



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 58TH 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 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)

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.

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

AGENDA ITEMS 35, 37 46, 47 AND 48

The CHAIRMAN: As agreed at this morning's meeting, the Committee will start this afternoon by hearing the remaining explanations of vote after the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1, in spite of its misgivings about some of its parts. In particular, we have doubts about operative paragraph 6 and had that paragraph been put to a separate vote we would have abstained. Our doubts about paragraph 6 stem from two things.

The first is the fact that it ties the concrete negotiations on a comprehensive test ban by the Committee on Disarmament to the submission of a trilateral draft. We note, of course, that by an oral revision the sponsors have now indicated that that trilateral draft should be submitted at the beginning of the 1979 session of the Committee on Disarmament. In spite of that, we have always felt - and we told the sponsors of the draft resolution - that in the light of what happened last year the commencement of negotiations by the Committee on Disarmament should not be made conditional on the submission of the trilateral draft, because we were almost certain that that draft would not be submitted at the time the sponsors of the draft resolution had in mind, that is, before the beginning of the 1979 session of the Committee on Disarmament. The statement made by the representative of the United States in explanation of vote has certainly confirmed that view, and we believe that the sponsors have now seen that such a link is not likely to accomplish what they had in mind.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Our second reason for having reservations on this paragraph is based in part on the point made by the representative of Argentina earlier in the day. He said, and my delegation agrees with him, that to expect the draft treaty to be submitted by the Committee on Disarmament to a resumed thirty-third session of the General Assembly might not give the Committee on Disarmament enough time to work fully on a comprehensive test ban treaty.

We think that the role of the Committee on Disarmament should not be seen as that of rubber-stamping whatever draft treaty is worked upon outside the context of that body: that Committee should be seen as the multilateral negotiating body which ought to be responsible for proposing a draft treaty which will attract the widest possible adherence, as is the intention also of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

Mr. MORENO (Italy) (interpretation from French): My delegation had asked to speak this morning to indicate, not being able to see clearly the indications on the board which in view of the distance are not very clear, that the vote of Italy had not been recorded. Now it has been confirmed to us by the documentx containing the results of that vote which was distributed by the Secretariat that the vote of Italy has not been recorded, and yet I did indeed press the "yes" button in order to vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1. I think that this is a technical failure similar to what happened yesterday, and I would request the Secretariat to be good enough to rectify the results of the voting accordingly and to take note of the fact that Italy voted in favour of the draft resolution on the comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Mr. VUKOVIC (Yugoslavia) My delegation has the same or very similar reservations to those expressed by the representative of Nigeria. However, we voted for this draft resolution because we support its basic thrust urging the nuclear weapon Powers which are engaged in these negotiations to submit their draft treaty to the Committee on Disarmament as early as possible.

Mrs. GORDAH (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): A material error has crept into the vote of my delegation during the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.43. We would wish that vote to be entered in the record. We voted in favour of the draft resolution. I was not able to point this out this morning, Sir, because you did not call on me to speak at that time.

The CHAIRMAN: There are no other delegations wishing to explain their votes. Thus, the consideration of the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2 concerning the implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/78 is concluded, and with it the consideration of agenda item 38.

As agreed yesterday, we shall now take up for the third time the question of the production of a United Nations film on wars and their consequences. I would remind representatives that there is a report of the Secretary-General on this matter contained in document A/33/389 and presented under agenda item 47, "General and complete disarmament".

Yesterday afternoon the Committee had a very thorough exchange of views both on the substance of the film and on the desirability of producing such a film, and also on the formal proposal by the representative of the United States that the First Committee should not at this time take a substantive decision on whether or not to produce it. Instead, in a procedural motion, the representative of the United States, supported by a number of other delegations, proposed that the question of the desirability and feasibility - if I may put it that way - of producing such a film first be submitted to the Secretary-General's advisory board of eminent persons for an advisory opinion.

(The Chairman)

In the subsequent debate on that particular proposal, the representatives of Mexico and Argentina, both members of the Advisory Board, took the firm view that the task proposed by the representative of the United States in his procedural motion would not be within the Board's competence inasmuch as that competence had been defined in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

As members will also recall, that particular legal view was not accepted by the representative of the United States, who considered that the General Assembly could give new tasks to the Advisory Board if it so wished.

The debate ended, subsequent to a procedural alternative which I had proposed, with the formal proposal by the representative of Mexico to the effect that, before proceeding any further on this legal question, we should obtain the advice of the Legal Counsel to the Secretary-General. To refresh the memories of the members of the Committee, I shall repeat the formulation of that question, which, as the representative of Mexico said, should be very carefully and very precisely formulated. He did so and was good enough to submit it in writing to the secretariat and it has been forwarded to the Legal Counsel in that form. I have the text only in Spanish, and I shall read out the formulation of the question in Spanish.

(interpretation from Spanish)

Is it within the competence of the Advisory Board as defined in paragraph 124 of the Final Document to decide on the production of films?

(continued in English)

I understand that the Legal Counsel has had sufficient time to study this question and that he is now prepared to give his reply. I therefore call on the Legal Counsel to the Secretary-General for that purpose.

Mr. SUY (Under-Secretary-General, the Legal Counsel): It has been proposed in this Committee that the Secretary-General, acting through the Office of Public Information, should be entrusted with the task of preparing a film on the horrors of war. In this connexion, the question has been raised whether it would come within the terms of reference of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, established pursuant to paragraph 124 of the Final Document of the tenth special

(Mr. Suy, Legal Counsel)

session of the General Assembly, to advise the Secretary-General on the preparation of such a film. I understand that if this question is not answered in the affirmative it has been asked whether the General Assembly could, for the purpose of the preparation of this film, expand the mandate of the Advisory Board to cover advice to the Secretary-General on this subject.

