

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
THIRTY-THIRD SESSION  
*Official Records\**



FIRST COMMITTEE  
59th meeting  
held on  
Friday, 1 December 1978  
at 11 a.m.  
New York

---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 59TH 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 (concluded)

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

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 (concluded)

AGENDA ITEM 128: CONCLUSION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF GUARANTEES OF THE SECURITY OF NON-NUCLEAR STATES (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.59  
4 December 1978

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 35, 37, 47, 48 AND 128

The CHAIRMAN: The First Committee will continue and conclude its decision-making process on draft resolutions presented under disarmament items and under agenda item 128, Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States. As agreed yesterday, we will take those draft resolutions which were deferred because the financial implications were lacking. The first draft resolution for consideration by the Committee is A/C.1/33/L.40 presented under item 35, on 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. This draft resolution has 32 co-sponsors and was introduced to the First Committee by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 49th meeting of the Committee on 24 November 1978.

The co-sponsors have expressed a wish that this draft resolution be adopted by consensus.

Before proceeding to that, I call on the Secretary of the Committee to speak on the question of the financial implications.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to make this statement on behalf of the Secretary-General in regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.40.

The draft resolution contained in that document notes that the majority of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons has proposed to the depository Governments that a second review conference be convened in 1980. The Secretary-General is requested to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the review conference and its preparation.

It should be noted that the review conference is a conference of States Parties to the Treaty. The first review conference included amongst its rules of procedure rule 12 in which it was stated that the costs of the review conference, including the sessions of the Preparatory Committee, will be met by the States Parties to the Treaty participating in the review conference in accordance with a detailed schedule which was attached to the rules of procedure.

The wording of operative paragraph 2 to the draft resolution is identical to the wording of resolution 3184 (XXVIII) which preceded the convening of the first review conference. Consequently, in the absence of indications to the contrary, the Secretary-General assumes that his mandate under the draft resolution is to make the necessary services available to the Conference and its preparatory period, but that the associated costs will be met by the States Parties themselves as was the case for the first review conference. Accordingly, the draft resolution contains no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations.

•

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the Committee will now be prepared to pronounce itself on this draft resolution. As indicated earlier, it is the wish of the co-sponsors that it be adopted by consensus.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): My delegation would appreciate a vote on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will accordingly proceed to a vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.40 concerning the review conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.40 was adopted by 74 votes to 1 with 12 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: This concludes the consideration by the Committee of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.40 and also the consideration of agenda item 35.

It is the proposal of the Chair that the Committee next consider a similar draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.41 submitted under agenda item 37 - Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons - being a preliminary draft resolution concerning the review conference of the Convention on Biological Weapons. This draft resolution has 24 co-sponsors. It was introduced to the First Committee by the representative of the United Kingdom at its 49th meeting on 24 November 1978.

Before proceeding any further with this draft resolution I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement about its financial implications.

---

\*Subsequently, the delegations of Liberia, Mauritius, Sierra Leone and Togo advised the Secretariat that had they been present they would have voted in favour.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee): The draft resolution contained in Document A/C.1/33/L.41 bearing in mind that the Convention on Chemical and Bacteriological Weapons will have been in force for five years on 26 March 1980 and expecting that the Review Conference called for in the Convention will take place near that time notes that a preparatory committee is to be arranged and requests the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the review conference and its preparation.

It should be noted that the review conference is a conference of States Parties to the Treaty. As such, it is similar to the review conference of the Treaty on the Non Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to which reference was just made in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.40 under agenda item 35, and in respect of which the first review conference took place in 1975.

(Mr. Banerjee, Secretary of the  
Committee)

That Review Conference included amongst its rules of procedure rule 12 in which it was stated that costs of the Review Conference, including the sessions of the Preparatory Committee, would be met by the States Parties to the Treaty participating in the Review Conference in accordance with the detailed schedule which was attached to the rules of procedure.

The wording of operative paragraph 2 of the present draft resolution is identical to the wording of resolution 3184 (XXVIII), which preceded the convening of the first Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. As a result, and in the absence of indications to the contrary, the Secretary-General assumes that his mandate under the draft resolution is to make the necessary services available to the Conference in its preparatory period, but that the associated cost will be met by the States Parties themselves, as was the case under the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Accordingly, the draft resolution contains no special financial implications at this stage for the regular budget of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN: We are now ready to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.41. Since I hear no objection, I declare the draft resolution adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.41 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.41 and also of item 37 of the agenda.

