

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
56th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 29 November 1978
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 56TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 35: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SECOND CONFERENCE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 37: CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 38: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/78: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 46: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE OF PEACE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 47: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued):

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

AGENDA ITEM 48: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE DEEMED TO BE EXCESSIVELY INJURIOUS OR TO HAVE INDISCRIMINATE EFFECTS: REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY CONFERENCE (continued)

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.56
1 December 1978

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 35, 37, 38, 46, 47, 48 AND 49

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue this afternoon its consideration of the draft resolutions on disarmament.

Before taking up the draft resolutions, however, the Committee, as I announced at this morning's meeting, will first continue its consideration of the question of the Production of a United Nations film on wars and their consequences". I refer in this context to document A/33/389, which is the report of the Secretary General on this matter.

As representatives will recall, the question was taken up yesterday at the afternoon meeting, during which the Under-Secretary-General for the Office of Public Information made an additional statement in the context of the Secretary-General's report and, subsequently, the representative of Saudi Arabia made a statement further clarifying the aims and purposes of this film.

However, the Committee did not take a decision on the matter, owing to the fact that the representative of the United States, under the relevant rule of procedure, asked for a delay of 24 hours in order to obtain instructions from his Government. That period having now elapsed I propose that the Committee continue consideration of the matter with a view to arriving at a decision this afternoon as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): As the Chairman has just pointed out, it was the United States delegation in general and me in particular that requested that action on the Secretary-General's report dealing with the production of a United Nations film on wars and their consequences be delayed for 24 hours. I made this request both in order to consult with my Government and, as part of that consultation, because it was not entirely clear to me what action we were being asked to take.

I must confess that the passage of 24 hours, consultations with my Government and a re-reading of document A/33/389 have done nothing to relieve these doubts.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

Having said that, I should like to indicate my complete sympathy with the motives and objectives of the representative of Saudi Arabia. None of us who has ever seen the effects of war and people marching off with flags flying and bands playing and then the tattered refuse which sometimes comes back - or, for that matter, in my particular branch of the service, the Air Force, you never see at all - can fail to sympathize with the objectives that our colleague is advancing.

But we have before us in this document a report of the Secretary-General, in which he states that the Office of Public Information indicates that, while there is a

"... vast accumulation of cinematographic footage depicting the misery and destruction caused by conflicts of the twentieth century...", it could, if the General Assembly so decided, make a 60-minute long documentary on the subject.

This report, which we received yesterday morning, does not recommend any specific action, and it is for that reason that I am not fully sure on what we are called upon to take a decision today. That is why - and this may surprise many of my colleagues, because I am not known as a cautious person - I should like to sound a note of caution. As the report of the Secretary General makes clear, there is already a great deal of material in national and private archives around the world describing the horrors of war. If the United Nations is to make another such film, the United States believes that it would be very important that it be something different, something based on a broader and more philosophical view of history, and, having listened with interest to my colleague's observations yesterday, I do not think that he disagrees with that.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

Therefore, I suggest that if we are going to take action on this proposal which has come to us with very little time for reflection -- although I could not claim the subject is new to us, we knew it at the last General Assembly, but the particular proposal that was on our desks yesterday morning -- that action should be to refer it to the Secretary-General's advisory board of eminent persons which we established last summer under paragraph 124 of the Final Report of the special session. If we are to take any action other than taking note of the report, I would recommend that it be on the basis of the suggestion that I have made.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I feel I am obliged to endeavour to dispel the doubts of the representative of the United States with regard to the points he raised about the proposed film so that he may be in no doubt whatsoever because, after all, as he himself said, this question was raised last year when some representatives pointed out that it would involve financial implications. The representative of Sweden said at the time that he would rather see his draft resolution adopted at the thirty-second session without an amendment with regard to the publication of a periodical.

That is why I thought it better, on the advice of many representatives, to refer my amendment to the Secretary-General for study. And in order to refresh the memory of the representative of the United States who no doubt has read the report, I would perhaps repeat very slowly the proposal of last year so that some of his doubts, if not all of them, may be dispelled. I shall then add, in trying to explain that there should be no fear on his part, what I said yesterday on this matter. I proposed

"that consideration be given to the making of a United Nations film" -- the emphasis is on a "United Nations film" --

"candidly portraying the vast devastation wrought by the last World War and subsequent wars, and also highlighting the human tragedies and untold miseries brought about as a consequence of these wars, so that such a United Nations film could be shown in schools and universities and on television all over the world with the hope of creating a genuine aversion to all wars in the future". (A/33/389)

The representative of the United States said that there are many films about wars. We all know that. It is precisely because we have so many films about wars that I wanted a United Nations film that would cull excerpts from films apolitically - the emphasis is on the word "apolitically". So the Americans need not be afraid about Hiroshima and Nagasaki, or the British about Dresden.

Now if my great-great-grandfather did something wrong, I am not trying to say that I am guilty. If the Americans, for example, took what is called the United States from the Indians, many of them have a sense of guilt. Others say, "Well, we came here, not in the Mayflower and other ships, we came later from Europe in 1848" - many of them, even later. They and their Government should not have a sense of guilt.

I want to be explicit. I am not known for double talk. Come on, do not be afraid of that. It has to be apolitical in the sense that the United Nations Secretariat and, if you like, the advisory board you mentioned, will have to pass on the film to make sure that nothing is weighed in favour of one country that wages war. War is war. War is brutal, whether it is waged by the Arabs - I start with the Arabs - or by the Americans - because I happen to be here in America - by the British, by whoever rationalizes certain difficulties inside a country and plunges his country into war as has happened in two world wars.

That is why I cited A. J. P. Taylor yesterday. He is an English scholar; he is an historian; he corrects many notions about the Second World War, let alone the First World War. I want to assure the representative of the United States and his Government that there will be no implications or propaganda in having such a United Nations film. It is a film that will have more impact than the 40 or so resolutions which we are adopting here.