The Final Document of the tenth special session forms part of General Assembly resolution S-10/2 of 30 June 1978. Paragraph 124 thereof reads as follows:

"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."

The question that arises is whether preparation of a film on the horrors of war could be considered as coming within the ambit of "various aspects of studies ... in the field of disarmament and arms limitation".

It would seem axiomatic that a film highlighting the disastrous consequences of war is pertinent to the issue of disarmament, and this is recognized in the Final Document of the tenth special session where, for example, in paragraph 100 it is stated that:

"Governmental and non-governmental information organs and those of the United Nations and its specialized agencies should give priority to the preparation and distribution of printed and audio-visual material relating to the danger represented by the armaments race ...".

Audio-visual materials include, of course, films. The subject matter of the film here under consideration would thus appear to come within the scope of the terms of reference of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies.

(Mr. Suy, Legal Counsel)

It remains to be considered whether a film, in other words an audio-visual presentation, can be considered to be a "study" within the terms of the Advisory Board's competence to advise on "various aspects of studies", or whether the term "study" should be confined solely to written material. In this connexion, it is to be noted that the General Assembly has full competence to interpret its own resolutions, and to determine whether the "studies" or "aspects of studies" referred to in paragraph 124 of the Final Document encompass films.

In its narrowest meaning, a study can be construed to relate to the written word and to publications in printed form only, but such a narrow interpretation is not necessarily required by the term itself. The Concise Oxford Dictionary, inter alia, defines the word as referring to the "devotion of time and thought to acquiring information especially from books, pursuit of some branch of knowledge". The pursuit of some branch of knowledge is no longer necessarily confined to the written word, and its results can be conveyed not only in print but on film. Within the United Nations increasing importance has been attached to audio-visual techniques as a means of conveying information or messages - the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements being a prime example of this - and the Organization has considered films as coming within the ambit of the term "publication" for purposes of copyright, for example. It would appear perfectly legitimate, it seems to me, within the terms of the Final Document, which contemplates comprehensive programmes of studies, to interpret the words "studies" and "aspects of studies" to encompass films on relevant topics. In this respect, paragraph 98 of the Final Document should be recalled, in which it is stated inter alia that:

"At its thirty-third and subsequent sessions the General Assembly should determine the specific guidelines for carrying out studies, taking into account the proposals already submitted including those made by individual countries at the special session, as well as other proposals which can be introduced later in this field." (S-10/2, para. 98)

As it is concluded that the General Assembly can interpret the existing terms of reference of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies to cover the

(Mr. Suy, Legal Counsel)

film here concerned, it is not necessary to answer in any detail the question whether the Assembly can amend the terms of reference of the Board to cover films. Should, however, the General Assembly prefer to give the narrow definition of "studies" and "various aspects of studies" to confine those terms to written materials, it is nevertheless clear from General Assembly practice that subsequent sessions of the Assembly may, without involving reconsideration, amend the terms of reference of any bodies established by or on the instructions of the Assembly. However, the extent to which the Assembly might wish to do so, particularly if a vote were involved in relation to a paragraph forming part of what had been a long and carefully balanced consensus, is a matter of policy which lies beyond the scope of this legal opinion.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on representatives who have asked to speak, I wish to thank the Legal Counsel to the Secretary-General for what appears, at least to the Chair, to have been an extremely balanced, exhaustive and profound elucidation of all the pertinent arguments and considerations which can affect the question which, by decision of this Committee, was put to the Legal Counsel. I am sure the whole Committee joins the Chair in extending thanks for this help and advice on a matter which has exercised this Committee for a considerable time during the last two days. The Chair expresses the wish that this will expedite our proceedings to a proper conclusion.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I very much regret that what I have to say will not be the profundity so admired by the Chairman in the statement just made by the Legal Counsel. I shall merely make an improvised statement on what I have just heard. I shall not be speaking to the very clear, precise and unequivocal question which I put yesterday, and which the Chairman repeated today. At times one is not at all sure whether a verb is in the affirmative or in the interrogative, and at times a fact cannot be rendered properly in English. This is not placing any blame on the interpreters. So let me put it in English:  
(spoke in English)



(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

does it fall within the competence of the Advisory Board to make a pronouncement on the production of films, it being understood that the competence would be that defined in paragraph 124 of the Final Document? That was the question.  
(continued in Spanish)

The Legal Counsel has stressed, not once but several times, the fact that within the narrow sense of the word "studies" - I do not think "narrow" is the right word; I think we should say within the normal, customary, generally accepted meaning of the word "studies". That is the area within which we should try to seek an answer.

The International Court of Justice, whose advisory opinions, it must be said, are not always models of precision, has on more than one occasion said, in referring to a treaty or a convention - and the same applies to a question - that when the terms of a treaty or a convention are used in their normal sense, in their normal meaning, there is no need to go further to consult dictionaries or speculate on possible meanings. One need take only the normal meaning of the word, and I think we all have a fairly good idea of what the word "studies" means.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

It is my honour to be a member of the advisory board. Here at United Nations Headquarters from 14 to 22 November that advisory board held its first session, and not a single member of the board once thought that the preparation of films could be construed as a study.

Members may be familiar with Conference Room Paper No. 3. If they are not, they can ask the Secretariat about it. It is the draft report of the Secretary-General, which was adopted. I think eventually it will become "Rev.3", although it will not say that but "Report of the Secretary-General on the first session".

Now, Sir, you could ask for that report, and the Legal Counsel could ask for it, and read it very carefully. I think that in its five pages you will not find a word that suggests that the meaning of "studies" is anything but what I have suggested.

