



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 29TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

\* 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.1/33/PV.29  
7 November 1978

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee was to have begun today the general debate on agenda items 35 to 49. We were to have had two speakers on those items, but I now understand that neither wishes to make a statement today, and officially, there is nothing else on the agenda of this meeting.

Mr. RIOS (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): Since the meeting will probably be adjourned, I should like to take this opportunity to ask you, Mr. Chairman, to clarify if possible the position with regard to a draft resolution that has been with us now for some days, and of which it is said at one time that it is about to be discussed and at another that it is not, so that the comments on it are varied. I am referring to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1.

There are some delegations which are very small, like my own, with only one representative, who has to go from one Committee to another. It is for that reason that I am taking the liberty of asking you, Sir, to clarify the situation and tell us when the Committee will consider this draft resolution and take a decision on it. I had heard that you had given a ruling on when that would be, but I was not present so that I am not absolutely sure.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not believe that it is within the purview of the Chairman to try to elicit, explain or clarify the intentions of the sponsors of different draft resolutions which are before this Committee. Therefore, I have no answer to give to the question from the representative of Panama.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): We consider that the draft resolution on military and nuclear collaboration with Israel (A/C.1/33/L.1) under item 125 of the agenda, in which Israeli armament is condemned, should be considered separately from the other resolutions, on the grounds that it is a draft sponsored by a special session of the General Assembly. Therefore, we ask that it be put to the vote as soon as the speakers in this Committee have completed their statements on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN: If I understood the statement of the representative of Iraq correctly, he replied in fact to the representative of Panama and the thrust of his remarks was to demand that this Committee vote upon draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1, in which the name of his country appears as a sponsor.

Therefore, we have first a demand for a vote on a resolution in this Committee. Before proceeding further with that demand, I would remind the Committee that at its meeting on 6 October on the organization of work, on the proposal of the representative of Argentina an understanding was reached that the adoption of resolutions on all the items listed in the agenda of the First Committee would be taken at the end of its work. I refer to the verbatim report in document A/C.1/33/PV.3, on page 12.

Subsequently, in discussing the organization of work on 25 October, the Chairman expressed himself as follows:

"As members of the Committee will also recall, when we decided on our work programme a few weeks ago, there was an understanding that most or all items would be left open, so that members would have enough time to draft resolutions, and also so that it would be possible to take up all the draft resolutions at the end of our work for this session."

(A/C.1/33/PV.15, p. 89)

The Committee agreed to those suggestions.

The Committee has therefore two opposite points of view before it. When the last ruling was made, the representative of Iraq was not present. I presume that had he been present he would have raised an objection to that ruling. Be that as it may, in this situation I judge it proper that the Committee itself, as master of its own procedure, should decide the issue as between the proposal by Iraq and the understanding and the ruling of the Chairman.

Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to make a few remarks in connexion with what you have just told us, Mr. Chairman. We have listened attentively to the explanation given by the Chairman in connexion with the organization of our work as well as to the statement of the representative of Iraq explaining the position of that country.

I should like to say quite sincerely that the statements have moved us, because we profoundly respect the aspirations, wishes and expectations of every country. We consider that every member of the Organization has, under the Charter, equal rights to state its position and to make its opinion known; the right to hold an opinion and to make a request is in accordance with the Charter and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, as is the case at the moment.

As I have said, we have listened to the account given to us by the Chairman on the decision so far taken by this Committee. We have also read closely the verbatim records contained in documents A/C.1/33/PV.3 and A/C.1/33/PV.15 respectively.

As we understand it, there are two different aspects to the request. One is procedural and simply comes under the rules of procedure; that pertains to the decision taken by this Committee. The other is one of substance, closely linked with the reasons why that decision was reached. So that we may proceed in a certain order, I shall refer first to the procedural aspect.

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

I therefore believe we should refresh our memories with reference to what the Committee agreed to and which appears in the relevant verbatim records which I have just mentioned.

At the 3rd meeting of this Committee, a resolution was adopted expressly. It appears in document A/C.1/33/PV.3, on page 47. With the indulgence of the Chairman and members of the Committee, I shall read the verbatim record:

"The CHAIRMAN: As no other representative wishes to express a view at this point, I think we are approaching the time when we should take a decision on the working schedule of the First Committee. I myself have found the preceding discussion most valuable, because it has given some insight into how some of the items are going to shape up. All sides have, I think, urged the officers of the Committee to observe as much flexibility as possible. You may be sure that I will try to do so.

