still a substantial number of draft resolutions on which the Committee will have to take decisions and some that have still to be introduced. One additional day would enable us to proceed without undue haste, might provide some much-needed time for reflection and would allow time for delegations to introduce their draft resolutions. Therefore I hope that members of the Committee will agree that the deadline for action on the disarmament questions be extended to Wednesday, 26 November. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees that we conclude our consideration of the disarmament items on the afternoon of Wednesday, 26 November.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to make two brief observations in connexion with our discussion last Friday on draft resolutions A/C.1/35/L.30 and L.31.

First of all, the French delegation would like to stress that it appreciated at their true value the modifications introduced to the texts of draft resolutions A/C.1/35/L.30 and L.31 by the sponsors. The changes introduced to the text of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.30 thus enabled us to avoid voting against that draft resolution and a corresponding change would have allowed us to act similarly with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.31 .

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

Furthermore, the French delegation would like to return for a moment to what was said at the meeting on Friday about the conditions of the establishment by French enterprises of an electro-nuclear power plant in the Cape province. We note that the two draft resolutions, A/C.1/35/L.30 and L.31, require South Africa to place all its nuclear installations under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). These provisions seem to us to be excellent, and we fully support them. France, for its part, places under the same safeguards all the transfers of nuclear technology made by it to South Africa. Such control, together with the very nature of the electrical power plant under construction - which unquestionably relates to peaceful applications of nuclear energy - constitute guarantees which are entirely in conformity with those accepted by the States that are members of IAEA. In these conditions we do not think there can be any objection to the training of the personnel who will, in accordance with these guarantees, be in charge of the operation of an electrical power plant.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): This Committee met last Friday to vote upon the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.22, entitled "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war". In his explanation of vote before the vote the representative of Ireland opposed the draft resolution, saying that there was little prospect of nuclear-weapon States agreeing to a declaration on the non-use of nuclear weapons and that such a declaration could even be dangerous since it might distract attention from our pursuit in a realistic manner of the goal of nuclear disarmament and the search for an appropriate security system.

My delegation is firmly of the view that what is required in a deteriorating international situation is for us to redouble our efforts to achieve peace and disarmament rather than give in to counsels of despair, which could only lead us inexorably to a nuclear war. It is

(Mr. Venkateswaran, India)

this kind of sense of resignation and traditional acceptance which the Brandt Commission's report characterized as "one of the chief enemies of disarmament, which we should all guard against". Alas, the argument for so-called realism has all too often been used to prevent international efforts at achieving nuclear disarmament. It seems to us ironical that, while the representative of Ireland considers that the use of nuclear weapons would be the height of madness, he regards the declaration designed to prevent their use as unrealistic and dangerous. Judged by the arguments of realism and practicability, a large number of the draft resolutions considered by this Committee would perhaps seem unrealistic to him as well.

(Mr. Venkateswaran, India)

The Indian delegation, for its part, is willing to give all draft resolutions the same serious consideration and attention, even though we may not agree with the approach or contents of some of them. We were therefore particularly pained to hear the judgement pronounced by the representative of Ireland that the draft resolution in A/C.1/35/L.22, which was sponsored by as many as 24 delegations and which now stands recommended by the First Committee to the General Assembly for adoption, falls into the category of resolutions which allegedly threaten to devalue the worth of United Nations resolutions. It is relevant to point out that in the voting on the draft resolution an overwhelming number of delegations, representing an overwhelming majority of the peoples of the world, in fact cast affirmative votes.

In conclusion, I should like to assure the Irish delegation that, as far as the Indian delegation is concerned, it will give any draft resolution presented by Ireland or others the same serious and respectful consideration as other draft resolutions presented in this Committee. We do not believe that we possess a monopoly on wisdom. We are convinced that the views of all nations can serve to increase our understanding and ability to deal with the urgent problems the world faces today.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): I should like to say that I am extremely grateful to the representative of India for the comments which he has just given us. I should like to make it absolutely clear that in the remarks which I delivered myself of on Friday on this subject I did not in any sense intend them to be critical of the delegation of India or of its submitting a draft resolution on this subject.

As I hope I made clear in my statement on this subject on Friday last, we addressed ourselves to the resolution which had already been introduced on this subject in 1961 and to which in fact most if not all the arguments which I mentioned in my statement related. However, I should like at this point simply to make that point clear and to state that I prefer to reserve our position on this and deliver another statement on this issue at a later stage.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.