It was our privilege -- we all had the opportunity -- to attend the tenth special session of the General Assembly. We have come to call it the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament. I do not think anyone who attended that session could have any doubt about the meaning of the word "studies", in paragraph 98 or any other paragraph of the Final Document in which the term may be used. So, as the International Court of Justice recommends for treaties and conventions -- and I am quite sure the Legal Counsel is very familiar with all this -- in applying that principle to the use of this word we should not think in terms of narrow meanings or broad meanings: we should think in terms of the normal meaning. We should give the word "studies" the meaning everyone normally attaches to it.

May I now turn to another question. Here I completely agree with the Legal Counsel, just as I completely disagree with him on the other matter. Obviously the General Assembly is a sovereign body and it is perfectly within its rights when it comes to amending decisions it adopted at earlier sessions. The rules of procedure say that when it is a question of changing a decision at the same session a two-thirds majority is necessary. But when it is a question of changing a decision adopted at an earlier session there is no special majority laid down.

Here, then, I completely agree with him. But I would venture to ask this question. We have had a Preparatory Committee. It held five sessions.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Later we had a special session, which based its work on that of the Preparatory Committee. It lasted for five weeks. During that entire period - during the special session and in the work of the Preparatory Committee - major efforts were made and success was achieved. There was a consensus on a Final Document. That Final Document should be viewed as a whole. Everything is related to everything else. Now, may I ask, are we going to start trying to put forward amendments, to bring about changes in the substance of that Final Document? Are we going to start trying to do that with majority votes? I would say that that would be a course of action fraught with great dangers for our work and the work of the special session of the General Assembly, which we have praised so often.

If we change the meaning or the scope of one paragraph now, then today or tomorrow, using the same procedure, we might wish to change the meaning or the scope of other paragraphs, which might be of much greater import than this paragraph.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I should like very briefly to seek some information before a vote is taken on the question of the production of the film requested by Ambassador Baroody, not to continue or to reopen the debate on the item under consideration.

I listened with great attention to the statement of Mr. Akatani, Under-Secretary-General for the Office of Public Information, and several statements of my distinguished colleague and mentor Ambassador Baroody and other colleagues concerning document A/C.1/33/389 regarding the production of a United Nations film on wars and their consequences.

I hasten to add that I fully support the compilation of a film on the horrors of wars. However, I am wondering whether the Secretariat is in a position to inform the Committee whether the United Nations has in the past produced such a film on related subjects and, if so, how many Member States have asked for the film to be shown in their respective countries. I assure the Committee that my only motive in asking this question is to receive a favourable reply so that I may convince my own Government to have such a film projected in Mauritius in the event that it has not yet done so.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

Finally, as a member of the Advisory Board, I thank my colleague and friend Mr. Erik Suy, Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs, for his learned opinion and guidance. I have noted with great interest the comments thereon of my colleague on the advisory board, Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I shall be quite brief. Having said that, I shall make the necessary absolutely essential and psychologically necessary explanation that I am always frightened when I disagree with Ambassador Garcia Robles, my friend, colleague and mentor, on a legal problem. But I am afraid I have to.

The representative of Mexico referred to the International Court of Justice. I would refer to the Permanent Court of Arbitration and that great jurist Max Huber, who, when he decided the Isle de Palmas case, developed the concept of inter temporal law. In other words, the world changes.

Now, it is true that in older dictionaries "studies" may have been defined as something that was written. It did not mean a movie in some of the old dictionaries, because there were no movies then. It did not mean a television show, because there was no television.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

Right now, I personally conceive that "study" is not for the purpose of someone reading by the lamp and putting something down in a delicate manuscript, where only a few dedicated scholars could read it. The purpose of a study is to get information which is to be disseminated, and I can think of no reason why in the year 1978 we should say that a sound film to be shown in movie theatres and also on television does not play the role of a study as much as any learned tome which goes into a library and either gathers dust or is read only by a select few.

Now, as I listened to the opinion of the Legal Counsel, I heard nothing in his statement that would make it possible to rule out of order the amendment which I suggested. I am not suggesting that he made any recommendations as to how we should vote on this amendment. He clearly did not; indeed, it would have been improper for him to do so, and he was quite proper. But I think that his statement made it possible for us to vote on my amendment, and, without saying more, I hope that we do it and get this matter behind us.

The CHAIRMAN: I must say that future historians will have great difficulty in ascertaining whether at this point this is the First Committee or the Sixth Committee.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): Like the representative of Mexico, I would have preferred to have the statement of the Legal Counsel in writing before stating my opinion. Nevertheless, I believe that there are certain aspects which can be commented upon.

The first concerns the mandate of the Advisory Board and is part of the opinion requested of the Legal Counsel. I shall not repeat the arguments of the representative of Mexico, to which I fully subscribe, because for my part I do not have the slightest doubt that the mandate conferred upon the Advisory Board - whether it is given a wide or narrow interpretation - has nothing to do with its having to pronounce itself on the feasibility of producing a film.

To be frank, I deplore the fact that the Legal Counsel should have been consulted on a second aspect, because, as the Chairman just remarked, future historians looking at our records might get the impression that the representatives of this

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

Committee were suffering from mental deficiency. Indeed, one need not show undue imagination to consult the Legal Counsel as to whether or not the General Assembly is empowered to amend the mandate conferred upon a body which it has established. One need not have gone to law school to know that it does have such powers. In my statement yesterday, I began by saying that the Assembly was in fact sovereign and could change the mandate conferred upon a body. But, for that body to undertake the study, the mandate would first have to be changed.

Now the question is to try to establish, by a process of interpretation, whether or not to produce a film. We must leave aside, for a moment, the question of the mandate and concentrate on other important aspects.

What would the Advisory Board be asked? When I spoke yesterday, I sought clarification as to what was to be asked of the Advisory Board. I did not get an answer and I still do not know what the Advisory Board may be asked to do. If it is to be requested to pronounce itself or make a study on the feasibility of the film, I should like to bring to the attention of the Chairman and of the representatives that that study has already been carried out at the request of the Secretary-General and is contained in document A/33/389, paragraph 2 of which states:

"In pursuance of that understanding the Secretary-General instructed the Office of Public Information to survey the possibilities of producing a film ..."

and in paragraph 3 it is stated that:

"The Office of Public Information conducted a survey ...".