Again and again I say it has to be apolitical. And the only way that it can be made apolitical is through the supervision of the Secretariat which is international. I hope you have faith in the Secretariat. And then to make assurance doubly sure that others - a committee of the United Nations - will look at the last version. All it will cost is \$200,000. It is not a gamble. It is something that may have more influence on the minds of people. I am not referring to a flagrant war of aggression when a given country without any reason, out of ambition, aggresses against another country or marches against it. That type of war is a war of self-defence and aggression.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

But most wars, whether the first in my lifetime, or the Second World War, were motivated by politicians for economic and political reasons, for expanding their power, or curbing - I am not going to mention names now - in the First World War, certain countries from expanding their commerce in territories which some Powers thought was their preserve.

I said yesterday - and I repeat it now because I feel that I am constrained to repeat it - that we will not enter into past motivations. It will be a visual, factual picture of the conflicts, and it will be, like we say in literature, an anthology of those conflicts, with no political undertones. I mentioned that I am not an expert, nor do I think that others here are experts on these matters. We will leave it to the experts and we will see to it that if there is anything that smacks of any bias towards placing the blame on one country or another, this will not do. It is simply the devastation of war.

It has been said that it would be a superfluous film. How can it be a superfluous film when we know that war films have been made not merely to show that the people who suffered or inflicted suffering were not to blame. Of course, everybody has to rationalize the motives for a war.

This will have no motivation whatsoever. I want the young people in universities, in high schools, and the others on television to know what war is. I want the people in the seats of power - they are also human, like you and me - to be impressed by the horrors of war, again and again, so that they may be more cautious in their policy. And this may pave the way for more negotiations between them and those who are in conflict, whether in ideology or economic interests, or what have you.

It is not a propagandistic film. It is an enlightening film. It may be difficult for you and me, but the experts can see to it, when we caution them, when we give them the directives, that the film will not be slanted to blame one party and exonerate the other and vice versa.

I hope I have made myself clear. Yesterday, had it not been for the representative of the United States - and Mr. Akatani made it very clear in the report he gave at the request of the Secretary-General, as to how much it would cost - we would have disposed of the matter. Nobody here seemed to object. Yesterday, the representative of the United States, I believe, did not ask us to

(Mr. Baroudy, Saudi Arabia)

do anything before we voted on the draft resolution concerning the monitoring of satellites. I think it was a French draft resolution originally, and the representative of France introduced it. And it required an expenditure of \$114,000 or \$120,000, something that worries the representative of the United States. I do not know, but he may have abstained. However, he did not ask for a 24-hour delay on that.

Why is he asking for it now on this? Is he afraid of something? I assure him that I will see to it that if the film is going to be slanted towards blaming the United States for having done things they should not have done, we will see to it that nothing of that sort will happen. Therefore, with a clear conscience, I can tell him that I believe - I may be wrong, but I know a little bit about the consensus of the Committee - that had he not raised this question of 24 hours - it was within his right to raise it - we would have disposed of the question. Now he wants to put a spoke in the wheel, in other words, to have another report.

But then I know what will happen. They will say: let us talk about this matter or take a decision at the thirty-fourth session. We have had too many things deferred like that. I want it to be decided upon by the Committee now. If the representative of the United States is not in a position to vote, for reasons that are not known to me - I do not want to imagine anything at this stage - well and good. After all, we are representatives of sovereign States. If we were to consult our Governments on every one of those 38 or 40 draft resolutions, we would accomplish nothing.

There is nothing hidden in this request to have a film made; there is nothing, shall I say, sinister. Believe me, I am the last one to try and bring in some sort of dissent and contention between nations, especially between the major States. We are small States. We are buying arms. You are providing them from the taxpayers' money. We here are concerned about how to reduce armaments, leaving aside disarmament. Is that not a modest request? Is it not worth the gamble? It is a gamble. Let the United States consider it as a gamble. It will cost \$200,000, subject to the film being agreed upon after it is done - not only by the Secretary-General, but also by advisers of the Secretary-General. And if the Secretary-General asked me, I would say that the representative of the United States, who asked for a 24-hour delay, should be among the advisers.

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

Is that reasonable? What do you want me to do? For Heaven's sake, I am trying an innovative idea, instead of going on and on with other resolutions. I have been here for 33 years and I know the tricks. I am not using any tricks. Please, be reasonable and do not ask us to defer the whole question until next year.

I beg the Chairman to do what he tried to do yesterday, to ask if there are any objections. Two or three may have objections. It is a draft resolution on my part and let us put it to the vote. This question of a film is a draft resolution. We do not have to waste more paper and have it circulated. This draft resolution is based on whether or not we should have a film. Kindly put it to the vote. I would like to appeal to the representative of the United States. If he needs time and he wants to abstain, it does not mean that the subject of the film should not be discussed now and should be deferred until next year. Whatever the majority would like to do, let us do it. Perhaps by consensus, unless he wants to oppose it. And if he wants to oppose it, there should be a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Saudi Arabia for his statement during which, if the understanding of the Chairman is correct, he made it very clear that he requests the Committee to take a decision on the matter, and I understand that the decision which he seeks is that this Committee recommend to the General Assembly that the United Nations proceed to produce this film in accordance with the report of the Secretary-General. I understand that a formal decision is sought by the representative of Saudi Arabia.

Before proceeding further, is there any delegation which wishes to state its views at this time?

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As is clear from document A/33/389, the Office of Public Information has carried out a study of the technical aspects involved in the question raised by the representative of Saudi Arabia. However, it seems to us that the proposal has not only technical but also political aspects. It is important to realize what the content of the film would be to have an idea of that. That is why it seems to us that it would be appropriate and reasonable to accept the proposal of the United States that the Committee should transmit the proposal to make such a film to the Secretary-General's advisory board for study. We support that proposal made by the United States representative.

Mr. LENNUYEUX-COMNÈNE (France) (interpretation from French): In speaking for the first time on this question, I should like to begin by saying to the representative of Saudi Arabia that I do not for one moment doubt the very noble intentions which lie behind his proposal to have a film made on war. Indeed, no people has suffered more from that scourge than has the French people and its sufferings have inspired much of the production of France's literature, cinema and theatre.