The next draft resolution to be taken up for consideration is that contained in document A/C.1/33/L.35, submitted under item 47, "General and complete disarmament", and concerning specifically a study of all the aspects of regional disarmament. It has nine sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Belgium at the 50th meeting of the Committee, on 24 November 1978. It also has financial implications, which are explained in document A/C.1/33/L.55. A recorded vote has been requested.

(The Chairman)

I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has already expressed its concern with regard to the growing number of various kinds of studies with regard to the problem of disarmament which it is proposed be carried out through the United Nations.

Now we are compelled once again to confirm our point of view that the increase, without any necessity, of the quantity of such studies can only create the illusion of efforts going on in the field of disarmament. Furthermore, we know that such studies have considerable financial implications.

For these reasons, the Soviet delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.35.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): Members may recall that my delegation has expressed its point of view specifically on the subject of regional disarmament. Therefore, we were very interested to see the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Belgium and others.

We have informally consulted with the sponsors of the draft resolution and suggested to them some ideas which would have taken into account the position of my country on this question. However, unfortunately, it has not been possible for them to reflect those ideas in the draft resolution.

Therefore, in the positive and constructive spirit which inspires my delegation, and in order to be able to vote in favour of this draft resolution, we are constrained to present here a minor amendment to the text which is, we think, the minimum that is required to enable us to vote for the draft resolution.

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

The amendment that we would like to propose would be to the last preambular paragraph of the text which reads: "Taking fully into account the decisions and recommendations of the Final Document adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly". Here we would propose the addition of the following words, "and the views expressed by Member States at its thirty-third session".

This minor and brief addition to the text would satisfy my delegation for the time being as far as concerns the reflection of our view which we have expressed in this debate. We very much hope that the sponsors will find it possible to accommodate those views and this minor amendment to their text.



The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Pakistan has submitted orally an amendment to the last paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.35. I do not know whether any of the sponsors of the draft resolution are ready to react to that suggestion at this time?

Mr. CHAMPENOIS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The Belgian delegation has noted the statement by the representative of Pakistan and would like to thank him for its constructive nature. The Belgian delegation has no objection at all to the amendment; indeed, we entirely agree with it.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): The views of my delegation on regional aspects of disarmament are well known and I shall not take the time of the Committee in explaining them this morning. We feel that this draft resolution is worded in such a way that its entire thrust is directed towards conventional disarmament. For example, in the first preambular paragraph the General Assembly is expressing its concern about the armaments race and the continued increase in expenditures on armaments. It would be consistent with the position of the General Assembly if in this paragraph it were to express its concern at the nuclear armaments race in particular, and my delegation would have preferred to have had the words "in particular the nuclear armaments race" incorporated in this paragraph.

There is now a board to advise the Secretary General which is to deal with the whole question of studies. The advisory board has already met once and is to meet again next year to prepare a comprehensive programme of studies. I wonder whether there is still time for the Assembly to take a decision to refer this whole question to the advisory board, which is composed of very eminent personalities from different countries, and entrust the board with the task of giving its expert opinion to the Assembly at its next session. I should like to know what the sponsors of the draft resolution would think about that proposal, which is made in a constructive spirit. It would be in keeping with the line of thinking of the General Assembly on the whole subject of studies. It might therefore be not inappropriate for us first to ask the advisory board to have a look at this proposal for a new study and give its opinion at the next session.

Mr. NADABHA (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation has already had occasion, at the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly, to explain its views on the study proposed with regard to regional disarmament, which is the subject of the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.35. We have taken our position as a result of the conclusions of the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament held this year, which made it clear that the priority of priorities was general disarmament, and included among the objectives was nuclear disarmament. Then draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.35 incorporates the same idea with regard to all regions of the world, without distinguishing between one region and another in terms of the tension in the region and as an example I would cite the Middle East. Such mild solutions to the problems of the world have never been the proper solutions which can bring about stability and means to remedy those problems.

I therefore express the Jordanian delegation's rejection of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.35.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that two questions remain to be answered before we can proceed to the vote.

The first concerns the amendment proposed by the representative of Pakistan. It has been accepted by the representative of Belgium on behalf of his own delegation, but I thought he conveyed the idea that it would have to be accepted by the other sponsors also before a definite reply could be given. I think that as the other sponsors are present I may, with their permission, interpret their silence as acceptance of the proposal made by the representative of Pakistan and accepted by the representative of Belgium. We shall proceed accordingly.