So the study has been made, and the opinion of the Office of Public Information is that this study is feasible.

Therefore, what is the Advisory Board going to be asked to do?

I wish, in all seriousness, to raise this problem, because no less than half of the meetings of the Advisory Board have been devoted to the examination of its mandate and attributes. An aspect which was stressed above all was that the Advisory Board could in no way - I repeat, in no way - eventually convert itself into a kind of censoring, supervisory body or clearing-house with respect to requests made by sovereign States in the General Assembly. In other words, a State Member of the United Nations can call

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

for a study on any subject and if the General Assembly considers that it should be carried out, then it must be carried out. What the Advisory Board cannot do is to say no, that the study is not suitable, because the Advisory Board would then be setting itself up as a censor of the will of sovereign States of the General Assembly. That is very important.

If the study has already been carried out by the Office of Public Information, what is to be requested of the Advisory Board? The members of the Advisory Board are eminent persons - at least, in principle, one supposes that they are - but what can they say? That the film should be in black and white or in colour, that it should last 20, 30 or 60 minutes, as it is suggested, that it include certain aspects of this or that war? What is to be requested of the Advisory Board? None of its members know anything about producing a film; but it is presumed that they are knowledgeable in matters of disarmament.

Yesterday I asked what was to be requested of the Board - and until now I do not know the answer - and I did so, furthermore, because the Assembly cannot issue instructions to the Advisory Board. The most that the Assembly can do is to request the Secretary-General - because the Advisory Board advises the Secretary-General and not the Assembly - to transmit a request to the Board with very specific guidelines on what it will have to decide with respect to this film.

There is a third point which I should like to raise. The Advisory Board is perfectly aware that at this thirty-third session there have been a series of requests for studies, and the Board unanimously decided that it was not going to consider any request for a study from the thirty-third session, primarily for lack of time.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

Finally - and I think this is of major importance - we all know that in a parliamentary body one of the most customary procedures followed, when one does not wish to deal directly with a request on the part of one of the members is to seek out dilatory procedures. I would suggest that this is such a form of procrastination. I would even go further than that. I would say that the advisory board began its studies in a most business-like fashion, and if we now today seek the easy way out and ask it to pronounce on the film, then I would respectfully submit that in the future, whenever there is a draft resolution which is not to the liking of one or more delegations, it will use the same technique; it will say that the advisory board has taken the matter under advisement; that would only obstruct its work further. That would mean that it might very well become a censorship body or sorting house or supervisory board, which is something that has already been rejected.

I think then that the proper course of action in this case is to vote in favour or against the proposal put forward by the representative of Saudi Arabia. Those who have any doubts about the appropriateness of the film or its consequences, or perhaps even about the cost of the film, let them vote against the proposal. Those who believe, as I do, that television is crammed with violence, that it incites violence for all practical purposes, could feel that it would not do any harm at all to bring to the attention of the new generations what the horrors of war really mean for the future generations will have to take this matter seriously and carry out the process of disarmament themselves.



Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I must hasten to thank my good friend the Legal Counsel of the United Nations for trying to enlighten us with regard to legal implications, since they were requested by none other than our friend from the United States. I gather that the Legal Counsel was not conclusive, and I endorse word for word what both my colleagues from Mexico and Argentina have said, so I need not recapitulate.

But since you mentioned, Sir, that probably some of us at least might think this is the Sixth Committee, I have no better way of telling you that such arguments may lead to expect by quoting a quatrain of Omar Khayyam, who incidentally was not only a poet and an astronomer; he was also a tent maker - Khayam - in Arabic, is the maker of tents - and was a practical man. My good colleague from the United States figures in this quatrain himself, as also does my good friend, Mr. Suy - not by name but by implication. It runs:

"Myself when young did eagerly frequent  
Doctor and Saint, and heard great argument  
About it and about: but evermore  
Came out by the same Door as in I went."

Here the doctor is the Legal Counsel, and the saint is our colleague from the United States. He is horrified by war and he should know how it should be presented. And the doctor has to treat us all to see what dose of medicine he should give to the United States and to the others who are in this difficulty.

Suffice it to say that two of the pillars of the Advisory Board none other than Ambassador Garcia Robles and Ambassador de Rozas, have made it clear time and again - and I shall not go into their argument, it was very clear to us all - that they do not feel that they should deal with this question.

Assuming that we were to refer this question to them and they feel that it is not within the scope of their studies - it is not a question of competence - it means that the saint, my colleague from the United States, would sleep in peace. For then the thing would be sent back to the United Nations and in the meantime they can perhaps, since the United States is a major Power, be persuaded by the opinion of the representative of the United States Government. That is if his Government has not already given him instructions. And if it has given him instructions, then it is a matter of policy. But we also, the small States and the medium-sized States, have our own policy as to what may be feasible and what may be good in the service of peace.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

There is doubt as to the interpretation of what is narrow and what is normal, but we must take into account that words are symbols of thought and not mathematical formulas, so that many of them become subjective when it suits our purpose. We must note also that at least two members of the advisory board of eminent persons, or whatever you want to call it, two of its pillars, have, as I mentioned, said that they do not feel that they should be seized of this problem because they have already other things on their hands.

And I must answer my very good friend Ambassador Ramphul, who was at one time my opponent eight years ago on the stamp issue in which he lost. We became great friends after that. That was his first year: he learnt the game. I said that the United Nations would not impose the film on anyone, but that it would be accessible to any country that thought it might contribute to peace by showing the young and the old what past wars had done in terms of tragedy, devastation, killing, maiming - I will not catalogue all that wars do.