I feel that in order to be convincing in this field, taking account of everything that has been written, said or filmed, one must have genius. I believe that no book has pleaded for peace better than Tolstoy's War and Peace. At least, that is the feeling of the French people. It is a reference work, because it was written by a man of genius. We wonder, therefore, whether we could decide that an anthology of an hour's duration could really show the full scope of the scourge that war can bring upon us. Frankly, I do not think so. The subject of the life and death of peoples is one requiring not only genius but also a great deal of preparation. In those circumstances, I think it would be difficult at present to confer a mission of this importance, which brings up all our civilizations and the past of all of us, and decide here and now that we are going to make them the subject of a brief hour-long anthology, which could have a lesser or greater impact depending on the pattern of distribution which we do not know, on our younger generations which, I must say, are alas already aware of the realities of war as the result of the too numerous films which have been produced during the 50 years of the existence of cinematography.

(Mr. Lennuyeux-Commène, France)

Consequently, I believe very sincerely, and without doubting in the least the noble intentions of the Permanent Representative of Saudi Arabia or the usefulness of the work he is proposing, that it is necessary to defer to the wish of the United States representative and to ask the Board which advises the Secretary-General to consider this question so that we shall not be acting in a vacuum, so to speak. This concerns a film which must be truly convincing and must go beyond what has been written and filmed on the same subject over many years. Believe me - and I am sure the representative of Saudi Arabia knows this - there exist on this subject already productions that are extremely moving, extremely convincing, and the United Nations must not be found lacking in genius when dealing with it. It is for the United Nations, indeed, more than for any other organization, to plead convincingly in favour of peace.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I must thank my colleagues from the Soviet Union and France for having suggested that the Committee should refer the idea of making a film to the advisory board. The representative of France said it takes a genius like Tolstoy. I have read War and Peace, and there is no doubt that there are subjective feelings about War and Peace, especially about the Napoleonic wars and that sort of thing. It is not completely objective, with all due respect to Tolstoy; parts are subjective. Are we to wait until a genius comes along? We do not know what the definition of a genius is nowadays, with propaganda rife everywhere. Members all know very well that it takes 50 years for it to be decided whether or not a novel is to be considered the work of a genius. In my youth I read many popular and well-known novelists. When, after 20 or 25 years, I ask friends if they know them they have never heard of them - and we all thought they were geniuses.

We cannot wait for a man of genius. The collective co-operation of the members of the Secretariat whose work is in the field of information, whether auditory or visual, should be given the opportunity to make a film. That would not prevent the Advisory Board referred to by the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union from making sure that it was apolitical. You do not have to be a genius to make an apolitical film. There are checks and balances among the members of the Secretariat who would select and co-ordinate the work. We cannot go by clichés - "a genius does this", or "geniuses have done things".

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

I have seen many war films, and many were moving but they were slanted -- if I may say so to the representative of France. Perhaps it was not deliberate; perhaps there was not sufficient detachment. But when there are experts from the Secretariat working on such a film they are conscious of their duty to the United Nations and to the General Assembly.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

To make doubly certain the advisory board can be shown the film. They may have some ideas, apolitical ideas - if they are going to be political ideas I will be around, I hope, and others will be around to take issue with them, to see that there are no insinuations to blame one party or the other.

Why are the representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States and France so nervous that there might be something that perhaps may not redound to their past policies? We have nothing to do with past policies.

It can be done. I have seen very moving war films made after the First World War, but they were slanted. Then I saw films that showed me another view of the war. I am not so simple as not to know that there are some very well-made war films, very moving too, regardless of who was killing whom. I am an Asian, a Middle Easterner, and when I saw films - I am speaking of the First World War - I did not care whether they were German, British or French. They were moving.

I think Mr. Akatani made it clear in the report of the Secretary-General by putting in my amendment word for word, and then I explained myself that it has to be completely apolitical. If we refer it to the advisory board, perhaps they will have divergent views and some will say yes and some will say no, and then I know what the decision will be: it is not the time for it now. There are enough war films and it is superfluous.

That is why I use the word "gamble". Gamble with \$200,000, my good friend of the United States. I wish I still had my father's money; I would invest some of it myself if you are worried about implications. I am telling you we will see to it that there will be no implications. Not I but the advisory board. But let us make the film. On what will they judge? I was not born yesterday. Take it to the advisory board and put it on the shelf, and next year somebody else will bring forth another excuse for not having a film. Why don't you give the benefit of the doubt to such a project, that it might work out. As I said, we voted the French proposal on monitoring, involving an expenditure of some \$114,000 or \$120,000. It is a gamble. Two weeks. Let us gamble with the film and show it to the advisory board.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

What about that, my good friends from the United States and the Soviet Union and France? I would like to elicit your reply. I am trying to be reasonable with you. I agree with you there should be supervision of what the Secretariat produces. I have full confidence that the Secretariat will produce an apolitical film in the selection of the material from extant films about wars, again, apolitically. Well, answer me. If there are political implications I am ready to see how I can grapple with them, and I hope I can convince you. Maybe you will convince me.

All you have to say is, refer it to the advisory board. All right. I will agree to the advisory board. Let's make the film and refer it to the advisory board. Is this a good idea? Let me hear their reply, Sir, if they wish to reply of course. I cannot force them to.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that in the light of the turn this question has taken, my delegation no longer has a very clear idea of what we should be considering here.

