

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

*Official Records* \*



FIRST COMMITTEE  
52nd meeting  
held on  
Monday, 27 November 1978  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 52ND MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 125: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION:: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (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.1/33/PV.52  
29 November 1978

ENGLISH

78-73708

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

AGENDA ITEM 125 (continued)

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION (A/33/42, A/33/279, A/33/305, A/33/312, A/33/317)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue this afternoon to take votes and decisions on the draft resolutions presented under item 125 of the agenda. Unless otherwise announced, these votes will be taken in the order in which the draft resolutions have been presented.

The first draft resolution presented for the decision of the Committee is contained in document A/C.1/33/L.3/Rev.1 concerning the "Urgent need for cessation of further testing of nuclear weapons". With the addition of the delegations of Togo and Liberia this afternoon, this draft resolution has 32 co-sponsors. It was introduced in the Committee by the representative of India at the 18th meeting of the Committee on 27 October 1978. The co-sponsors have expressed the wish that this draft resolution be adopted by consensus. Before going any further I should like to call on the representative of India who has been in consultation with the co-sponsors of the draft resolution immediately preceding this meeting of the Committee.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): The co-sponsors have had an opportunity to hold informal consultations with the representative of Liberia regarding the amendments contained in document A/C.1/33/L.36 and we have reached a solution of the matter. Perhaps it would be more appropriate if, Mr. Chairman, you were to give an opportunity to the representative of Liberia himself to convey our decision regarding his amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: In that context may I draw the attention of the members of the Committee to the amendments which were submitted on 22 November by Liberia and which are contained in document A/C.1/33/L.36. I now call on the representative of Liberia.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): I would like to state for the benefit of the Committee that the co-sponsors met in an atmosphere of complete understanding and harmony. The Liberian delegation will not press to a vote the two amendments under A/C.1/33/L.36. It may be that the representative of India would want to make further comment on this.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the representative of India wish to make any further statement at this time.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): On behalf of the co-sponsors, I wish to convey our sincere appreciation to the representative of Liberia for the very constructive spirit of co-operation and understanding that he has shown with regard to our draft resolution. The co-sponsors were in complete agreement with the spirit of the Liberian amendments and would indeed have been happy to incorporate them in our draft resolution. We could not do so only because we did not have sufficient time to examine their important and constructive amendments in the detailed and in-depth manner which they deserved.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

At the same time, the representative of Liberia has become a sponsor of the draft resolution, even though the amendments have not been incorporated in its text. As far as the Indian delegation is concerned, clearly we would have been happy to accept the amendments. On behalf of the co-sponsors, once again I wish to convey our sincere appreciation and gratitude to the Liberian delegation.

The CHAIRMAN: It is the understanding of the Chair that the draft amendments submitted by the delegation of Liberia in document A/C.1/33/L.36 will not be pressed to the vote and that instead, the delegations of Liberia and Togo have joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3/Rev.1\* as it stands. Therefore, the Committee will have to pronounce itself on that document as it stands. As I mentioned earlier the sponsors would like this draft resolution to be adopted by consensus. Is there any objection to such a procedure?

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I would respectfully suggest that we have a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now, accordingly, vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3/Rev.1\*, entitled "Urgent need for cessation of further testing of nuclear weapons", as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Niggria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: China, France.

Abstaining: Belgium, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3/Rev.1 was adopted by 89 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions\*

---

\* Subsequently the delegations of Angola, Burundi, Democratic Yemen, Guinea, Honduras, Mauritius, Qatar, Paraguay, Togo and Venezuela advised the Secretariat that had they been present they would have voted in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. HSU (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The position of the Chinese delegation on the question of the complete nuclear test ban is known to all. We are of the view that when the super-Powers have conducted thousands of nuclear tests, and when they are in a position to continue to develop and improve their nuclear weapons even without conducting tests, to propose a nuclear test ban without demanding that they engage in the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons can only further strengthen the super-Powers' nuclear monopoly rather than being conducive to the genuine realization of nuclear disarmament. Therefore, the Chinese delegation voted against the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/33/L.3/R.v.1\*, and wishes to state that the Chinese delegation reserves its position on all references advocating or calling for a complete nuclear test ban in other draft resolutions.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): In explaining the reasons for the abstention of the United States of America on this resolution, I would like to explain why an immediate moratorium on nuclear testing, which we recognize is strongly desired by many nations in this room, does not seem to us to be a good idea. We have strongly and consistently held the view that a comprehensive test ban, in order to promote stability and mutual confidence among its participants, must be based on adequate measures of verification. At this moment, we are engaged in the detailed and technically complex process of elaborating such measures. We have made steady progress in these efforts, and are confident that effective and mutually acceptable solutions can be achieved.

But an immediate cessation of nuclear testing under a moratorium could seriously complicate these efforts. Therefore, while we understand and sympathize with the motivation of those who call for a moratorium, we believe the surest way of arriving at our goal - that is, the earliest possible achievement of a comprehensive test ban that could truly promote confidence among the parties - is through the negotiations now being carried on at Geneva, and that is the reason for our abstention.

Mr. PEARSON (Canada): My delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3/Rev.1 calling for a moratorium on nuclear testing pending the achievement of a comprehensive test ban. There is no need to reiterate here that my Government strongly favours the cessation of any kind of nuclear testing, whether for weapons or any other purposes. However, we must point out that the moratorium concept as described in this draft resolution, continues to give us some difficulty. We have always maintained that a comprehensive test ban, or, for that matter, a moratorium must be accompanied by adequate measures of verification. In our opinion, we cannot rely purely on national technical means to verify the cessation of nuclear tests. Therefore, my Government has always considered that the best solution is the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban which would include effective measures of verification. We fervently hope such a treaty will be tabled in the coming months.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): For many years the Pakistan delegation has actively advocated an early and comprehensive ban on nuclear testing. We therefore support the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty which would leave no loopholes for nuclear proliferation.

It is a matter for some regret that the comprehensive test ban treaty has not yet been concluded despite the clearly expressed desire of the international community. Since the prospects of a comprehensive test ban still seem somewhat uncertain, my delegation has agreed to the proposal for an immediate moratorium on nuclear testing. We see this as a call especially on the major Powers which are in the process of negotiating the comprehensive test ban. We feel that among the nuclear Powers the first step should be taken by those that are technically and numerically far in advance of the other nuclear Powers. This is necessary to create conditions for a universal and comprehensive ban on nuclear testing.

At the same time we agree with the view that the proposed moratorium should not allow any loopholes to make possible either vertical or horizontal proliferation. We therefore favour the proposals submitted by Japan in document A/C.1/33/L.8 and are glad to see that they have been materially incorporated in the revised draft resolution.

For those reasons Pakistan voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.3/Rev.1.

Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation is far from indifferent to the draft resolution just voted upon. It fully appreciates the feelings and intentions of the sponsors of the draft, but, as we said on 30 June 1978, on the adoption of the Final Document of the tenth special session - A/S.10/PV.27 of 7 July - through Mr. Taittinger, cessation of nuclear testing should form part of a real process of disarmament. We could associate ourselves with the idea of a cessation of nuclear testing by all States within that framework of an effective process of nuclear disarmament. But we feel it is wrong to think that stopping tests will be conducive to a qualitative freeze on nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

The two most heavily armed States have through their numerous tests accumulated sufficient data to make any improvements they may need without any further testing. The halting of tests would not in itself make a positive contribution to non-proliferation whether it was the result of a temporary commitment not to test or of a treaty on total prohibition.

My delegation therefore reiterates the reservations it expressed on the occasion of the adoption of the Final Document of the tenth special session.

Mr. VELISSARAPOULOS (Greece) (interpretation from French): My delegation voted in favour of the Indian draft because it respects the general principle and concept it contains. However, the implementation of any resolution of this sort implies that progress in means of verification will match progress towards genuine disarmament. What we have voted on is the question of practical means to ensure respect for general nuclear disarmament and the concept of security of States, which is closely linked to the matter of disarmament.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The position of the Finnish Government is well known as far as the comprehensive test ban on nuclear weapons is concerned. We are strongly in favour of all effective efforts aiming at that important disarmament measure. I think I need not elaborate on that point any further here.

My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3. We feel that any action taken by the General Assembly at this stage might not help the efforts that are being made concurrently in Geneva within the framework of the disarmament negotiating body there, and we hope that early positive results will be forthcoming from the tripartite talks there.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As is well known, the Soviet Union firmly and consistently pursues a policy of bringing about the conclusion as early as possible of a treaty on the complete cessation of nuclear-weapon testing. In order to overcome the difficulties in the path of the preparation of such a treaty we have shown flexibility.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

However, we wish to point out in connexion with this draft resolution that the practical implementation of the appeal which it contains is possible only if all nuclear States, without exception, agree to stop nuclear-weapon testing before the conclusion of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing.

The Soviet Union feels, in this connexion, that the adoption of this draft resolution does not involve the question of peaceful nuclear explosions within the context of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Article 5 of that Treaty is particularly relevant in this respect. It provides that the potential benefits of any peaceful application of nuclear explosions would be made accessible, under appropriate international observation and in keeping with suitable international procedures, to the States parties to the Treaty which do not have nuclear weapons and that this would be done on a non-discriminatory basis.

Since the draft resolution contains an appeal to refrain from any nuclear-weapon testing addressed to all States, and in particular to all nuclear-weapon States, the Soviet delegation voted in favour of it.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3/Rev.1, on the "Urgent need for cessation of further testing of nuclear weapons".

The Committee will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.4/Rev.1, on the "International week devoted to fostering the objectives of disarmament". This draft resolution is sponsored by 21 countries and was introduced to the Committee by the representative of Mongolia at our 12th meeting, on 23 October 1978.

Delegations have expressed the wish that this draft resolution be adopted by consensus. Since I hear no objection, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.4/Rev.1 is adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.4/Rev.1 was adopted.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the draft resolution just adopted, my delegation wishes to announce to the delegations of the First Committee that this year a number of measures were taken in the Soviet Union with regard to Disarmament Week.

On 24 October in Moscow there was a public meeting which addressed a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in which the participants called for the enhancement of the role of the United Nations and the responsibility of its Member States in the implementation of effective measures to consolidate international peace and security. The Soviet Committee for the Defence of Peace, the Committee of War Veterans and the Committee of Soviet Women also held meetings in connexion with Disarmament Week and adopted certain relevant decisions. The Soviet press contained much material devoted to Disarmament Week.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.4/Rev.1.

The next draft resolution to be considered in order of submission is contained in document A/C.1/33/L.5, entitled "United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament". It was also introduced under agenda item 125, "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". It is co-sponsored by 33 delegations and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the thirty-third meeting of the Committee on 9 November 1978.

The sponsors have expressed the wish that this draft resolution be adopted by consensus. However, before I proceed further, the Secretary of the Committee wishes to make a statement concerning the financial implications, and I now call on him.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee): The decision on the programme of fellowships has already been taken by the special session in its Final Document (resolution S-10/2), in paragraph 103. Therefore, the financial implications of this decision are contained in a document of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/33/C.64) on the revised budget estimates for 1979 of the Centre for Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments with regard to that announcement? As there is none, we shall then proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.5. Does anyone object to its being adopted by consensus?

Mr. CHERKAOUI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): My delegation wishes to propose two amendments, consisting of the addition of two operative paragraphs, to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.5. I should like, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, to read out those two paragraphs.

First, we should like to add an operative paragraph 3, reading:

"Expresses the hope that the seminar on disarmament would be of at least six months' duration;"

Then we should also like an operative paragraph 4, reading:

"Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly a report on the question of the implementation of the programme of fellowships."

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Morocco has just introduced amendments, in the form of two additional operative paragraphs, to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.5. It appears to me that to try now to ascertain which delegations agree or do not agree to these amendments would lead to unnecessary complication and prolongation of our work. I therefore suggest that they be submitted in writing to the Secretariat in the usual way, so that they may be distributed tomorrow, and that, until such time as delegations - and particularly the sponsors, of course - have had sufficient time to study them, we leave aside consideration of the draft resolution.

Is there any objection to that procedure?

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): Mr. Chairman, I do not object to your very correct suggestion, but perhaps we might devote a few minutes to seeing whether we could reach a consensus on this matter at this meeting.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

With that purpose in mind, I should like to suggest to the representative of Morocco that he not insist on his new operative paragraph 3, since the period of six months is already covered in the guidelines prepared by the Secretary-General which we would be approving in operative paragraph 1. Hence, in approving the draft resolution as it now stands, we would be already approving the period of six months now being proposed by the delegation of Morocco.

With regard to the second amendment - the new operative paragraph 4 - my delegation believes that it is a good one. It would be useful to have a report from the Secretary-General with regard to the implementation of the resolution, and I should imagine that practically no delegation would have any objection to that kind of proposal.

Therefore, if the delegation of Morocco did not insist on its first amendment - since its substance is already included in the present operative paragraph 1 - and if no delegation had any objection to the second amendment, we could still proceed to adopt the draft resolution, as amended, by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I can only hope that the representative of India proves to be right. I now call on the representative of Morocco.

Mr. CHERKAOUI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): My delegation is ready to comply with the wishes of the representative of India not to insist on its first amendment with regard to the six months' period, if that is in fact included in the report of the Secretary-General. We thought that the word "guidelines" was perhaps too general and vague in meaning and that, in order to make things clearer, we would specify this in the draft resolution. In any event, we are ready not to insist on that proposal.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the representative of India wish to comment on that?