And, as I think my colleague Ambassador de Rozas also asked, why is our colleague from the United States so nervous about it? By implication he says "we have enough violence". Violence is that every day - violence and pornography on your television, and we are learning from you because we think you are a great country. The mass media of information ape you - ape the strong, unfortunately, and which is revealing, without any motivation.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

To sum up, who created the Advisory Board? The General Assembly. Do I have to remind the Committee that when there is such a controversial matter - and this is controversial only because the representative of the United States made an issue of it - we transcend that body which we formed; we transcend it as a committee of the whole here. Furthermore, the Board is not sure, as we have heard from two of its pillars that it is competent to deal with this question or that it will have the time; and it does not have any terms of reference as to how to go about it. When you want to refer something to a committee, whether it is an advisory body of eminent persons or any committee, you give it terms of reference. You tell it to study something. Study what? Without terms of reference, what is it? A book? Somebody mentioned the dictionary. Webster's Dictionary has been issued every two years, in many editions. It does not have the interpretation that some would think that it encompasses everything that it encompasses information.

There are studies and studies. They may include audio visual material because, after all sound and sight are media of information.

I may tell the representative of the United States that we have been through this, starting at Lake Success, in the matter of freedom of information. We are not here dealing with the substance of the matter, because the Board is not competent; and even if it were competent it has no terms of reference. The eminent persons on the Board do not know what to study or how to begin to study it. They are loaded with work.

The whole thing resolves itself into a simple matter. There are those who think such a film should be made, a film which calls for the paltry sum of \$200,000. With all due respect to the generosity of the United States. if I were to ask my Government to finance it, I would be laughed at. My Government would say, "We gave \$150 million in six years to the World Food Programme. The other day we gave \$5 million extra to such-and-such an agency. Baroody, what are you asking us? Have you lost your mind?" I say nothing, because if I tell them it is because the representative of the United States has brought up the question of funds they will laugh at me.

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

I know it is not the financial implications that worry the representative of the United States. The United States wants to have things its own way because it is a strong Power. There is nothing wrong in that. If I belonged to a strong Power I would perhaps develop the same psychology. It is the psychology of the strong.

May I humbly suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you do what has been suggested by others. Do not refer this matter to the Advisory Board of eminent persons, two at least of whom - and they are very important members of that board - have told us they are not willing to undertake this study. If the United States representative wants this matter referred to the Advisory Board, he wants to bury it or shelve it; that is obvious. Let us come out with the truth. Why wear kid gloves? The other members of the Committee can make up their minds as to whether or not they want to vote with the United States to shelve the film or bury it.

Of course, we come back to the dictum that the General Assembly and every body constituted by it is the master of its own procedure. So may I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if nobody objects - and I hope the representative of the United States will not have any objection - to put to the vote the report of the Secretary-General and my request as to whether or not we should have the film. It is as simple as that. Otherwise, I shall have to repeat Omar Khayyam once again, in another quatrain.

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon we have discussed this matter for almost two hours, the third consecutive day that we have done so. It is therefore my intention not to prolong the debate or to postpone the decision any longer. There are three more speakers on my list the representatives of the United States, Mauritius and Mexico. After they have spoken it is my intention to proceed to the decision-making phase which I shall outline when the time comes.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I was very touched to be described as both a saint and a lawyer, because in my country those two terms are not

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

necessarily synonymous. On the other hand, I really wish to point out that we have discussed this matter for five hours, of which I believe I took up less than 15 minutes.

I did not agree to a consensus, because I was not prepared for it, and I made a procedural motion. We have discussed for over three and a half hours whether or not that motion should be put to the vote, and we requested a legal opinion, which did not see any objection to its being put to the vote. If this is a democratic organization, why can we not vote on my motion? What is the objection to it? Those who do not like it, and there are obviously those who do not, will vote "no"; those who do will vote "yes". This is a democratic Organization, so what is the objection to voting on this motion? I cannot understand it - unless it really reflects a fundamental distrust of this Organization's ability to decide how it wants to operate.

I would urge, Mr. Chairman that we vote on the procedural motion that I have made and then, depending on that vote, see where we go from there. I am perfectly prepared to participate in that vote, and my vote on the first motion will be no surprise. I think we ought to go ahead and vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot resist making two comments on the statement of the United States representative. First, I am not quite sure about the 15 minutes. Secondly, it is now too late in the proceedings to rule him out of order because he explained his vote in advance on his own motion.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I did ask a question of the Secretariat and I wonder whether it is in a position to reply? If not, I am quite willing to receive the information later.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): As I am one of those who is responsible for the many hours and minutes spent on the subject, as pointed out by my friend Mr. Fisher, let me say that all that happened against my will.

As I said yesterday, and as the representative of Saudi Arabia has said once again today, for me the question has been very simple right from the beginning. The page and a half of the Secretary-General's report (A/33/389) is self-explanatory. I think that a vote could have been taken right away, and now, at this stage, we would already know that the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly is in favour of that film. But that did not happen. I have nothing against a vote being taken now on the proposal of the representative of the United States.

I do not wish to explain my vote in advance, but I would like to explain what the purpose of the vote will be. To vote in favour of sending this matter to the Advisory Board will mean "a first-class burial" for the proposal of Saudi Arabia. If we decide not to send the matter to the Advisory Board, that will mean voting in favour of the proposal of Saudi Arabia.

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

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): Not having contributed to the five-hour debate, I would like to facilitate the disposition of this particular matter. However, since the motion made by the representative of the United States is being referred to as a procedural motion, I believe that if we examine the rules of procedure very carefully, we will see that

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

the proposal made by the representative of the United States is not a procedural motion but a substantive one. Rule 119 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly defines procedural motions - and there are only four - as follows: suspension of the meeting; adjournment of the meeting; adjournment of the debate, and closure of debate. All other motions are substantive motions and those fall under rule 131 of the rules of procedure, which states:

"If two or more proposals relate to the same question, the Committee shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted. The committee may, after each vote on a proposal, decide whether to vote on the next proposal."