Yesterday, document A/33/389 was circulated, a document which contains a report of the Secretary-General. This is a very brief and concise report, but a very clear one. According to that report it would seem that at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly the delegation of Saudi Arabia submitted amendments to a draft resolution. Those amendments were aimed at a recommendation by the General Assembly

"that consideration be given to the making of a United Nations film candidly portraying the vast devastation wrought by the last World War and subsequent wars, and also highlighting the human tragedies and untold miseries brought about as a consequence of these wars, so that such a United Nations film could be shown in schools and universities and on television all over the world with the hope of creating a genuine aversion to all wars in the future". (A/33/389)

From what we then read in the same document it would seem that the First Committee considered that the amendments did not need to be put to the vote, on the understanding that the Office of Public Information would undertake preparatory research work and that the Secretary-General would report at the next regular session - that is, of this session - on the feasibility of making such a film.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Now, paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the same document (A/33/389) are perfectly clear. The Office of Public Information has conducted the studies requested of it. It has concluded that it could produce a film as described and that it would be a 60-minute-long documentary intended primarily for television and later on shorter versions for distribution to educational establishments and non-governmental organizations. If the Assembly now embarks on a discussion of other things, I think that it would be changing a decision it took at a previous session. With regard to a specific suggestion which has been made here that this matter be transmitted to the advisory board, I think that in order to do so the Assembly would first have to modify the terms of reference, the powers, and the functions which it set forth for that advisory board in paragraph 12⁴ of the Final Document. Paragraph 12⁴ is also very clear. It states that:

"The Secretary-General is requested to set up an advisory board of eminent persons, selected on the basis of their personal expertise and taking into account the principle of equitable geographical representation, to advise him on various aspects of studies to be made under the auspices of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and arms limitation, including a programme of such studies." (S-10/2, para. 12⁴)

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

For further clarification I wish to state that the advisory board held its first session from 14 to 22 November, and since it is my honour to be a member of that board I am able to say that I am up-to-date on the matters with which it dealt. While there was some elaboration of the provisions in paragraph 12⁴, it never went beyond studies and it never thought that the advisory board would become an expert on cinematographic activities. For example, the advisory board said that some specific functions envisaged by the Secretary-General were the following:

"to define the purposes of studies on disarmament in the context of the guidelines set forth in the Final Document of the tenth special session" - I repeat, "studies";

"to draw up a broad programme for such studies in order to support the work ... ;

"to contribute to the better utilization of possible contributions by specialized agencies and other institutions to programmes of the United Nations system concerning studies and information on this question;

"to bring together experts of research institutes and non-governmental organizations which may be interested in various aspects of the problem."

Therefore, if a draft such as the one which is now before us were to go to the advisory board before its terms of reference were changed, I, as a member of the board, would feel obliged to say in the board that the board would be acting ultra vires as long as its terms of reference or powers are not modified. I also believe that our hands are full with studies alone and we shall have a full programme for several years at least.

Therefore, there is no point in thinking that the Board would be an easy solution for questions on which we try to avoid a resolution.

I repeat that my delegation believes that as the matter appears in the report of the Secretary-General, document A/33/389, it is very clear. My delegation considers that such a film would be extremely useful and we would have no objection to voting in favour of its production, if a vote were taken.

Mr. KODJOVI (Togo) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Togo believes that it is absolutely necessary for the greatest importance to be attached to the suggestion put forward by the delegation of Saudi Arabia concerning the production of a film on the phenomenon of war. We believe that this phenomenon should be considered with respect to its causes and its effects and in the most objective way possible. We believe that the objective of such an endeavour would be a noble one because what is involved is the developing of an instrument aimed at influencing the minds of future generations and at mobilizing and alerting those generations to the phenomenon of war.

While we recognize that haste might be unwise in such an undertaking, and in an undertaking of such scope, we also believe that this Committee should not use the risk to which such haste might lead as a reason for postponing this endeavour indefinitely. I do not think we have to wait for a genius to begin this undertaking. The important thing is for the work to be directed not towards putting countries, one country or a group of countries on trial, but towards putting war on trial. We believe that that trial will be all the more effective if it is carefully planned. We know that history has recorded numerous wars, that wars do not have the same causes and that they do not take place in the same way in different countries. But what they do have in common is their horrible nature, and it is that horrible aspect which should be highlighted. We believe that that could be done, the essential thing being, as I have said, to so arrange the sequences that, in the course of their projection, there will be no way of attacking, or judging, or placing on trial one country or another. Subject to that precaution, I believe it is essential, I repeat, that this question should not be postponed indefinitely, and that we should be able here, in the First Committee - where we speak about disarmament and about war, and where all oppose war and express their political will on this subject - to do something constructive and take a decision on this question.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): We have before us an oral proposal that the First Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it act not in the way recommended by the document before us - which indeed contains no recommendation - but to do what the document describes is possible. We have a statement as to the cost. It is difficult to present a written amendment to an oral proposal, but I should like to propose as an amendment that our action be to refer this matter to the advisory board of eminent persons set up under paragraph 12⁴ of the Final Document. I should like to point out that any doubts - and whenever I hear my colleague from Mexico express a legal opinion I am automatically reduced to jelly - that anyone might have as to the propriety of the eminent persons dealing with that would be resolved by a General Assembly resolution. If the General Assembly asked them to do it, they could not say, "We cannot do it because the General Assembly did not tell us to". Therefore, on that assumption, and in view of the fact that the week is passing by very quickly, I would respectfully suggest, if it meets with the agreement of the Chairman and the members of this Committee, that we vote on this proposed oral amendment and then if it is adopted, vote on the proposal as amended, or if it is not adopted, vote on the proposal as originally made. We can go ahead and do it with two pushes of the button.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I see that the attitude of the representative of the United States has not changed. However, it is his right to submit an amendment, although the question here is not a proposal; it is a decision. Therefore, I do not think the amendment is receivable because one must have an amendment to a written text. Here there is a report which was expanded by the statement of the Under-Secretary-General of the Office of Public Information. The decision which has to be taken here is, to make or not to make a film.

I have said that the amendment is not receivable in this case, but if the Chair wishes to rule otherwise, I am prepared to submit an amendment to an amendment. I hope the representative of the United States will not re-open the debate because in the end, the question of cost will be enlarged. We are talking about a film costing \$200,000. If it is a question of principle, I stand by my principle.