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): I thought the declaration of the representative of Morocco was quite clear, at least to me, that he agrees with the two modest suggestions which I had made. I have no further comment but express the hope that we can now proceed to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States is not objecting to a consensus. We should like to make it clear that we understand that the Secretary-General will finance the fellowships from the funds already appropriated in the 1978-1979 regular budget under section Z.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand from the Secretariat that this is indeed the case. We shall then proceed if everybody agrees, to the adoption. I hope by consensus of this draft resolution which now has a third operative paragraph reading:

"Requests the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of the fellowship programme."

May I ask the representative of Morocco whether this is a correct rendering of his amendment?

Mr. CHERKAOUI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I could read my amendment, if you wish:

"Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly a report on the implementation of the programme of fellowships."

The CHAIRMAN: With these precisions, the third operative paragraphs reads:

"Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly a report on the implementation of the fellowships programme."

With this oral amendment by the delegation of Morocco, accepted on behalf of the co-sponsors by the delegation of India, I now put this draft resolution for decision to the Committee by consensus.

Is there anyone who wishes to dissent from its adoption by consensus? Since there is no objection, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.5, as amended, is adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.5, as amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The next draft resolution under item 125, in numerical order, is the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.9. It is a general draft resolution concerning the review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session. It has 12 sponsors. It was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 36th meeting of the First Committee on 13 November 1978.

I see no speakers in advance of the vote on that draft resolution. I therefore propose to put it to the vote. There has been no request by the sponsors, that is, no request recorded by the Secretariat, that the draft resolution in question should be adopted by consensus.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish):

It is true that no request or formal request, that is, has actually been made in specific terms as to the adoption of this draft by consensus. But I do remember that when I introduced the text officially, I did say that we, the co-sponsors, had taken immense care in the drafting of the text, weighing every word and sometimes in order to avoid difficulties of any sort, using not just the same terms but sometimes the same whole sentences as the text contained in the Final Document adopted by consensus. We did so in the hope that this draft resolution would likewise be adopted by consensus. Of course, this can be seen from the corresponding verbatim record; and if that were not enough, my delegation would formally request that it be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Mexico for his very kind clarification. We now have a request that this draft resolution be adopted by consensus. Before taking action on that basis, may I ask if there is any delegation which thinks otherwise?

Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic):  
Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to delay the work of the Committee and I am also sorry that the Secretariat did not tell you that I wanted the floor in order to call your attention to an error in translation in the Arabic text. And this could cause some problems. Therefore, if you will allow me, Mr. Chairman, I shall give the translation that I find adequate after consultation with certain other delegations.

I make reference to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.9, in English and in French. In the penultimate line, the French text states: "et que le Comité du désarmement est déjà dûment constitué". In the Arabic text it says that the Committee "was formed in an adequate manner". This is what is stated in the Arabic text; this is the Arabic translation.

My delegation considers that the words "already properly constituted" should be deleted and that we should say: "the Committee was formed according to practice". This is the purely linguistic change that we want to bring to the Arabic text.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure that the secretariat of the Committee, as well as the Chairman, are grateful for this correction.

We shall now proceed to where we left off. I was asking whether there was any delegation which thinks otherwise: meaning which thinks that the draft resolution should not be adopted by consensus? I see none. The draft resolution is therefore adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.9 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the delegation of China which has asked to make a statement after the adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. HSU (China) (interpretation from Chinese): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.9, which has just been adopted, the Chinese delegation is not opposed to its adoption by consensus. As for draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1, which is to be adopted, the Chinese delegation is also in favour of it. But both draft resolutions contain references to a complete test ban as well as SALT II.

The Chinese delegation has always held different views on these matters and wishes to state here that the Chinese delegation reserves its position on similar references in other resolutions.

Mr. BUSTANI (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation has joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.9 dealing with the review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session. It has done so despite some shortcomings which the draft resolution presents to us, concerning in particular its evaluation of the results of the special session, of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which does not correspond to our own.

In this connexion it would be useful to recall that the Brazilian delegation makes general and substantive reservations to the Final Document as a whole, while not standing in the way of its adoption by consensus. Consequently, in our opinion the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution under consideration does not represent an accurate and objective appraisal of the Final Document which resulted from the work of the special session. Furthermore, operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution refers to certain measures in the field of disarmament, on the validity and effectiveness of which we have already expressed our doubts, as contained in the reservations we made to paragraphs 83 and 84 of the Final Document.

Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (interpretation from French): In giving approval to the draft resolution, my delegation at the same time wishes to make the following observations. The first concerns operative paragraph 2. My delegation interprets this clause as upholding the principle whereby the Committee on Disarmament will

(Mr. Leprette, France)

conduct its work on the basis of consensus, as provided for in paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the tenth special session.

In connexion with operative paragraph 4, France, as regards the reference to "the agreement for a comprehensive test ban", reiterates the general reservations it expressed in this connexion on the occasion of the adoption of the same Final Document. These reservations will be found in the records of the meeting of 7 July 1978 (A/S-10/PV.27).

The CHAIRMAN: This concludes the consideration of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.9.

The next draft resolution, in numerical order, presented under item 125, is in document A/C.1/33/L.10. It concerns the dissemination of information on the arms race and disarmament. This draft resolution has 21 sponsors and it was introduced to the Committee by the representative of Venezuela at the 20th meeting of the First Committee on 7 November 1978.

I understand that the representative of Venezuela has asked for the floor and I call upon her.

Miss LOPEZ (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): I simply wish to draw the Committee's attention to the revised version of document A/C.1/33/L.10.

We wished therein to deal with the concerns of some delegations which contributed ideas to improve the original text. First, we have made two changes in operative paragraph 2, which specifies, at the end, that our request to Member States refers to the activities undertaken in the field of dissemination of information on the arms race and disarmament. We feel that as the paragraph is now worded, in accordance with the requests of some delegations, it more clearly expresses the wish of the co-sponsors.

The second change that I would like to draw to the Committee's attention is in operative paragraph 5, which has been reworded taking into account the text of paragraph 123 of the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

We hope that with these two minor changes, which in our view clarifies the purpose of our draft resolution, we may be able to secure a consensus in the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Venezuela has made certain clarifications concerning the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.10/Rev.1. I understand that she was speaking on behalf of all the sponsors of the draft resolution in expressing the wish that the draft resolution should be adopted by consensus.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has just adopted by consensus the draft resolution, under agenda item 125, on dissemination of information on the arms race and disarmament (A/C.1/33/L.10/Rev.1). The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of the draft resolution.

The next draft resolution, in chronological order, submitted for the consideration of the First Committee under agenda item 125 is in document A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1. It is a general draft resolution, concerning the review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session. The draft resolution has 32 sponsors. Does any representative wish to speak on the draft resolution?