Before submitting the final working schedule for adoption by the Committee, perhaps it would be good if I were to repeat it. For the consideration of item 125, 'Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session', from 16 to 20 meetings would be allotted; next, for item 128, 10 meetings; then for the substantive disarmament items, from 35 to 49 inclusive, from 38 to 42 meetings; and, finally, for item 50, 'Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security', 10 meetings. Keeping in mind the discussion we have had this morning, I formally propose that the Committee adopt this working schedule. It was so decided." (A/C.1/33/PV.3, p. 47)

Then comes the complement to this decision which was adopted at the 15th meeting of the Committee, which appears in document A/C.1/33/PV.15 on page 89. This statement is somewhat lengthy and so, in order not to prolong my statement unduly, I shall read only those substantive parts which are relevant to the decision taken.

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

"The CHAIRMAN: Since we still have a few minutes before our scheduled time ends, I thought that perhaps we could use the time usefully by considering what we have achieved and what lies ahead of us in the immediate future." (A/C.1/33/PV/15, p. 89)

Then there is an account of what transpired at the third meeting. Further on, we read the following:

"A number of draft resolutions have been issued and distributed under item 125. It is clear, however, that there will have to be more draft resolutions under that item, if only because the Final Document prescribes that the first Committee should take this or that action. And, as I understand it, that action can only be taken, in most cases, by a draft resolution." (Ibid)

Further on still, we read the following:

"As members of the Committee will also recall, when we decided on our work programme a few weeks ago, there was an understanding that most or all items would be left open, so that members would have enough time to draft resolutions, and also so that it would be possible to take up all the draft resolutions at the end of our work for this session." (Ibid)

At the end of the statement by the Chairman which appears in the verbatim record, we read:

"If there are no comments or objections, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to my suggestions. It was so decided."

(Ibid., p. 90)

This means that the Committee adopted two procedures to be followed. First of all, the Committee set a certain number of meetings for the debates on the various items, while at the same time giving the Chairman discretion to act with the utmost flexibility in deciding the number of meetings needed depending on how the situation evolved, and, secondly, it agreed that the decisions - that is to say, the resolutions on the items - would be adopted at the end of our work during this session. The Committee is the master of its own procedure, as we read in annex I of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly on page 37, which contains the recommendations and suggestions of the Special Committee on Methods and Procedures of the General Assembly. The Special Committee was established

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

under resolution 271 (III) of 29 April 1949, and its recommendations were approved under resolution 362 (IV). Under paragraph 39, under the heading of "Role of the Presiding Officers", we read:

"The Special Committee recommends to the General Assembly that the Chairmen of the Main Committees should fully exercise the functions assigned to them in the rules of procedure and, in particular, make use of the perogatives given them in rule 108<sup>e</sup> /para. 1237" (A/520/Rev.12, p. 56)

If, as we have heard this afternoon, one or more delegations wishes to alter what has been decided by this Committee, they are fully entitled to request it. We would then have to apply the relevant rules of procedure, go back on what we have already decided and decide on another working method. This is all I wish to say with regard to the procedural aspect.

I should like now to refer to the other aspect mentioned earlier, namely, the spirit which prevailed in the Committee in adopting the decisions. The spirit is clear from the many statements made during the third meeting of this committee. From reading the relevant verbatim record, we clearly understand that the intention of every delegation was to have a thorough and flexible debate on all items pertaining to disarmament in order to arrive at positive decisions fully in accord with the aspirations of peoples, and that beforehand we should have a real and global picture of the disarmament situation before adopting any resolutions. The decision taken that there be flexibility in the debates on all disarmament items was not a mere whim, nor was it a decision lightly taken without quite knowing why.

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

This aspect was already dealt with by the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the work of the General Assembly. Among its conclusions, adopted under resolution 2837 (XXVI) and appearing as annex V to the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, we read under the heading of "General debate in Committee":

"The Special Committee, while recognizing the unquestionable usefulness and importance of the general debate, considers that Chairmen should encourage the Main Committees:

...

"(b) To extend, whenever appropriate, the practice of holding a single debate on related and logically linked agenda items.

"The Special Committee recognizes that a general debate on questions previously considered by a United Nations organ and covered by a report of the organ concerned should be retained. The Committee, however, draws the attention of the Chairmen of the Main Committees to the possibility of consulting their Committees in every case when a general debate on a certain item does not seem to be needed. The Chairmen may resort to this practice to ascertain in particular whether the Committees desire to hold a general debate on every question referred to them by other organs.