When the film is made, I am not averse to having it referred to the advisory board. We have heard the representative of Mexico on the implications of the advisory board. I will not talk about the amendment to the amendment unless the representative of the United States will concede that this is not a proposal to which there is going to be an amendment, because if we re-open the debate about the advisory board, we will never finish. If we re-open the debate about the advisory board in the light of what the representative of Mexico has said, then there are pros and cons. To show my goodwill, I made it clear to the representative of the United States that after the film is made, the advisory board will perhaps pin medals on the Secretariat members who tried so hard to discover how it should be made; maybe they will have some suggestions. Maybe the final version of the film will not come out unless the advisory board sees the first showing. The representative of the United States wants to say something; maybe they are coaching him on how to put a spoke in my wheel. But if you decide, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is receivable, give me the floor and I will put an amendment to the amendment which I hope will satisfy the representative of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to disagree with the representative of Saudi Arabia when he says we will never come to the end of the debate, because the Chair will take good care to see that we end this debate. We will end the debate in an orderly manner and with a decision which corresponds to the normal procedure in the First Committee and in the United Nations. It is the hope of the Chair that we will now proceed in an orderly manner, and quickly. The representative of the United States in an earlier intervention was good enough to say that we can dispose of this very quickly by pushing the button twice, and this is exactly what the Chair proposes to the Committee, on the following understanding: that the proposal by the representative of the United States, supported by a number of other delegations, is receivable. The Chair does not want to get into an argument as to whether it is an amendment. The Chair does not want to get into an argument as to whether we can or cannot take a decision on the film without a draft resolution. As agreed by the Committee, it is a question of decision. Therefore, in the view of the Chair the proposal by the representative of the United States has the character of a procedural proposal which is perfectly receivable, and it is the urgent wish of the Chair that no one challenges this ruling. It has not been the habit of this Committee for proposals not to receive the fair consideration they should receive by the democratic way of voting on them. I see that the representative of Saudi Arabia is signalling his wish to speak. He will be followed by the representative of Argentina.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I would very much like to listen to my friend from Argentina, and will defer to him. I have a small amendment to the amendment of the representative of the United States. Mr. Chairman, may I ask you kindly to let me hear what the representative of Argentina has to say because I have known him for many years and he may say something which may influence my decision with regard to a possible amendment.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I would like to ask for clarification because, since we are going to vote by pressing the buttons, I think the delegations should know very clearly upon what they are voting. The amendment proposed by the representative of the United States of America might seem at first glance to be a purely procedural proposal, but I have the same doubts on this point as does the representative of Mexico.

The General Assembly is a sovereign body and as such, can change the terms of reference of the advisory board in the sphere of disarmament. There is no doubt about that. But in order for the board to receive a request from the General Assembly, first of all - as was stated by Mr. Garcia Robles - it must amend those terms of reference and expand them to include undertakings other than studies. The production of a film obviously is not a study. Since I also have the honour of being a member of the advisory board, I have serious doubts that by means of a procedural action one could change a matter of substance such as the mandate of that body.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would request you, and perhaps through you the representative of the United States, to enlighten us as to the way in which his amendment would change the terms of reference of the advisory board established by the special session of the General Assembly in paragraph 124 of the Final Document, to enable it to discharge the mission referred to it by this session.

For this reason, I believe that verbal clarification would not be enough. It would be necessary for us to have a written text of the amendment so that we can study it. That written text would have to refer to the terms of reference of the advisory board and to changes to it in order that we could then express our views. As the representative of Mexico stated, the advisory board has a very busy schedule.

May I make an appeal? I believe that in order to avoid dealing with the proposal of the representative of Saudi Arabia, we should not try to shelve it by sending it to the advisory board. It would be preferable - and a more frank procedure - to vote on the proposal of the representative of Saudi Arabia, rather than to seek a procedure such as transmitting it to the advisory board, because that would entail a waste of time. It would also curtail expenditure for the United Nations, when we want to save money.

The CHAIRMAN: I have listened to the statement of the representative of Argentina with great care, as I also did earlier to that of the representative of Mexico. I am sure that the representative of Argentina agrees and that the Committee too agrees that I cannot at this time give a ruling on what is and what is not within the competence of the advisory board of eminent persons, and on whether and how anyone could eventually give new directions, instructions and tasks to that board, because, as the representative of Argentina himself observed, the General Assembly is a sovereign body.

There is also the question of whether or not looking into this film is a study.

Those are questions into which I, as Chairman, would not care to go. So we now have two possibilities. The first is to ask for a clarification from the legal adviser to the Secretary-General on the point raised by the representatives of Mexico and Argentina and pursue the matter once we have received that clarification. That would mean a delay, which, I understand, is not the wish of the main proponent of this proposal, the representative of Saudi Arabia. The second is that to proceed as I suggested a moment ago -- and I could, if necessary, make that procedure clear once more. I believe, however, that I need simply say that we would take a vote on the proposal of the representative of the United States -- which I interpret as a procedural proposal -- and after that vote, we could, if necessary, take a decision on the substance of the matter, namely, whether or not to recommend to the General Assembly that this film be produced.

I believe that that is both a simple and orderly procedure. Those are the choices available to the Committee.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I am glad that I deferred to my colleague from Argentina in order to listen to his opinion, because he reaffirmed what my colleague from Mexico had said. I am not going to re-open the debate, in deference to your efficiency as our Chairman, Sir, so that we may proceed to the vote and dispose of this matter.

However, with your indulgence, I would informally make the following request of my colleague from the United States. If he should refuse, I could then perhaps submit a small amendment to his amendment, in the context of what he wishes. My request takes into account what both my colleagues from Mexico and Argentina have said with regard to the terms of reference of the advisory board as to whether or not the request of the United States representative would be receivable - which may create further complications with regard not to the film itself but to referring to the board any other matter which it does not consider within its competence or its field of study.

Before I make my request formal - and perhaps I shall have no need to submit a formal amendment - I should like to seek the agreement of my colleague from the United States on the following proviso: that the would not be shown until the advisory board had had a chance to look it over. In the meantime, there should be some steps that could be taken so as to make the question of the film receivable by the advisory board. I am sure that the advisory board could see to it that the proper procedure would be followed.

In this way, we would save the time of the Committee and give satisfaction to our colleague from the United States that the film would not be released until the advisory board had a chance to look it over.

Further, adequate time would be provided so that the necessary machinery could be used to obtain what our colleague from the United States would like to see done, in fact, to see that the advisory board's terms of reference would allow it to look into this matter regardless of its heavy agenda of studies and other matters with which it is dealing very seriously.