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): On reading this draft resolution I observe that operative paragraph 2 of section A refers to the second round of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT II), and a resolution which we have not yet recommended or voted on. There is a similar reference in operative paragraph 1 of section B.

I am wondering whether it would not be more appropriate to deal with this at the same time as we deal with the SALT resolution and the other resolution to be adopted under paragraph 1 of section B? Perhaps I am being excessively pedantic, but I find it difficult to vote on adopting something by a reference when I do not know what it is.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): The sponsors of the draft resolution do not see any particular reason to postpone the vote on their draft until after the Committee has voted on the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/33/L.19 and L.29,

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

to which the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1 refers. According to our informal consultations and negotiations with the sponsors of the latter two draft resolutions, the prevailing feeling and assessment is that those two resolutions are going to be adopted either by a consensus or by a large majority. In the event that those two draft resolutions should fail to be adopted the sponsors of the draft resolution in A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1 agree to revise the respective paragraphs accordingly before the resolutions of the Committee are referred to the General Assembly in plenary meeting. I therefore propose that the Committee should now proceed with the adoption of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not understand that the representative of the United States had made a formal objection to the consideration of this draft resolution at this time.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I considered it a formal objection. I would, however, be prepared to abide by the Chairman's ruling, in other words, I am not fanatical about it.

The CHAIRMAN: With that assurance, perhaps we can proceed to consideration of the draft resolution.

There has been a suggestion from the sponsors that it be adopted either by a large majority or by consensus. I consider it the duty of the Chairman to try first the way of consensus and only if that fails to go by way of the large majority. May I therefore ask whether any representative has any objection to the adoption of this draft resolution by consensus?

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I said I would not appeal the ruling of the Chair if he said it was not premature to consider it now. I did that out of a desire to speed up our work and, to be frank, a recognition that my chances of sustaining an appeal from the Chair were fairly low. That, however, does not mean that we agreed on a consensus. We think this is a matter on which there should be a vote, particularly since the United States does not think it should be voted on at all. To say we then agree to a consensus is crowding even one of my easily crowdable dispositions. Not that you are crowding me, Sir, but it would require me to retreat even more than I normally retreat.

While I do not, as I indicated, challenge the ruling of the Chair that it is appropriate to consider it now, I do respectfully consider we should not record a consensus but should rather follow the procedure adopted earlier today.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be far from the Chair to try to make the representative of the United States retreat even further than he wants to retreat.

Before we proceed to the vote we must hear from the Secretariat about the financial implications of this particular draft resolution. I call on the Committee's Secretary.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee): The decision of the special session has already been stated in its Final Document. I particularly draw the attention of the Committee to document A/RES/S-10/2, paragraph 119. The financial implications of this are contained in the document of the Fifth Committee. I draw the attention of the Committee to document A/C.5/33/64 on the revised budget estimate for 1979 for the Centre for Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: May I now ask representatives to be kind enough to indicate their votes. I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order. It must relate to the actual conduct of the voting.

Sir Derek ASHE (United Kingdom): As regards our procedure it seems to be fairly clear from what has already been said that we have not got consensus on this particular resolution, that it covers a fairly wide range of subjects, some more complicated than others. I would, accordingly, suggest that perhaps we should vote on it section by section.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry if I have to disappoint the representative of the United Kingdom, but I am afraid that he was a second too late. Had he made his request before I asked the representatives to indicate their votes, he would have been in order. Now he cannot be in order unless for one reason or another the members of the Committee want to retract their earlier votes and prefer to take votes section by section. Of course, if there is any challenge this also requires a two thirds majority.

I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama,

Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1 was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those speakers who wish to speak in explanation of their vote after the vote.

Mr. FERRETTI (Italy): I wish simply to place on record my delegation's views on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1 which has just been adopted. The Italian delegation was unable to support the draft resolution and abstained in the vote. Section A in particular reflects an approach about which we have doubts. I wish to recall in this connexion the relevant part of the statement made by my delegation during the general debate on disarmament on 10 November. In particular, I wish to reiterate our conviction that while nuclear weapons have high priority in disarmament negotiations, we should not lose sight of the serious strain imposed on the ever-spiralling accumulation of conventional armaments, even in the poorest regions of this planet.

For this reason, the Italian Government is convinced that the peace and security of all States can rest only on a balanced reduction of both nuclear and conventional weapons. In this connexion I should like to recall that the Final Document of the special session recognized the need for urgent measures in conventional as well as nuclear disarmament.

Mr. ENTERLEIN (German Democratic Republic): My delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1. We welcome the statement in the preambular paragraph with regard to the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session and share the views of authors of the resolution that nuclear weapons pose the most serious threat to mankind and that it is therefore essential to proceed to nuclear disarmament and to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. We have, however, some doubts as to whether all the formulations contained in the operative part of the resolution are adequate or sufficient to attain the aforementioned aims.

Therefore, we would like to make the following remarks in this context. In section A, operative paragraph 3, we miss the constructive and concrete proposal of the Soviet Union to start negotiations on the prohibition of the manufacture of nuclear weapons, since without a prohibition on their manufacture, measures for the reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons will be far less effective. The implementation of this proposal would be an effective step towards the cessation of the quantitative arms race. In section B, operative paragraph 1 of the resolution, the Disarmament Commission is to be given tasks which figure neither in paragraph 118 of the Final Document of the tenth special session nor in the report of the Disarmament Commission in document A/33/42 which was also adopted by consensus.

(Mr. Enterlein, German Democratic Republic)

The disarmament Commission is invited to consider on a regular basis the reports and other documents of the Committee on Disarmament. However, at the end of the tenth special session it was decided by consensus, inter alia, that the Committee on Disarmament should "Submit a report to the General Assembly annually, or more frequently as appropriate ..." as stipulated in paragraph 120 (f) of the Final Document of the tenth special session. We doubt whether it serves the cause of disarmament in general if decisions adopted by consensus are subsequently changed. We deeply regret that it was not possible to include in the draft resolution a formulation on the convening of a world disarmament conference at the earliest possible date, as had again been requested at this General Assembly session by an overwhelming majority of States.

Since the authors of the draft resolution obviously had the intention, which we generally support, of reaffirming the decisions of the tenth special session, particularly in regard to the machinery, that aim would have been served better if no unilateral interpretation had been made of the Final Document with regard to important questions such as a second special session on disarmament and the world disarmament conference, two forums which neither replace nor exclude each other. However, it is gratifying to note that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.34, which suggests the renewal of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, also had in mind the decision of the tenth special session to keep the question of the convening of the world disarmament conference under constant review.