"At the same time, the Special Committee wishes to reaffirm that the general debate serves a necessary and very useful purpose in the work of the Main Committees and that its organization should in no circumstances be changed without the consent of the Committees concerned, which therefore should decide on the applicability of the above-mentioned suggestions." (A/520/Rev.12, paras. 61, 62 and 63)

This view is one which we have taken into account in regard to the statements made at the 3rd meeting of our Committee. Actually, we might quote any of those statements. With the permission of the Ambassador of Argentina, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, I shall take the liberty of reading a part of his statement because we consider it to be very important and, furthermore, he was supported by a large number of delegations. He said:

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

"Personally I feel that it is inevitable that when we discuss item 125 there should be what we might call a mini-general debate on that particular item: in other words, all delegations will give their views on the review to which the item refers and their assessment of the tenth special session. This does not mean that at the end of the exchange of views that may occur on that item we shall have to adopt resolutions. If the Committee deems it fitting those resolutions may well be postponed for adoption at the end of our session. The same would apply to item 128. It will be dealt with exclusively in a kind of debate where delegations will put forward their positions, but this does not necessarily imply that before we take up other items we shall have to adopt resolutions.

"In short, Mr. Chairman, I think there is no divergence between the views suggested by you and the opinions put forward by the delegations of Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Austria and Sweden. If we follow the order suggested by the officers of the Committee, we could begin to consider those items in what in the final analysis will be a general debate and defer until a subsequent stage - I would even say, towards the end of our work - the adoption of resolutions on all the items listed in the First Committee's agenda."

(A/C.1/33/PV.3, pp. 11-12)

This statement is the one which gave rise to the one you made, Mr. Chairman, and indicated the agreement of the members of this Committee. I could continue to quote similar statements from the records of the 3rd meeting of this Committee, but that would make my remarks unduly lengthy.

Apart from these considerations, there are others which have to be considered as fundamental. When the Committee adopted its programme of work, my delegation, and I assume the vast majority of delegations, communicated to our Foreign Ministers the fact that decisions would be taken at the end of our work. It is on this understanding that the Foreign Ministers, as they receive reports on the progress of our debates, will be taking positions on the draft

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

resolutions submitted. If decisions were to be taken earlier, perhaps the results would not reflect what countries really wished because many might not be prepared to vote.

As I said at the beginning, we have the highest respect for the views and wishes of other delegations, and if the majority is in favour of a procedure other than the one that we have already adopted, my delegation will not try to prevent this. Quite simply, after this statement we shall make known our position by our vote. But with the same respect which we said we profess for the views and wishes of all delegations, we appeal to those delegations that at this stage wish to change the working method to reflect carefully so as to avoid a debate which might prove sterile for the purposes we all pursue in respect to these items.

The CHAIRMAN: If I understood the representative of Uruguay correctly, during his statement he made a formal proposal that this Committee, as far as the voting on draft resolutions is concerned, keep to the understanding and the rulings which he was citing. Is that a correct interpretation of his statement?

Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): Yes, Mr. Chairman, your interpretation is correct. But at the same time, I said that if any delegation or several delegations wished at this stage to change the working method we had agreed to earlier, my delegation would not object. We would simply make known our position by our vote. However, we appeal to the members to think over what the consequences might be if we changed our working method. It could lead to a sterile discussion. We would be bottled up in a futile procedural debate which would not help us to advance to the attainment of the purposes we all pursue with respect to these items.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Uruguay for his clarification.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. Chairman, in response to your explanation of the situation, I should like on behalf of the nine countries of the European Communities to join the previous speaker in supporting most strongly the wish to postpone the decision on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1. This would be in accordance with the understanding reached at the 3rd meeting of the First Committee, and confirmed at the 15th meeting, that we should - and may I quote you, Mr. Chairman - "take up all the draft resolutions at the end of our work for this session". (A/C.1/33/PV.15, p. 89)

We see no particular urgency to decide on that draft now. This Committee has just finished its deliberations on items 125 and 128. The bulk of the disarmament topics have not yet been examined, nor have the draft resolutions been adequately discussed. The latter point applies also to the draft resolutions under the two items I have just mentioned.

A general exchange of views has taken place on these points, but there have been no specific discussions or consultations on texts of draft resolutions. We should prefer to examine the drafts, including draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1, more closely, to discuss them further and also to get on with the work of the Committee on several other issues before starting to vote on draft resolutions. We hope that the members of the Committee see, as we do, merit in proceeding in such a manner, and will agree to postpone the voting to a later stage.

Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): I regret that I find it necessary to speak again, but I fear I was not sufficiently clear. At no time did I refer to postponing a vote. Throughout my statement I thought I had been quite clear on that point.

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

I think we have a choice between two courses. Either we continue to follow the decision we have already taken in the Committee, or we apply the relevant rules of procedure - and the Secretariat will be able to give us information so that we may proceed in accordance with those rules - and then amend our prior decision and vote on a different method of work, namely, that we vote on the draft resolutions now, which might be very good. However, if we are to apply the rules of procedure, those are the only two courses open to us. There might be a third choice, on which the Secretariat could give us clarification, in accordance with the rules of procedure, and that is to interpret what appears in the records of the 3rd and 15th meetings of the Committee.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq): I am sorry that my delegation has to speak again but I wish to offer a few clarifications in view of the statements that have just been made.

To start with, there is some confusion regarding a decision. My delegation does not recall that a decision has been taken concerning the work procedure of the Committee. Actually at an earlier date my delegation pointed out that it would prefer an early vote on draft resolutions concerning item 125. However, in deference to statements by a number of representatives that they would need more time to study the existing draft resolutions and to introduce others, we acquiesced in the wishes of a number of delegations and in particular, after consultations with the officers of the Committee, we stated that we would agree to defer voting until after the conclusion of item 128. In this matter certain views were expressed, as we are aware. The representative of Argentina expressed a wish, and we very much respect his wish. The officers of the Committee also expressed an opinion. Whether suitable or not, it was an opinion that was expressed. That did not mean that a decision was taken.

Our position is very clear, and we expressed it in our earlier statement. It would be rather ironical for us to accept this as a decision when it was actually discussed merely as an exploration of opinion. We have now reached the point where we have to decide on the position we are going to adopt. We are open to any suggestions, but if someone says that certain options are closed and that in this it is necessary to abide by different rules of procedure, that would be

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

limiting us and tying our hands behind our backs. Certainly there should be a fair discussion, In this sense, item 125 is to a great extent separate from the other items, and ample time has been provided for all delegations to study it and also to contribute whatever draft resolutions or other material they may have. Actually there are five now, and after all this time I think it would be justifiable to have this particular draft resolution ended with. That would facilitate the work of this Committee. Especially for countries like mine that have small delegations that cannot be stretched over several committees, running from one room to another, it would be very helpful, and it would facilitate the work of the Committee, to finish with one item and then concentrate on another separate item, that is, "General and complete disarmament". That is the position of my delegation. It is actually the understanding of my delegation, and probably is shared by many other delegations.

Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from French);  
Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your indulgence in listening to such lengthy statements when you are concerned about gaining time and using it so that our work proceeds as it should.

My delegation did indeed understand that, at the last meeting last week, the proposal made by the representative of Pakistan had been adopted. The representative of Pakistan had made an excellent suggestion, which was to vote on the draft resolutions related to items already discussed. I understood that the Committee had accepted that motion. The representative of Iraq had asked that draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 be voted on because it was related to the item under discussion, namely, item 125, which is a summary of the views expressed at the special session, where that draft resolution had been submitted. I do not wish to take up too much of the Committee's time. I wish only to express support for what the representative of Iraq has said, and to request that the draft resolution in question be voted on and that the rules relating to points of order be applied.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): There is no reason to quote from the records of our meetings that have already been quoted. We had an indication as to the way we intended to proceed at our third meeting on 6 October. We had an indication of the way we intended to proceed at our fifteenth meeting on 25 October, and we had another indication this past Friday. Although the verbatim record is not yet available to me I have in my notes a fairly clear recollection of what was said. And in every case we said that we were going to vote, as a general rule, on all draft resolutions at the end of the session.

Now I see no particular reason for changing this. There has been no reason advanced. I know of no objective need for doing it, and we think that it is not appropriate at this early stage of our work to begin voting on intensely controversial proposals. There remain several weeks for the Committee to consider questions that are more directly related to arms control and disarmament before us during this our thirty-third session of the General Assembly. These various issues have great importance for mankind.

Each of us needs to exert his efforts to work for the best possible action on disarmament by this General Assembly. If we begin by voting now when there is no requirement to vote, the relations between delegations and their ability to consider proposals positively and in a forthcoming spirit will be compromised.

We support the position that the First Committee can best take up draft resolutions towards the end of the session. We know there is a very widespread sentiment in this Committee against voting today. Let us preserve the community of our delegations and not give way to action that will divide us.