To recapitulate, I wish to take into account the objective of my colleague from the United States that the film would not be shown until the advisory board had had a chance to pronounce itself on it, and also until the terms of reference of the board would have been clarified in one way or another - whether by a directive from the General Assembly or any other directive; and

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

there are other directives, into which I shall not go lest we digress and begin discussing the subject of the competence of the advisory board.

I think that that would be acceptable to my colleague from the United States. It is a question now of spending the money and not of releasing the film. If, however, it is a question of spending the money, we should be told. If it is a question of yielding from A to Z, we cannot yield from A to Z. We will yield to his wishes provided we will take into account the fact that if we take textually what he wants to see done it means shelving the film, as if we had taken no decision and had not spoken about the subject this afternoon and before.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I had hoped not to speak again in this debate, hoping we could get the resolution of our differences by the democratic method. But I really have no honourable alternative in view of the question put to me. I personally agree with the Chair's ruling. It is procedural motion. It should be voted on. I do not think that a reference that we agree to make a film and then decide whether it is fit to be released solves any of the problems. I would interpret a study as a decision to advise whether you embark on a course of action. I cannot conceive that the doubts that have been expressed by our two distinguished colleagues who in another capacity are members of the eminent Advisory Board - and they fit the title quite properly - would be compounded if they were not to advise on whether or not this course of action was worthwhile, but whether a film was in fact objective. That is really quite a different problem.

I think the thing to do is to decide whether the thing is worth having, as I would interpret its studies broadly, and then, if they say it is worthwhile, go ahead and do it.

So I cannot on behalf of the United States accede to the suggestion of the representative of Saudi Arabia whose good intentions and motivation on this I have nothing but the highest regard for.

I also agree with the position taken by the representatives of the Soviet Union and France. It is a very complicated matter, and we should have the benefit of the advisory board before deciding whether to go this way or not.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that with these further changes, particularly on the question of the competence or otherwise of the advisory board, every member of the Committee is now in full possession of all the facts and I trust that the members of the Committee on the basis of what has taken place during this debate, will be perfectly able to decide on the issues posed to the Committee. The Chair therefore proposes to put to the vote the procedural motion made by the representative of the United States, and supported by a number of other delegations, to send the question of the production of a United Nations film on wars and their consequences, explained in document A/33/389, for the consideration of the Secretary-General's advisory board of eminent persons.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Before we reach this stage, you said, Mr. Chairman, that you saw two possible procedures to follow. In my view, the opinion you expressed at that time was and continues to be correct. The first procedure you mentioned was that the Legal Counsel of the Secretary-General be asked whether or not it falls within the powers of the advisory board, as set forth in paragraph 124 of the Final Document, to give an opinion on the production of films, including films on disarmament.

Then you mentioned another alternative. My delegation favours the first alternative. And I believe that this will not bother the representative of Saudi Arabia either because what I recall is that consultations of this nature can be decided by the Secretary-General's Legal Counsel in a matter of hours and at times in a matter of minutes. Therefore, by our morning meeting tomorrow at the latest we would have that opinion.

In the meantime we could make good use of our time by dealing with the many other draft resolutions we have pending. As you, yourself, stated, and rightly so, the Committee under your leadership and in a spirit of co-operation which we all feel - but within the limits of absolute respect for our rights, let this be well understood - has gone beyond what you had yourself envisaged at the beginning of the week. This is my specific suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN: I have no difficulty with the proposal of the representative of Mexico to the effect that, before we proceed any further with this matter, the opinion of the legal adviser to the Secretary-General should be sought on the matter of the competence of the Secretary-General's advisory board of eminent persons, and on the question of whether and how matters and additional tasks, and what kind of tasks, can be given to the board. Therefore - and we were at this particular point already more than an hour ago - unless there is any objection to the suggestion of the representative of Mexico, suggest that we should do as he has proposed.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, as you may understand, the question we put to the Legal Counsel must be worded in precise terms. This is very important. The question as I have suggested it, and suggest it now, is: Does it fall within the competence of the advisory board, as it was defined in paragraph 12⁴ of the Final Document, to give an opinion on the production of films? That is the question.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Mexico for his formulation. I shall not try to repeat it, but the record will show exactly how he formulated it; and because the records come out a little late, I am sure that the representative of Mexico will be good enough to give the formulation in writing to the Secretariat.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I must thank the representative of Mexico for having clarified this situation, and his opinion was confirmed also by the representative of Argentina. Of course, the Legal Counsel, today or tomorrow, or whenever he is available, will take into account the formulation of the question posed by the representative of Mexico.

I want to show how reasonable I can be in this Committee. Could we not Mr. Chairman - and I hope you will consider this a reasonable question - take a decision forthwith so as not to have to reopen the subject tomorrow. Could we not decide now whether or not to ask the Secretariat to prepare a film, with

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

the proviso that if the advisory board is pronounced as competent I will then yield to the representative of the United States and will ask members of the Committee to vote on whether they want to have it referred to the Board or not. If the Board is not competent, then the whole question is disposed of. Is that not reasonable? We will take a decision now, with the proviso - I repeat - that if the decision is in favour of the Secretariat proceeding with the film that decision is subject to referring the whole question to the advisory board. In other words if the Legal Department says the Board is competent, then I yield. Is that not logical? What does our friend from the United States say to that?

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would be well for the Chair not to reply to the representative of Saudi Arabia, but rather, since he directed his question to the representative of the United States, to ask the representative of the United States if he so wishes, to give a reply. I shall be quite ready to rule on the question later.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I asked to be called upon to do something that always makes me very nervous - that is, to have a slight disagreement on a point of law with Ambassador Garcia Robles, the representative of Mexico. I think that the question to be put to the Legal Counsel under paragraph 124 of the Final Document - if that is the decision of the Committee, and I am prepared to accept the ruling of the Chairman if he wishes it to be done that way - should be not "Does this Committee have the right to do it", but, "If the General Assembly asked the board of eminent persons to do it would it be within the board's competence to do so?" Because we are only discussing a situation in which there might be a resolution asking the board to do it - a resolution by the General Assembly, not just by this Committee. And I would hope that my colleague from Mexico would agree that the legal point should be dealt with as it would actually come up.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

Not if I were to call one of them up today and say, "What about it?", or if the Secretary-General were to say, "What about it" - but supposing the General Assembly were to adopt a resolution along the lines that have been indicated, could the board of eminent persons respond?