Operative paragraph 2 of part B of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1, in the view of my delegation, is incompatible with paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the tenth special session, which says inter alia:

"The Assembly welcomes the agreement reached following appropriate consultations among the Member States during the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament that the Committee on Disarmament ...

(e) Adopt its own agenda taking into account the recommendations made to it by the General Assembly and the proposals presented by the members of the Committee;" (resolution S/10-2)

(Mr. Enterlein, German  
Democratic Republic)

This wording was reached on the understanding that any prior decisions concerning the agenda, the priorities and the time schedule of the Committee on Disarmament could negatively influence the fulfilment of its complicated task as a negotiating organ. However, should recommendations be given to the Geneva Committee on Disarmament concerning its priorities, my delegation believes that in any case they would have to include the elaboration of an agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction, and the preparation of a treaty on the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon.

Sir Derek ASHE (United Kingdom): I was engaged in reconciling myself to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, that we should take this draft resolution as a whole rather than in parts. When the vote was actually taken and when I had reconciled myself, I found the door was locked against me. I would like to record that if I had been in time, I would have abstained on this draft resolution, which is a pity, because if I had been able to vote section by section, I would have voted for part of it.

Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (interpretation from French): I would like to make clear that if a consensus on this resolution as a whole had been possible, we would not have opposed it. On the other hand, had the Committee voted on each section it would have been possible for us to vote in favour of some parts, but the circumstances in which the Committee decided are what they are, so I simply make the following observation.

The French delegation would have abstained on part A of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1. It cannot recommend the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty as stipulated in paragraph 1 of the operative part, for reasons explained at the time of the Final Document of the tenth special session. The French delegation also has reservations on operative paragraph 3 which has to do with paragraph 50 of the Final Document, on which France in June this year expressed regret that it did not take more into account a necessary parallel between nuclear disarmament on the one hand and conventional disarmament on the other. In this connexion, we wish to say that it is imperative to establish a distinction in disarmament negotiations between geographic areas where the nuclear weapon is an element

(Mr. Leprette, France)

of balance in general, and zones in which the introduction of the nuclear weapon would constitute in effect a dramatic element of imbalance. As the author of a plan for disarmament in Europe, France considers moreover that the highest priority should be given in that part of the world to the reduction of conventional weapons.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With regard to document A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1 we would like to state that this draft resolution, which we voted for refers to a whole gamut of important disarmament matters which were considered at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The draft resolution refers to the implementation of those recommendations and decisions.

My delegation attaches specific importance to the appeal made in this draft resolution urging all nuclear States to proceed to consultations aimed at bringing about the earliest possible initiation of negotiations in order to reduce the nuclear arms race. Must we recall once again that recently the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics proposed - and this was confirmed at this session - that nuclear Powers should discuss among themselves the question of the practical initiation of consultations, with the participation of a number of non-nuclear Powers, aimed at halting nuclear production in all its forms and the progressive reduction of stockpiles, leading to their complete elimination. It is obvious that implementation of this proposal, referred to in the paragraph I have mentioned of the draft resolution we have just adopted, could have a decisive influence on nuclear disarmament and on halting the nuclear arms race.

With regard to the question of negotiating mechanisms in the disarmament field, the Soviet delegation wishes to emphasize the great importance of convening a world disarmament conference which would be the broadest international body capable of adopting effective and efficient decisions in the sphere of the reduction of nuclear weapons and complete disarmament. Account being taken of the fact that in order to convene and hold a world disarmament conference time would be required, it would be appropriate for us to know now what would be

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

the period and the date for the conference, as well as what would be the best possible methods of preparing for it. We deplore the fact that this question has not been reflected in this draft resolution. The Soviet Union bases its position on the fact that the Disarmament Committee in its expanded composition must pursue its work in accordance with the fundamental principles which have determined its work in the past. There is no need to state that it would also take into account the recommendations of the special session of the United Nations devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

In other words, the Committee on Disarmament will continue to be an independent negotiating body, and it will perform its functions on the basis of consensus. It will itself establish its agenda as well as the priority to be accorded questions to be considered.

In this connexion we wish to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that as well as the questions currently before the Committee for consideration, and in addition to those mentioned in the draft resolution and a number of priority questions, there is also the question of the prohibition of the manufacture and production of new types of weapons of mass destruction.

With regard to the United Nations Disarmament Commission, as is mentioned in relevant terms in the draft resolution the Committee has just adopted the Disarmament Commission must perform simply consultative functions as a subordinate body of the United Nations General Assembly.

In conclusion I should like to state that the Soviet delegation reserves the right to define its position once again on the draft resolution the Committee has just adopted, taking into account the texts of the draft resolutions mentioned in section A, operative paragraph 2, and section B, operative paragraph 1.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): The Netherlands voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1 as a whole. Had the draft been put to the vote in parts, the Netherlands would have abstained on parts A and B and would have voted in favour of parts C and D. Subsequently we would have voted, as we did, in favour of the resolution as a whole.

Mr. KOLBY (Norway): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution because we support its main thrust. We do, however, have reservations on certain elements of parts A, B and D, which we feel do not accurately reflect the consensus of the special session.

Mr. VELISSAROPOULOS (Greece) (interpretation from French): We voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1. I would, however, like to make a statement similar to the one I made on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3. In my statement in the general debate on agenda item 125, the

(Mr. Velissaropoulos, Greece)

report of the Secretary-General, I was very insistent that we should not neglect conventional disarmament. Together with other delegations that have spoken in explanation of their votes, we believe it is necessary while we are dealing with nuclear disarmament to bear in mind the need to strike a balance between nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament. In the absence of such a balance there are very serious security questions which arise in the world, and consequently, in voting on this draft resolution with some reservations, we did so on the assumption that progress would be made in the nuclear field and in conventional disarmament. That is an absolute prerequisite to balanced progress towards the ideal we all have in mind, which is complete disarmament.

Mr. BERG (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I wish to refer to my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1.

My delegation abstained in that vote because it was difficult to find in section B of the draft resolution the concept of a balance between nuclear weapons and conventional weapons, to which we attach importance. This was stated in the general debate of this Committee only last Wednesday.

Since it was not possible to vote separately on certain paragraphs we had to abstain in the vote on the whole. Had we voted by sections the situation would have been different, since for my delegation there were no particular problems with sections C and D.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1.

The next draft resolution submitted under agenda item 125 is contained in document A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1. It concerns "Disarmament and development". I would draw the attention of representatives to amendments to it proposed by the delegation of Pakistan in document A/C.1/33/L.44.

The draft resolution has forty sponsors and was introduced by the representative of France at the forty-sixth meeting of the First Committee on 21 November 1978.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): Pakistan attaches deep importance to the subject of disarmament and development and we joined other delegations at the special session in proposing the study on this subject by qualified experts. At the special session Pakistan also warmly welcomed the proposal made by the President of France regarding a specific method of channelling resources from arms expenditure to economic and social development, particularly the development of the developing countries.