The CHAIRMAN: After listening carefully to the debate, I think that there are still two diametrically opposed views at present. Those views can be democratically resolved only by the Committee itself, and therefore, unless one or the other side wishes to concede the point, I shall have to put the point to a vote.

This will be a procedural vote as to whether at this time the Committee should accede to the Iraqi representative's request to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1. The form in which I shall put this question to the vote, since as it has been referred to by a number of speakers and as is very clear from the verbatim records, is whether or not the Committee wishes to follow the earlier understanding and

(The Chairman)

the ruling of the Chair that votes on draft resolutions should be taken at the end of the work of this Committee.

I think that the procedural point is that the Committee is already in the process of voting, and therefore I should allow only speakers on a point of order having to do with the conduct of the voting. Nevertheless, I call on the representative of Iraq.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq): I should just like to inquire as to the rule of procedure under which you, Mr. Chairman, will conduct this vote.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask the point of that question?

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq): Yes, it is because it is our understanding that there was no earlier decision taken as to our programme of work, and now we hear that a decision had previously been taken, and this is something new to us. To our understanding there was no previous decision concerning this issue, and we are proceeding to the vote on the understanding that this is an issue to be raised and decided accordingly, not on the basis that there had been a previous decision taken on this point.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to be in disagreement with the representative of Iraq, but if he should refer to the verbatim record of 25 October it is clearly stated there that draft resolutions should be voted on at the end, and the Committee agreed to that suggestion. I think that I have also repeated this today a number of times as have a number of representatives.

We shall now proceed to a procedural vote, not a substantive one, as to whether the Committee shall accede to the request of the representative of Iraq that draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.1 be voted on this afternoon. The proposal shall be phrased as to whether the Committee wishes to adhere to its earlier decision that all draft resolutions be voted upon at the end of the Committee's work.

The proposal was adopted by 59 votes in favour, 28 against, and 13 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: Therefore, the Committee has reaffirmed its decision that it will only vote on draft resolutions at the end of its work. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): My delegation abstained on this particular vote which you put to us because we thought that there was no need for the Committee to have proceeded to take a vote on this question.

Our understanding of the interventions of the representative of Iraq was to the effect that, if suggestions were made to that delegation as to the way and manner in which we should proceed, the delegation was open to such suggestions. In fact, at one stage we did hear the representative of Iraq say that he was going to try to simplify the work of the Committee and your task as Chairman.

It seems to us that if this Committee had explored a littler further the possibilities which were open to us, the Committee would not have had to go to a vote and, therefore, the atmosphere which we have been trying to preserve would have been preserved.

In any case, the vote which we have taken still leaves a lot of questions unanswered because everyone who has referred to the decision continued to say that we would take a vote on all the draft resolutions at the end of our work. When is the end of the work of the Committee? Is it at the beginning of December or is it on 8 December? I think that all the items which were assigned to the First Committee would be considered as items pertaining to the work of the Committee. So my delegation was really not clear, if we had voted on the question you put to us, what date we would have been voting for.

Mr. RIOS (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation agreed that we maintain the decision which was adopted previously precisely so as to avoid any problems or any confusion in the work of the Committee. Since a decision had already been taken, which appears in the verbatim record, that we would take up all the draft resolutions at the end of our work for this session, my delegation at no time considered that it would be appropriate to amend that decision. Accordingly, my delegation voted in favour of the reaffirmation of the previous decision. Otherwise, we would have set a precedent here which would have given rise to difficult situations in the future.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq): I very much appreciate what the representative of Nigeria has said.

We were rather confused on the ruling of the Chair. Was a decision previously taken on this or not? We were inquiring. We asked for the floor; our request for the floor was simply ignored. We were not asking for a vote on this matter. But if that was the wish of the Chair, very well. At least now we know where the Chair stands.

The second point here in this consideration regarding the end of the work of the Committee, we put the question to the Chair and to the whole Committee to be more definite as to when that would be. And as we have decided on the organization of our work, it would facilitate things for the Chair and for the Committee if a decision was made as to the appropriate date for having this resolution put to the vote.

As I said earlier, we are open to suggestions. We would like to co-operate with the Committee, and we are not in a hurry to have anything decided now. But we are against ways and means of diverting the attention of this Committee from facing the main issues of the discussion. This, actually, is our position.

The CHAIRMAN: May I simply say that the Chair feels no call to defend itself against any member of this Committee.