If the question of Ambassador Garcia Robles - my friend and colleague and mentor - had that little addition to it, I would be quite happy with any decision the Chairman wished to make. The notion of having a vote here contingent on what happens, I must confess, I cannot accept. I think this is a deliberative body. We ought to decide whether or not we want to decide on the facts that we need to decide on. And I would be prepared to accept, as I have indicated, either of the procedures that the Chairman indicates, and would hope that we could get on with other business promptly.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the attention of the members of this Committee to the fact that under rule 106 of the rules of procedure, the Chairman has a right to propose the adjournment of the debate. The Chairman, however, is a servant of the Committee, and it is my belief that I may best fulfil that function at this point if indeed I do not propose formally but suggest to the Committee that we have now gone as far as we can on this matter today and would be well advised to continue it tomorrow.

If I hear no objection it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now continue its consideration of the draft resolutions on which it has to take a decision. As announced this morning, we shall now take up the draft resolutions under agenda item 47, relating to general and complete disarmament.

The first draft resolution to be considered is in document A/C.1/33/L.19, concerning the report of the Disarmament Commission. There are financial implications in connexion with this draft resolution and they are detailed in document A/C.1/33/L.51.

The draft has 18 co-sponsors and it was introduced in the First Committee by the representative of Argentina at the 49th meeting of the Committee, on 24 November 1978. The sponsors have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus. If there is no objection, I shall declare the draft resolution so adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.19 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.19.

The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.21/Rev.2, introduced this morning by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, concerning confidence-building measures. The draft resolution has 20 co-sponsors. It was originally introduced by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany at the 40th meeting of the First Committee, on 16 November 1978. Two sets of amendments to that draft resolution have been submitted. The first set of amendments are proposed by the delegation of Pakistan and appear in document A/C.1/33/L.45. The second set of amendments are proposed by the delegation of Jordan and appear in document A/C.1/33/L.46. I have been informed, however, that the latter amendments have been incorporated in the draft resolution, but I should like to have official confirmation of that from the delegations of Jordan and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Mr. MADADHA (Jordan): I wish to thank the sponsors of the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.21/Rev.2 for their co-operation and understanding.

I should like to announce that with the deletion of operative paragraph 1 of the original draft, the amendment we asked for in document A/C.1/33/L.46 has been taken into account in the revised draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.21/Rev.2. However, since in the new operative paragraph 2 the words "in their respective regions" have been omitted from the original text, I shall be compelled to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.21/Rev.2, since the deletion of those words is not in conformity with operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand from the statement made by the representative of Jordan that the amendments in document A/C.1/33/L.46 do not call for any action by the Committee. In consequence, we shall now proceed to consider the amendments presented by the delegation of Pakistan, document A/C.1/33/L.45.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): I would like to inform the Committee of the results of the consultations which my delegation has had the opportunity to conduct with the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany on the question of the amendments contained in document A/C.1/33/L.45. As a consequence of these consultations, it will be noted, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.21/Rev.2 contains a new preambular paragraph 5 which reflects in substance the first amendment submitted by my country in document A/C.1/33/L.45. We have also taken into account the last preambular paragraph of document A/C.1/33/L.21/Rev.2 which notes the various proposals of confidence-building measures that were submitted at the special session and which, it is stated, deserve due consideration.

The next two points contained in document A/C.1/33/L.45 are points that were submitted by the Pakistan delegation at the special session on disarmament during the consideration of this question and are reflected in the formal and informal documents considered during the preparations for that session.

Taking this into account, we have agreed not to press our amendments to a vote, while reiterating at the same time that we continue to hold the positions that are reflected in document A/C.1/33/L.45 and shall revert to them at a subsequent stage when the consideration of this question is taken up in a more detailed manner.

The CHAIRMAN: The import of the statement of the representative of Pakistan is that the Committee need not take action on the amendments contained in document A/C.1/33/L.45. This will considerably facilitate the work of the Committee. We shall therefore proceed to the consideration of the draft resolution in its revised form, A/C.1/33/L.21/Rev.2. The sponsors have expressed the wish that it might be adopted by consensus.

Mr. IMAM (Kuwait): I respectfully submit, Sir, that a consensus does not exist.

Mr. MADADHA (Jordan): Mr. Chairman, since I have just said that we will abstain on this draft resolution, I would like to request a recorded vote.

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

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I regret very much indeed having to speak at this stage, but we worked very hard this morning and it would appear we shall be working even harder this afternoon and, it is believed, this evening. You will, therefore, permit me to ask a question which may appear to be lighthearted or insignificant but which, in my view, is rather serious not only for my state of health but especially for the vote-recording process.

This morning, what appeared to be a strange bug had affected the vote-recording machinery which, in turn, affected two members of the Eastern European Group. I do not know whether this disease is contagious. May I therefore inquire whether our experienced and efficient technicians have found a remedy to this disease or whether members of the Non Aligned Group, including the African Group, are likely to be contaminated.

To err is human but we cannot expect it to be so regarding electronic machines at the United Nations. Also, I ask this question because I am sitting in a rather awkward position having the electronic vote-recording board on my right, and I am suffering from a pain in my neck which makes it rather difficult for me to turn my head to the right to check my votes. If no remedy has been found I shall have to change my line of vision by bodily movement, without disrespect, of course, to my colleagues on the left, or to you, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: I can assure the representative of Mauritius - and I hope that he is delighted with this piece of information - that the voting machine is now in perfect order and quite ready to go on as long as we are. However, I am afraid that the Chair can do nothing about the position of the voting board nor about the pain in the neck of the representative.