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

Other ideas on this question were submitted also, including those by the delegation of Mexico and my own delegation.

Unfortunately, at the special session the General Assembly was unable to adopt a concrete recommendation on this subject, nor has it been feasible for the General Assembly to do so at the current session.

The draft resolution in A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1 now proposes the transmission of the French proposal for an international disarmament fund for development to the group on disarmament and development set up in accordance with paragraphs 94 and 95 of the Final Document of the special session.

It is the view of the Pakistan delegation that the reference of a proposal to the group of experts is for the purpose of the group's preparing reviews and recommendations on it: that is, the proposal is being transmitted to the group for action and not to be relegated to oblivion. It was to make this explicit that my delegation suggested the amendment in document A/C.1/33/L.44 requesting the group to include in its report to the General Assembly recommendations on various possible modalities for channelling resources from arms expenditures to the economic and social development of the developing countries. We have, however, been given to understand that this is implicit in the text of the draft resolution. It has also been pointed out that the Disarmament Commission is empowered to deliberate on the question of channelling resources from arms expenditures to the economic and social development of the developing countries.

In the light of all these factors and taking into account the views of France and other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1, the Pakistan delegation has decided not to press its amendment to a vote at this stage.

Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation wishes to thank the delegation of Pakistan for its gesture in withdrawing its proposed amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1.

The French delegation notes that the current mandate of the expert group on disarmament and development, which is to submit an interim report to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, has been expanded so as to allow for consideration of the question which is of concern to the delegation of Pakistan before the next session of the General Assembly. At least, that is the interpretation of the French delegation. The participation of qualified persons or institutions of developing countries in this study will naturally promote the consideration of this matter by the group on disarmament and development.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1 have expressed the desire that that draft be adopted by the Committee by consensus. If there is no objection, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1 will be adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1 was adopted.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States would like to make a statement on the basis on which it was prepared to join in the consensus support for draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1.

The United States shares with others the goal of reducing the resources devoted world-wide to military programmes and shares the hope that agreed disarmament measures will make that possible. The United States also believes that such released resources should be used to augment those resources now available for development everywhere, particularly in developing countries.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

The United States record in providing development aid to others over the past three decades speaks for itself. The United States was a sponsor of the Nordic draft resolution on a United Nations expert study on the relationship between disarmament and development, whose report is contained in document A/S-10/9, and we are participating actively in that study.

We believe that the United Nations General Assembly should not now alter in any way the terms of reference for a study which it adopted during the special session on disarmament. In any event, those terms of reference already provide ample latitude for the group of experts to consider in concept the feasibility of any extant proposals relevant to that study, including proposals dealing with incentives for disarmament and for reallocation of freed resources to development. Any such incentives should, in our view, be applicable to all countries.

The disarmament fund for development proposal (A/S-10/AC.1/28), as made at the special session on disarmament and in the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1 just adopted by consensus does not appear to be feasible at this time. consensus does not appear to be feasible at this time.

Furthermore, the United States has serious reservations as to its desirability in principle. In its interim stage, the proposal would rely on some over-all aggregate measurement of military efforts. In practical terms, it would almost certainly be impossible to compare either the military effectiveness of specific types of weapons or the aggregate worth of the wide variety of military weapons and forces. Military expenditures are probably the only practical means of making international comparisons of over-all effort, yet the present means of such comparisons are recognized to be inadequate.

The United States supports current efforts in the United Nations General Assembly to facilitate and encourage the meaningful reporting of military expenditures in comparable terms. But until that is accomplished, disarmament measures based on such figures would not be feasible or meaningful.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

In the final analysis, under present circumstances and until the work that I have indicated has been completed the very principle of fund contributions based on international comparisons of current military effort or inventories runs into the practically insoluble problem of achieving agreed universal criteria or thresholds for determining sufficiency in national military forces.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The draft resolution just adopted by the Committee provides for the transfer of the consideration of the proposal for the establishment of an International Disarmament Fund for Development to a group of governmental experts on the study of the relationship between disarmament and development.

In this respect we wish to observe that we see some sense in the establishment of some kind of mechanism within the framework of the United Nations for the financing of development objectives at the expense of disarmament only and exclusively within the context and in connexion with real reductions of the military budgets of States - first and foremost the States permanent members of the Security Council - and, consequently, in connexion with real measures to stop the arms race and with disarmament measures. In other words, giving our support to the allocation of a part of the resources released as a result of disarmament for purposes of development, and having taken the initiative in various corresponding proposals, the Soviet Union at the same time most resolutely opposes the idea that the objectives of development should be financed merely through contributions of the militarily most prominent States without any relation at all to a reduction of military outlays.

The Soviet delegation proceeds from the position that this viewpoint will be taken into account by the group of governmental experts to study the relationship between disarmament and development when it considers the various proposals related to the granting of assistance to the developing countries as a result of disarmament measures.

It is on that understanding that the Soviet delegation did not object to the adoption of this draft resolution by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the Committee's consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.12/Rev.1.

In numerical order, the next draft resolution to be considered by the Committee should be that contained in document A/C.1/33/L.13/Rev.1, concerning "Monitoring of Disarmament Agreements and Strengthening of Security". However, I am informed by the Secretariat that, although the calculation of the financial implications of this draft resolution is ready, it will not be available in printed form until tomorrow. Therefore, unless I hear any suggestion to the contrary, I propose that we defer consideration of this draft resolution for the time being, in order to take it up tomorrow morning.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The next draft resolution under agenda item 125 is that contained in document A/C.1/33/L.14, entitled "Programme of research and studies on disarmament". This draft resolution has 31 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of France at the forty-sixth meeting of the First Committee on 21 November 1978. The sponsors have expressed the wish that it be adopted by consensus. I understand that the representative of Singapore wishes to make a statement at this time, and I now call on him.

Mr. WONG (Singapore): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.14 on "Programme of research and studies on disarmament". We can also join in a consensus, if there is one, in adopting the draft resolution.

In voting for it, my delegation supports the proposal that the programme of research and studies on disarmament be undertaken within the United Nations system to promote better understanding of the problem of the arms race. In our view, full consideration should first be given to the question of whether such a programme of research and studies on disarmament may be entrusted to existing bodies within the United Nations system, such as the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), or whether a new international institute for disarmament research should be established for this purpose.

My delegation therefore hopes that, in reporting on this matter, the Secretary-General and the Advisory Board on Disarmament will give due attention to the question I have just raised.

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objections, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.14 by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.14 was adopted.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to explain the reasons for its agreeing to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.14 by consensus.