Secondly, I would draw the attention of the representative of Iraq to the fact that twice before the vote I said that there are two points of view diametrically opposed to each other. I continued to say that unless one of them yielded, I had no alternative but to put it to the vote. Those were my words, which no doubt the Iraqi representative will find in the verbatim record when it comes out.

Therefore, I cannot accept any accusation that people who did not need a vote and did not want a vote were not given the opportunity of saying so.

Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic): My delegation voted in favour of the Committee having to take a vote on the substance of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.1 in the belief that it was very important. Nevertheless, the Committee having voted against the request of the representative of Iraq which I seconded, my delegation accepts the Committee's decision, but does not think that the substance of the draft resolution was affected by that decision. I take note of the Chairman's statement that the vote was concerned only with procedure.

Mr. MADADHA (Jordan)(interpretation from Arabic): We would have liked things to proceed in an amiable way. I understood that the Iraqi representative did not insist on a vote but only expressed his opinion. In any case, we hope that the Chairman will now tell us when the vote will be taken on the draft resolutions on agenda item 125. If I understood correctly, the Chairman said at a previous meeting that the deadline for submitting draft resolutions on agenda item 125 was tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: In reply to the first question of the representative of Jordan about when the vote will be taken, I believe I said on Friday that the week of 27 November-1 December would be reserved exclusively for voting on draft resolutions and, therefore, that the debate on agenda items 35-49 would take only three weeks, from 6-24 November; that was also the reason why it was decided that the list of speakers would be closed tomorrow at 5 p.m.

The representative of Jordan also asked about the deadline for submitting draft resolutions on agenda item 125. We had originally fixed a tentative deadline of Friday, 10 November; but since, as I said last Friday, I understood there were draft resolutions still in the offing, that deadline was extended to Wednesday, 15 November. It will be further extended, if need be, but reluctantly.

Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina)(interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to your statement that we shall vote on draft resolutions during the week of 27 November-1 December. I would venture to suggest that we should set the deadline of 1 December for conclusion of the voting on the draft resolutions, but that we should show somewhat more flexibility as to the beginning.

It may happen that, during the course of the debate, we might find ourselves in the situation that you have just described, namely, that there may not be too many speakers on questions under discussion at the time; however, we know that there are numerous draft resolutions to be voted on and so on. I believe four days would not be enough to put to a vote drafts on which there would first be introduction by one or more delegations, comments, debates, the actual voting procedure and then explanations of vote before and after the vote.

In view of the number of draft resolutions we already have - and, as far as I know, others are in the process of being submitted - I think that four days, from 27 November to 1 December, might turn out not to be enough. Accordingly, I suggest that we take 1 December as a kind of deadline for the end of the vote but that we leave it to your discretion to be flexible about the date on which we start voting.

The CHAIRMAN: I am most grateful to the representative of Argentina, whose suggestions I have always found to be such that I should have thought of them myself. We shall certainly do what he has suggested.

He also brought to my mind another suggestion made on Friday - if I remember correctly - by the representative of Pakistan, namely, that when there is a lull in our meetings we can at least introduce draft resolutions. Of course there are now quite a number of draft resolutions already in circulation which have not been officially introduced. I would be most grateful if delegations could see their way to introduce them as quickly as possible, starting tomorrow afternoon of course.

Mr. PEREZ HERNANDEZ (Cuba)(interpretation from Spanish): First, if my memory serves me well, I believe the representative of Nigeria suggested that the list of speakers not be closed tomorrow but on Wednesday afternoon.

The second point is actually a question which I should like to address to the Chairman. In view of the large number of items, although the majority of them are related, will each delegation have the right to speak only once on all the items taken together or will delegations be able to put their names on the list several times so as to be able to deal with separate items and discuss them in the way they think best? I should be grateful if the Chairman would shed some light on that.

The CHAIRMAN: To reply first to the second question of the representative of Cuba, it has been the tradition of this Committee that when several disarmament items are within one block and covered by one debate, those delegations which so wish may intervene more than once.

In reply to the first question, namely that referring to the closing of the list of speakers, the memory of the representative of Cuba is entirely correct except for the fact that since the original proposal was made by the representative of Nigeria, the Chair made an arrangement with him which would allow the Chair to close the list of speakers tomorrow afternoon. I hope that this will not cause too much inconvenience to delegations.

I note that this has been a rather animated afternoon but perhaps tomorrow everyone will take a calmer attitude. As there are no further speakers this afternoon and as we have no speakers for tomorrow morning and only one for tomorrow afternoon, the meeting will adjourn until 3 p.m. tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.