We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.21/Rev.2, on confidence-building measures, which is submitted under item 47.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Bahrain, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.21/Rev.2 was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

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

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.21/Rev.2 on confidence-building measures. However, we should like to point out the following in that connexion. My delegation would have liked the draft resolution entitled "Confidence-building measures" to be more oriented towards the achievement of disarmament, because we believe that the most effective way of building confidence among States is by achieving agreement on real disarmament measures. Only such measures can establish an atmosphere in which distrust can be gradually eliminated. However, as pointed out in the Declaration of States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty this year, the arms race continues to be accelerated, which is reflected in the Washington session of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Confidence-building measures, therefore, are constantly being undermined. My delegation would like to draw attention to the fact that the most important prerequisite for creating an atmosphere conducive to disarmament is the reaching of agreement on effective measures to halt the arms race.

Mr. GARBA (Niger) (interpretation from French): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.21/Rev.2. We are pleased to note that its sponsors agreed to certain modifications to the initial draft in the light of amendments submitted by Pakistan and Jordan. Nevertheless, my delegation would have liked to see the second revision of the draft contain the first and second preambular paragraphs as set out in document A/C.1/33/L.45. We believe that respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the pacific and just settlement of disputes, and respect for the full implementation of international agreements and the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations are the best springboard for the establishment of confidence in relations among States.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.21/Rev.2.

The Committee will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.29. This draft resolution concerns the SALT II negotiations and has 13 sponsors. It was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 48th meeting of the First Committee on 22 November 1978.

Mr. MESHARRAFA (Egypt): My delegation would like to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.29.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has taken note of that fact. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

MR. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation is authorized to make the following statement in connexion with the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.29.

The Soviet Union is doing everything within its power to achieve the successful and speedy completion of negotiations to limit strategic weapons. Therefore, we cannot, for our part, accept operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.29.

In view of those circumstances, the Soviet delegation will abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): The Albanian delegation will vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.29. Our delegation cannot note with satisfaction the demagogic statements of the American imperialists and the Soviet social imperialists. As everyone knows, those statements are only aimed at covering up the aggressive policy and the arms race which are being unrelentingly pursued by those two super-Powers.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

We believe that it is important to denounce not only the continued arms race of the two imperialist super-Powers but also their slogans and false statements. We also believe that the SALT negotiations are nothing but an attempt on the part of those two super-Powers to attain their well-known goals in the field of the continuous arms build-up and that those negotiations have nothing to do with genuine efforts to direct the disarmament problem towards a real solution.

Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): Costa Rica wishes to be included among the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.29.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.29, submitted under agenda item 47 and concerning the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) II negotiations.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.29 was adopted by 115 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

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

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States of America would like to explain the support it has given to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.29. We understand the strong interest of other members of the international community in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). Accordingly, we intend to provide appropriate information on a timely basis with respect to the SALT negotiations. We will notify the General Assembly of signature and, in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter, we intend to register the treaty with the United Nations Secretariat, which we would expect to publish the text of the treaty in accordance with that Article.

I would also note that while we support the resolution we share some of the concerns of the Soviet delegation as regards its tone, particularly the tone of paragraph 1.

Mr. FAN (China) (interpretation from Chinese): With regard to the draft resolution just adopted, based on our principled stand on this question, the Chinese delegation would like to say that it did not participate in the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the Committee's consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.29. I call on the representative of Pakistan who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply in connexion with item 43, Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, and the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.25 adopted by the Committee under that item.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): I would like the record to show that this is a statement which we wish to make in clarification of some of the points raised in the discussion regarding the resolution on the nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia rather than a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

In the discussion this morning many Members, including certain regional States, made the point that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone requires the agreement of the regional States concerned, and that it should emanate from within the region. We agree with both these points.

The initiative for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia has emanated from within the region. It has emanated from Pakistan, which is a State within the zone of South Asia. We also agree that its establishment will require the agreement of all the States concerned. But this does not mean that unless or until the full agreement of all regional States is obtained the General Assembly cannot consider the proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. If this criterion of prior agreement of all the regional States were to be applied in other cases, the General Assembly would be prevented from considering both the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa and the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East, where also one State in each case is resisting the proposal. Therefore, we find somewhat inconsistent the positions of those States which have felt it necessary to abstain on our draft resolution, or to oppose it, on the basis of such arguments.

Mr. AL-KOYUMI (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): We have been using this electric voting machine but so far we have not received the result sheets. I fear that they may have been lost during this morning's demonstrations in New York.

The CHAIRMAN: In reply to the remarks made by the representative of Oman, if I remember correctly after we had taken the first vote this morning I announced that because of technical difficulties the photocopied results of the votes would not be available immediately, but later.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Mr. IMAM (Kuwait): Mr. Chairman, would you be so kind as to give us some indication of the draft resolutions to be voted upon tomorrow, both at the morning and afternoon meetings.

The CHAIRMAN: I was about to do so. I should like to take up tomorrow, in numerical order, the following draft resolutions under agenda item 47, "General and complete disarmament": draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32, concerning a study on nuclear weapons"; since draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.35, because of its financial implications, cannot be voted upon, tomorrow morning at least, we shall therefore next take up draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38, concerning the Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territory of States where there are no such weapons at present; draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42, concerning the Committee on Disarmament; draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.43, concerning the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes", which is the last draft resolution under agenda item 47 upon which we shall be able to vote tomorrow.

We shall then take up, under agenda item 48, "World Disarmament Conference", and the draft resolution submitted under that item in document A/C.1/33/L.34. Next, under agenda item 49, "United Nations Conference on Prohibition or Restriction of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be Deemed to be Excessively injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects", we shall take up draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.26.

I propose to take up the question of the production of a United Nations film on wars and their consequences at the beginning of tomorrow afternoon's meeting, provided, of course, that the advice requested by the Committee on the proposal of the representative of Mexico is ready at that time. It is perhaps well for me to express the urgent wish that we do not tomorrow afternoon have a repetition of the debate held this afternoon on the matter. As I had occasion to remark earlier, it is at least my impression that all aspects of the matter have now been thoroughly debated and that the only thing left for the Committee to do is to take a decision, after we have first decided how to take that decision.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.