First of all, it is necessary to emphasize that, as a matter of principle, we are opposed to an excessive increase in the carrying out, through the United Nations of various types of studies on problems of disarmament. This kind of thing can quite successfully and sometimes with considerable benefit to the whole endeavour be done by other international forums and organizations and also by national organizations. As for the United Nations, the task, as we see it, is that of purposefully concentrating attention and efforts on the achievement of practical disarmament measures, carrying out independent or autonomous studies only in genuine and extremely necessary cases.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Otherwise we would be causing the Organization to stray far afield from decisions in the specific sphere of disarmament questions. As for the question dealt with in the draft resolution now before us, our position is this: we must avoid getting into a situation in which the task of putting an end to the arms race and bringing about disarmament would be made dependent on the conclusion of some institute or other. However, we have taken into account the fact that the draft resolution provides only for the study of the question of the formation of an international institute for disarmament research and of contact for that purpose with the advisory board reporting to the Secretary-General.

The CHAIRMAN: This concludes consideration by the Committee of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.14.

We shall next take up draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, which is submitted under item 125, and relates specifically to paragraph 125 of the Final Document of the special session on disarmament. The sponsors have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus.

Mr. IMAM (Kuwait): During the first organizational meeting of the Disarmament Commission the question of the status of proposals and suggestions listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document of the tenth special session was raised. It was agreed at that time that such proposals and suggestions could only be dealt with if formally revised by their authors in the First Committee. During the meetings of the First Committee some of these proposals have been revived and introduced in the form of draft resolutions.

Now we see that all the proposals and suggestions listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document of the tenth special session are to be transmitted to the deliberative and negotiating as well as to the studying organs dealing with the question of disarmament. This will unduly complicate the work of the Disarmament Commission during its first substantive session. May I inquire of the co-sponsors at this stage why they chose to deviate from the procedure agreed on as being applicable to the proposals and suggestions listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document of the tenth special session. Some clarification of this matter would be appreciated.

Mr. JOSEPH (Sri Lanka): The reason the sponsors introduced this resolution was that the position under the relevant paragraph of the Final Document seems to be that unless the General Assembly makes its recommendations at this session these proposals and suggestions need not be considered or could fall by the wayside. I quote from the Final Document:

"... taking into consideration the many relevant comments and observations made in both the general debate in plenary meeting and the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Tenth Special Session, the Secretary-General is requested to transmit, together with this Final Document, to the appropriate deliberative and negotiating organs dealing with the questions of disarmament all the official records of the special session devoted to disarmament, in accordance with the recommendations which the Assembly may adopt at its thirty-third session." (S-10/2, para. 125)

It is in the light of this sentence in the Final Document that the sponsors have submitted draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, covering all 33 proposals and suggestions made in paragraph 125 of the Final Document.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): Before we take a decision on this draft resolution and bearing in mind the comment which the representative of Sri Lanka has just made on behalf of the sponsors, I should like to propose some very minor additions to this draft resolution to make quite clear the points he made and to meet the concern of the representative of Kuwait, which to some extent I share.

I notice first of all that in A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1 the words "studying organs" still appear in operative paragraph 1. On the other hand, in operative paragraph 2, only the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament, that is, the deliberative and negotiating organs, are requested to report on the proposals.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Now, it would seem to me that the inclusion of the words "as well as studying" in operative paragraph 1, which had existed in the original draft in a preambular paragraph but had been deleted, would seem rather confusing, and I would suggest to the representative of Sri Lanka, on behalf of the co-sponsors, the deletion of those words, because they merely serve to create confusion. That is my first suggestion.

My second suggestion, again in line with his comment, would be, for the purposes of clarity, in the third line of operative paragraph 1, after the words "information and comments made by Member States", the addition of the words "during the thirty-third session of the General Assembly".

The reason for making this proposal is that the comments and information provided during the thirty-third session would be the only new element beyond what the Secretary-General had already been mandated to do in the Final Document of the special session. In other words, if we do not add those few words, we would merely be repeating what the Final Document of the special session allows the Secretary-General to do.

My last suggestion relates to the second line of operative paragraph 2, after the words "Committee on Disarmament to report" I would propose the addition of a comma, and then the words "as appropriate," before the continuation of that sentence; so that the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament would report, as appropriate, on the various proposals that are being forwarded to them, to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

As I said, these are merely minor additions to make the purport of this draft resolution clearer, because I did have some doubts in my own mind, really, and the response given by the representative of Sri Lanka to the representative of Kuwait convinced me that there might be a need to streamline the draft resolution in the manner I had suggested. I hope it does not create any problems for the sponsors.

The CHAIRMAN: Are the sponsors desirous of or willing to reply to the proposed amendments?

Mr. JOSEPH (Sri Lanka): I hope I am speaking for the other sponsors of this draft resolution as well.

Of the three points made by the representative of Nigeria, I should like to take his second and third points first and say that, as far as the delegation of Sri Lanka is concerned, we do not find any great difficulty in accepting them.

As regards the first suggestion he made, concerning the studying organs, this matter led to quite a bit of discussion among the sponsors themselves, and I should like to explain the situation and the reason for our leaving the words "as well as studying" in operative paragraph 1.

It will be recalled that when I introduced this draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, I mentioned that by "studying organs" we envisaged the Centre for Disarmament and the panels of experts, including the Secretary-General's Advisory Council on Disarmament Studies, because among the 33 suggestions and proposals in paragraph 125 of the Final Document there are various studies and views that have been put forward, and we the sponsors thought that those studies and views could appropriately be referred to one of those studying organs; and advisedly we removed the term "studying organs" from the first preambular paragraph, because we were trying as much as possible to be faithful to the text of paragraph 125 of the Final Document, which, admittedly, does not refer to "studying organs". That is why we took that term out of the preambular paragraph and put it into operative paragraph 1; we thought it would be appropriate for the Secretary-General to refer some of these studies to the studying organs.

I hope this explanation I have given will be satisfactory to the representative of Nigeria, and I would also hope that I voice the views of the other sponsors; since it is an oral amendment that has been made without notice to us, I have had no opportunity of consulting with them, but I am sure I have explained the intention that was behind this draft resolution when all of us got together and sponsored it.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the last two amendments are acceptable to the sponsors but the first one is not.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation shares the view expressed by the representative of Nigeria. I believe that the studying organs have either been established with a specific mandate - for example, the group of experts to study the relationship between disarmament and development, or the other group, which is to study the relationship between disarmament and international security - or, as in the case of the advisory board, those organs have been set up to advise the Secretary-General on questions which he submits to them; or even though there may not be specific questions, they would work in accordance with the terms of reference which the Secretary-General may establish for it.

In my view, it would be pointless to transmit to studying organs the series of suggestions or proposals, many of which must now be considered dead and finished with. That is why I repeat that my delegation fully agrees with the delegation of Nigeria that we should delete the words "as well as studying". That was the first point I wanted to make.