I would therefore submit that we first take a vote on the proposal made by the representative of Saudi Arabia to have a film on this subject. If that proposal is adopted, we shall then decide whether to vote on the proposal made by the United States.

The CHAIRMAN: I must say that I regret having given the floor to the representative of Pakistan, but whether right or wrong - and I suppose that the Chairman can be impeached if necessary - it has been the ruling of this Chairman that this is a procedural motion. There was no objection to that ruling of the Chairman at that time. So I take it that if the representative of Pakistan wishes to pursue the matter, he will propose, first of all, a challenge to the ruling of the Chairman, and, secondly, also ask the Committee to reconsider its decision of yesterday, that will require a two-thirds vote. I do not know when we will come out from here if we embark on that.

While I see the point of view of the representative of Pakistan I hope he sees mine.

Mr. IMAM (Kuwait): I have three points to make and I shall be very brief. First, Mr. Chairman, with regard to your ruling that it is a procedural motion, I remember that yesterday the representative of Argentina challenged your ruling and said that it was not procedural, that it was substantive. And he explained his point.

That is my first point. The second point is that the representative of Argentina asked a pertinent question: what is the Advisory Board asked to do? Until now I have not heard any answer to that question.

I still have a further question, no matter what we vote upon, and it is this.

(Mr. Imam, Kuwait)

My third question relates to the manner in which the Board reaches its conclusions and how it would give an advisory opinion. The question is simply this: is there a consensus rule in the Advisory Board? If there is not, do the members of the Board vote? If there is disagreement among the members of the Board, do they give separate opinions, and if so, of what value would such separate opinions have and to what extent could they help us in our work?

These are the points on which I should like clarification.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall be delighted to give the clarification requested by the representative of Kuwait. I shall give no reply to his first question. I shall reply to his second question, namely, what is the Advisory Board asked to do, in a moment when I shall read out the procedural proposal of the representative of the United States. I would suggest that the third question is premature at this time. It would be relevant if the Committee were to give this task to the Advisory Board. In that event we could revert to that question, if necessary.

The Committee will vote first on the procedural proposal of the representative representative of the United States, which reads:

"The General Assembly requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to invite the Advisory Board of eminent persons, established under paragraph 124 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to express its opinion on the advisability of the making of a film on wars and their consequences (A/33/389) and requests the Advisory Board to give its advice on this question promptly."

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Before we actually proceed to the vote I wish to make the following statement, which is quite pertinent in the circumstances. The Chairman has read out the proposal on which we are about to vote, which includes the phrase, "and requests the Advisory Board to give its advice on this question promptly". I think it is important for the Committee to know that the Advisory Board at its meeting which has just been concluded, decided that its next session would not take place immediately but would take place from 30 April to 9 May next



(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

year. It also decided to give priority at that second session to the question to which the Secretary-General himself gave priority, namely, a comprehensive programme of studies on disarmament. In this connexion, the United Nations Secretariat has been asked to prepare a comprehensive document on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on the procedural proposal of the representative of the United States, which I previously read out.

The proposal was rejected by 62 votes to 33, with 22 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The next decision to be taken by the Committee is on the substantive matter. That matter has a very simple content. As the members of the Committee will appreciate, this is one of the few - but by no means unprecedented - decisions to be taken without a formal draft resolution. In a way, the role of a draft resolution in this instance is filled by the report of the Secretary-General (A/33/389), which was referred to many times during the debate on the subject.

Therefore, with the approval of the original proponent of the idea, the representative of Saudi Arabia, I shall next put to the vote the proposal to recommend to the General Assembly that it proceed with the production of a United Nations film on wars and their consequences.

As we know, in decisions involving financial implications, these are normally requested. However, in this instance the members of the Committee have been aware for three days that the production of the film as described in the Secretary-General's report is estimated to cost approximately \$200,000.

The Committee will now proceed to the vote on the proposal.

The proposal was adopted by 96 votes to none, with 26 abstentions.

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

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): The Swedish delegation fully agrees with the objectives of this proposal, which have been so well explained to us by the representative of Saudi Arabia. We also agree with him that a film can be a very important medium to achieve those objectives.

However, we abstained in the vote because we considered that the question had not been prepared in an appropriate and sufficient way. Now that the decision has been taken, the Swedish delegation wishes to give the assurance of its wholehearted support, particularly by seeing to it that that film will be widely distributed in our own country - and we are convinced that all other delegations will do likewise.

In order to add to our knowledge and experience, I should like to request that the Secretary-General keep the Members of the Organization informed not only on progress with regard to the production of the film but also, after it has been produced, with regard to its distribution among Member States and how it is received. For our guidance in matters of this kind in future, I am convinced that we all agree that such information would be of great value.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): My delegation voted in favour of the substantive question and against the procedural question. I have represented Mauritius in the United Nations for the past decade, and I have never before seen so much red on the voting board. That is should have looked so red as to match the colour of my tie on a motion of the United States made me blush.

Earlier I asked a question of the Secretariat, and I have now received a written reply. I believe that it would serve some purpose if I were to read it out at this stage. It is brief, and, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall now do so.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

"Nuclear Countdown exists in English, French, Spanish, Arabic and Japanese. Distribution has been made to all United Nations Centres and UNDP offices where film libraries are in operation. Nuclear Countdown has received very good TV exposure world-wide in developed countries, as well as developing countries. These countries are: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Finland, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Jamaica, Madagascar, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United States (six major educational stations, including WETA TV, Washington DC), Yugoslavia, Zaire." It will be noted that Mauritius is not on this list, and that is precisely why I asked the question.

"Telecasts in languages in addition to the ones listed above include: Bulgarian, Finnish, German, Polish, Romanian, Serbo-Croat, Portuguese.

"Repeat telecasts of the film were suggested for Disarmament Week. Most of the television organizations responded to this suggestion."

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes consideration of the question of the production of a United Nations film on wars and their consequences, which, I would observe, has been studied in depth.

The Committee will now continue its consideration of the draft resolutions on disarmament.

As announced this morning, it is my intention to take up first for consideration draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.39, presented under agenda item 37, "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons", which has the record number of 44 sponsors. It was introduced to the First Committee by the representative of Poland at the 51st meeting, on 27 November 1978.

Although no request to that effect has been made by the sponsors, regardless of their great number, it is my recollection that previous similar draft resolutions on this subject have more often than not been adopted by consensus. Are there any objections to such a procedure being followed on this occasion? I declare the draft resolution adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.39 was adopted.

Mr. FAN (China) (interpretation from Chinese): With regard to the draft resolution that has just been adopted by consensus (A/C.1/33/L.39), the Chinese delegation wishes to state that it did not participate in the decision.

As for the draft resolution still to be put to the vote under the same item (A/C.1/33/L.41), the Chinese delegation will take the same position.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.39.

Members will recall that the other draft resolution under agenda item 37 (A/C.1/33/L.41), which concerns the Review Conference of the biological weapons Convention cannot be considered until tomorrow, when the statement on the financial implications is expected to be available.

I now invite the attention of the members of the Committee to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, and more particularly to the draft resolution contained in its chapter V, "Recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean". The draft resolution is entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace". As will be recalled, this draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, at the 36th meeting of the First Committee, on 13 November 1978. The financial implications of the draft resolution are detailed in document A/C.1/33/L.52.

Mr. JOSEPH (Sri Lanka): On behalf of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean the delegation of Sri Lanka wishes to refer to the Secretary-General's statement on the administrative and financial implications of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean (A/C.1/33/L.52). It will be noted that paragraph 3 (b) (i) of that statement refers to the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States and says that provision would be made for in-session documentation in Arabic, Chinese, English and French and that in the case of summary records provision would be made for Chinese, English and French.

Since quite a number of countries that would take part in the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States would be Arab countries, the delegation of Sri Lanka suggests that this Committee recommend to the General Assembly that interpretation and summary records for that conference be provided in Arabic as well. That would mean that provision would be made for Arabic, Chinese, English and French at the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States.

Mr. PASSANI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of Sri Lanka has said that Arabic should be added to the languages to be used at the Meeting of Littoral and Hinterland States. I would point out that equally important are the documents that will be issued prior to the Meeting. Paragraph 3 (a) (iii) of the statement submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.1/33/L.52) indicates that pre-session documentation will be issued in Chinese, English and French.

The States Members of the United Nations and those that will participate in the Meeting of Littoral and Hinterland States attach particular importance to pre-session documentation. We hope that that documentation will be issued in Arabic also. We therefore propose that pre-session documents be issued in Arabic as well as Chinese, English and French the languages given in paragraph 3 (a) (iii) of document A/C.1/33/L.52.

The CHAIRMAN: The proposals of the representatives of Sri Lanka and Democratic Yemen will be taken into account and decided upon by the General Assembly.

I believe the Committee is now ready to pronounce itself on the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean (A/33/29).

Are there any objections to this draft resolution?

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I think it might be advisable for a recorded vote to be taken.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in paragraph 28 of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean (A/33/29). A recorded vote has been requested.

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, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahariya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution in paragraph 28 of document A/33/29 was adopted by 112 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.



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

Mr. EILAN (Israel): Israel supports all efforts to promote peace and stability in the region of the Indian Ocean. This attitude stems not only from our general policy but in particular from our close proximity to that region and our concern for the safety of the maritime routes there, which are vital to the security and economy of Israel.

Therefore my Government has followed with considerable interest the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and the Group of Littoral and Hinterland States, with which it wishes to be associated.

However, the draft resolution just voted upon includes certain provisions the language of which we cannot support. In addition we object to the wording of operative paragraph 4 relating to the category of countries to be invited to the Meeting of Littoral and Hinterland States.

Israel therefore had no option but to abstain.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation voted for the draft resolution submitted by the Committee on the Indian Ocean. However, the preambular paragraphs of the draft contain certain provisions concerning which the Soviet delegation wishes to provide some clarification.

I am referring to the formulation regarding the military presence and military rivalry of the great Powers in the region of the Indian Ocean. The Soviet delegation states that the Soviet Union bears no responsibility whatsoever for military tension and the activation of the military presence in that region. The Soviet Union considers that the basic premise for the establishment of a genuine zone of peace in the Indian Ocean is the elimination from that region of foreign military bases and the prohibition of the establishment of new ones.

As for the appeal contained in the draft resolution that the talks between the USSR and the United States concerning their military presence in the Indian Ocean be resumed at an early date, we likewise wish to make it quite clear that since February 1978 the Soviet-American talks have been suspended by the American side. As has been stated on a number of occasions, the Soviet Union is ready to resume those talks.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): Speaking on behalf of the nine members of the European Community, I should like to explain why we abstained in the vote on the draft resolution contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in document A/33/29.

We share the desire of the littoral States of the Indian Ocean for peace and stability in their region and we wish to work with them towards that end. The States members of the European Community have always adopted a positive attitude towards regional arms control measures, and this year we shall be voting in favour of the Belgian draft resolution on steps for regional disarmament (A/C.1/33/L.35). However, we have been unable to respond positively to this draft resolution on the Indian Ocean peace zone for two main reasons. First, there has been no precise internationally negotiated definition either of the area or the activities to be excluded from it. Secondly, the draft resolution covers a major ocean area which is subject to international jurisdiction, and we should therefore need to be assured that the provision of international law concerning freedom of movement by sea and air for all nations would not be contravened.