My second point is a question. I should like to ask the representative of the Secretary-General - or, in his absence, perhaps the Secretary of the Committee could reply - the following. It is true that paragraph 125 requests the Secretary-General:

"to transmit, together with this Final Document, to the appropriate deliberative and negotiating organs dealing with the questions of disarmament all the official records of the special session devoted to disarmament, in accordance with the recommendations which the Assembly may adopt at its thirty-third session." (A/RES/S-10/2, para. 125)

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

From the outset it was very clear to my delegation that the Secretary-General did not have to wait for any possible recommendations that would come out of this session, and I said that at the first or second meeting of the Committee on Disarmament. But I do not know what was done because it seemed that some delegations understood that that transmittal of official documents should not take place before it was known whether or not the thirty-third session of the General Assembly would adopt recommendations.

If the Secretary-General has already transmitted the official documents of the special session devoted to disarmament - as it is clear to my delegation that he should have done in accordance with paragraph 125 of the Final Document - then what the representative of Nigeria said in that connexion would reflect the existing situation, that is, it would therefore not be necessary to transmit official documents which have already been transmitted. But - and this is the alternative, and on this point I should like to obtain clarification from the Representative of the Secretary-General - if those official documents have not yet been transmitted, then the paragraph we may adopt now should mention the official documents of the tenth special session and/or the rest of what operative paragraph 1 now contains.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the Representative of the Secretary-General, the Director of the Centre for Disarmament, is prepared to give an immediate reply to the query of the representative of Mexico, and I call on him.

Mr. BJORNERSTEDT (Assistant Secretary-General, Centre for Disarmament): In response to the question, I wish to say that the documentation has so far not been formally transmitted to the organs in question, the Secretary-General wishing to take into account the views expressed and the decisions to be taken by the General Assembly on this matter. I think that was indicated at the beginning of the First Committee discussion a month ago when some exchange of views took place on this. But I wish to repeat that the formal situation is that the documentation has not been transmitted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Liberia on a point of order.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): I think we are splitting hairs here.

I want to support what the representative of Sri Lanka has said and as one of the sponsors I would appeal to our colleague from Nigeria to accept our suggestion instead of continuing this debate. I fully support what the representative of Sri Lanka has said about the fact that we have endeavoured to produce here a document that we thought would be acceptable to the Committee, in line with the Final Document. Therefore, I would strongly recommend that my colleague from Nigeria accept the fact that we have been pleased to agree to the two latter amendments to this draft resolution so that we may proceed to a vote.

Mr. PEREZ HERNANDEZ (Cuba)(interpretation from Spanish): When we proposed this draft resolution we took into account paragraph 125. After the explanation given by the Representative of the Secretary-General, as well as the request by the representative of Liberia, I should like to request our friend the representative of Nigeria to accept the inclusion of the last two recommendations he has proposed, but that with regard to the word "studying" we retain it in operative paragraph 1 for the following reasons.

In accordance with a decision of the tenth special session in paragraph 125 of the Final Document, there is a series of ideas and proposals that should be sent to the negotiating and deliberative bodies; and, in actual fact, as was pointed out by Ambassador Garcia Robles, studying organs are not mentioned there. But, in accordance also with a decision of the tenth special session, we set up the deliberative body which not only has terms of reference that enable it to undertake studies on the basis of requests by the Secretary-General, but also on its own initiative can propose that certain studies be undertaken.

(Mr. Perez Hernandez, Cuba)

In my view, some of the proposals and suggestions of the draft texts which were submitted to the tenth special session but which were not included in a final decision are none the less deserving of further study and, therefore, the consultative organ itself could consider them and propose studies.

For those reasons, I would ask the representative of Nigeria to consent to our inserting his two proposals but retaining the concept of "studying", because we feel it is and will be in keeping with reality in the future.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me at this point, when the moment of adjournment is rapidly approaching and we have been working very efficiently ever since this morning, that this small difference that has been discussed during the last half hour or so can perhaps best be settled if the people most closely concerned with it consult with each other, either after this meeting or tomorrow before the meeting, so that they can produce a text which we can adopt by consensus and perhaps without very much further discussion. As I was saying, so far the Committee has kept well to its time schedule. We have today passed 10 resolutions, admittedly helped by the fact that 6 of them have been passed by consensus, which I think is always a welcome circumstance. Only four have required votes.

Unless there is objection from the Committee, I intend to adjourn the meeting now, in order to call it promptly at 10.30 tomorrow and it is the particular wish of the Chair that all delegations should endeavour to be here promptly at 10.30. Today, for instance, we lost most time by the fact of delegations coming to the room after the vote and having to record their votes by means of statements. This takes up an inordinate amount of the time of the Committee and, I would submit, does not advance our affairs.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I merely wish to say that, as concerns your suggested procedure, Mr. Chairman, my delegation is fully in agreement, and in whatever private talks we have between now and tomorrow, my delegation will demonstrate a spirit of conciliation and understanding of the viewpoints of others which it has always shown. But so that representatives may give some thought to this matter at the same time as they consider the other viewpoints expressed here on the same question, I should like to add a few words about the subject which we have debated.

In the light of what was said by the representative of the Secretary-General, my delegation believes that in operative paragraph 1 it will be necessary, after the words "proposals and suggestions listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document" to add the following: "... together with the official documents of the tenth special session". And we would further add the words "... at the thirty-third regular session", after the word "suggestions" in the last line of the paragraph.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Regarding the proposed deletion my delegation is open to a solution, but we continue to think that the words "as well as studying" should be omitted, because they are superfluous. But we shall try to ensure that the procedure which you, Mr. Chairman, have suggested produces the desired results.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.27, on the signature and ratification of Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, I have been instructed to make the following statement. The Soviet Union, as is well known, is a consistent supporter of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world. The establishment of such zones can be conducive to reducing the threat of nuclear war and to the consolidation of the non-proliferation system. On the basis of this position of my Government, the Soviet Union this year signed Additional Protocol II to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. On the instructions of the Soviet Government, I am empowered to state that the Soviet Union intends in the near future to ratify Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. We assume that this statement will be taken into account by the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.27, as agreed during consultations.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): In regard to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.16/Rev.1, I should merely like to say that if I did not immediately respond to the appeals by the representatives of Liberia and Cuba, it is because I thought I should naturally bow to the very wise suggestion of the Chair that we should sleep on this matter and come back to it tomorrow morning. Otherwise I would have found their appeals irresistible at this point.

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting I have to announce the following additional sponsors of draft resolutions: Niger, A/C.1/33/L.23, Bahamas, A/C.1/33/L.35; Togo, Mali, Syrian Arab Republic and Liberia, A/C.1/33/L.39; Philippines, A/C.1/33/L.30/Rev.1; Denmark, A/C.1/33/L.41, and Togo and Bahamas, A/C.1/33/L.42.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.