We believe that decisions on these questions should precede rather than follow the declaration of any peace zone.

For those reasons, we have reluctantly abstained in the vote on that draft resolution; however, we shall keep our policy under constant review in the light of the outcome of the United States-USSR discussions and the proposals which emerge from the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean proposed in this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes consideration by the Committee of agenda item 46.

At this point, I am sure that delegations will be delighted to know that during these past four days we have taken decisions on all the draft resolutions that were ready for consideration. I now call on the representative of the USSR

(The Chairman)

to introduce, under agenda item 128, "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States", draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.1.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): On behalf of 18 sponsors, I should like to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.1, on the question of the "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States".

The Soviet delegation, taking into account the exchanges of views with other delegations, has introduced a number of changes in its initial draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.6. The revised draft resolution will be distributed by the Secretariat shortly. The basic change applies to the operative part, in which operative paragraphs 2 and 3 have been replaced by a new operative paragraph, which will become operative paragraph 2. In that new paragraph, there is a request to the Committee on Disarmament to examine, for the purpose of concluding a convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States, a draft convention of that kind as well as views and proposals concerning effective political and international legal measures aimed at ensuring that States not possessing nuclear weapons have guarantees against the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

This new formulation takes into account the course of discussion which took place in the First Committee on the questions of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States. Also, from the preamble we have deleted the paragraph referring to Security Council resolution 255 (1968), adopted in connexion with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Finally, in the text of the draft resolution the expression "non-nuclear States" has been replaced by the formulation "non-nuclear weapon States." Where possible, we have also dropped formulations relating to the strengthening of guarantees of security, replacing them with the formulation "strengthening the security".

We hope that all these changes, which take into account all the observations made by a large number of delegations, will contribute to broad support for draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.1.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

In conclusion, I should like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude and that of the Soviet delegation to the delegation of Pakistan for its co-operation in the consultations which we held over a long period.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): After having carefully listened to and studied the enlightened statement of the representative of Liberia this morning, and taking into account the introduction just made by the representative of the USSR, I wish to announce that I should like my country, Mauritius to be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.1 unless, of course, the Soviet Union and the other sponsors have any serious objection to my joining them as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution.

Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): The Committee will recall that under agenda item 128 my delegation had also submitted a draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.15. Since the initial submission of the draft resolution my delegation has been engaged in intensive consultations with several members of this Committee with a view to finding a text which we hoped could have formed a basis of a consensus.

With that aim in view, my delegation has also handed to the secretariat a few minutes ago a revised version of our draft resolution, which, perhaps, the secretariat would be in a position to circulate in all the languages, maybe later this evening or some time tomorrow morning. I hope, Mr. Chairman, we have your permission then to formally introduce our revised version of A/C.1/33/L.15 some time tomorrow morning with the earnest hope that the Committee could perhaps find it possible to adopt it by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it is in the interests of the Committee that that revised draft resolution be introduced as early as possible, and I suggest that we might begin our proceedings tomorrow by having it introduced. It is hoped that it will be possible to print and distribute the text in time for it to reach delegations tomorrow morning with the normal distribution of documents.

## ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: We have now come to the end of the official business for this afternoon, and before we adjourn I should like to inform the Committee of the order in which I intend to put the remaining draft resolutions to the vote tomorrow.

First, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.40, under agenda item 35, followed by draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.41, under agenda item 37. The statements of the financial implications of these two proposals, which we have been awaiting, should be ready tomorrow morning.

Next, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.35, under agenda item 47. "General and complete disarmament", and, on that same item, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.1, to which the proposed amendments in document A/C.1/33/L.54 have been submitted by the delegations of Argentina, Germany, Federal Republic of, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Sweden and Venezuela.

I had hoped that we should be able to deal with draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.1 today, but contacts between the sponsors of the amendments and the sponsors of the draft resolution are continuing, and therefore a delay until tomorrow has been requested.

Next, we would consider draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.34 under agenda item 48, concerning a world disarmament conference, which also has been in abeyance pending a statement on the financial implications.

Finally, as we agreed on Monday last, in order to give full latitude to any possible consultations, we shall take up -- on what is to be the last day of voting -- the draft resolutions under agenda item 128, "Conclusion of an international convention of the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States". As representatives heard a moment ago, there is to be a revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6 sponsored by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

(The Chairman)

There will also be a revised version of Pakistan's draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15 on the same item.

It would seem that only unexpected developments could prevent us from concluding this part of our work by tomorrow evening, so that we should then be able on Monday morning to begin, as envisaged in the original programme, consideration of the only remaining item, item 50, "Implementation of the Declaration of Strengthening of International Security".

Tomorrow morning, at 10 o'clock, there is to be one of the regular meetings of the restricted Bureau of the General Assembly at which the Chairmen and principal staff members of all the Main Committees are present. I would therefore suggest that we begin the meeting of the First Committee tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock instead of at the normal time.

Mr. IMAM (Kuwait): I gather from what you say, Mr. Chairman, that a meeting is to be held tomorrow which may finish at 11 o'clock. However, our experience of such meetings is that they are sometimes protracted. We have a limited number of draft resolutions before us, so would it not be more advisable for the First Committee to meet in the afternoon only which would give delegations more time to read the texts, and those holding consultations time to finish those consultations?

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid not. While it might appear on the surface that we do not have many draft resolutions left to deal with, some of them may perhaps take more time than we have bargained for. Therefore, it is my very firm conviction that we should start at 11 o'clock so that we have two full good hours of work. It being a Friday, it would be the preference of the Chairman, if we work well, to conclude our afternoon meeting a little earlier than 6 o'clock rather than risk going beyond that hour.

Chile and Uruguay have joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.1, and Venezuela has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.35.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.