(The Chairman)

However, there was also another matter - a query from the representative of India as to whether this is not one of the studies that should be sent to the Secretary-General's Advisory Board of eminent persons.

Mr. CHAMPENOIS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I would like to speak once again, briefly, to react to the problem just raised by the representative of India with regard to this study possibly being referred to the Advisory Board for an opinion. I think that that board is certainly competent to give an opinion. This falls within the framework of its terms of reference, and it can certainly do that and its opinion would certainly be welcome.

Nevertheless, I should like to stress one point. The draft resolution submitted by Belgium, with other sponsors, is a text which saw the light first a few years ago. It is the result of a continuing process which formally began in this Assembly at the thirty-second session. It has already been the subject of a draft resolution last year and what we propose this year is in direct line of succession to last year's draft resolution. Furthermore, all delegations know that at the special session devoted to disarmament the regional question, the regional possibilities, the regional approach, whether it be in the nuclear or in other fields - and I do not intend to be exclusive at all - gave rise to a great deal of interest, even if it was controversial in nature. But I think there is interest.

In the circumstances, the Belgian delegation believes that to refer the matter to the Advisory Board for a preliminary view on whether or not a study should be carried out - because that would be the point - would be dilatory. It would just be a matter of putting things off until later without having any guarantee, however, about what would happen subsequently. We do not know what the view of the Advisory Board would be. I believe that this point is fundamental. The Belgian draft resolution is the result of a process which began a year ago. More than 30 countries have made contributions, some

(Mr. Champenois, Belgium)

of them extremely substantial. Some other countries have indicated their interest in seeing that the study be begun directly - and I am referring to what was said yesterday about the competence of the Advisory Board. It was clear that while the board could give an opinion it was not competent to pronounce on or to decide, of itself, what should be done. I think it is the General Assembly which is sovereign in this area.

We therefore insist that a decision be taken today on the basis of the draft resolution submitted by Belgium and its co-sponsors, as amended by the delegation of Pakistan.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Belgium for his statement, which I now believe has made the position very clear and enables the Committee to take a decision on the matter.

I now call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, who wishes to explain his vote.

Mr. GLAIEL (interpretation from French): My delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.35 because, apart from the arguments already put forward by the representative of Jordan, we believe that the terminology used in the draft resolution is vague and limits itself to misunderstanding. The whole of the text indeed deals with general ideas the scope of which is not clear. That is why my delegation will abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.35, concerning a study of all the aspects of regional disarmament, in the form in which it appears in the original draft, with the exception of the addition, at the end of the fifth preambular paragraph, of the words: "and the views expressed by Member States at its thirty-third session,".

I have already drawn the attention of the members to the financial implications, which appear in document A/C.1/33/L.55.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Canada, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Eyelorusian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mongolia, Mozambique, Oman, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.35 was adopted by 79 votes to none, with 40 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will consider next draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.34, presented under agenda item 48, "World Disarmament Conference". This draft resolution has 13 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Iran, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, at our 48th meeting, on 22 November 1978.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee by consensus.

The draft resolution has financial implications, which are set forth in document A/C.1/33/L.56.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee, who would like to point out a correction to that document.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the last paragraph of document A/C.1/33/L.56, namely, paragraph 5, in which the amount stated, \$240,900, should be \$250,900, so that the paragraph should read:

"In summary, the total costs of the Ad Hoc Committee of the World Disarmament Conference are estimated in an amount of \$250,900 all of which relates to conference servicing."

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.34, concerning a world disarmament conference.

As I have indicated, it is the wish of the sponsors that that draft be adopted by consensus.

Since I hear no objection, I declare the draft resolution so adopted.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representative who wish to make statements at this stage.

Mr. FAN (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation is of the view that, the special session on disarmament having been convened, all the deliberations and consideration on questions of disarmament should be conducted under the direct auspices of the United Nations. Besides, a second

special session of the General Assembly on disarmament will be held in due course. Therefore, we have reservations about the holding of a world disarmament conference outside the United Nations.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States participated in this consensus, but we have some doubts which we feel obligated to make known to the members of this Committee.

In the view of the United States, it is not the lack of a suitable forum that constitutes the principal obstacle to progress in disarmament. Quite to the contrary, we believe that a premature world disarmament conference held without an adequate basis for agreement on questions of substance, a basis which manifestly does not now exist, would probably hinder rather than advance efforts to reach arms control agreements. Moreover, we do not foresee appropriate conditions for a world disarmament conference emerging in the near future.

That is the basis for our doubts and our questioning the desirability of continuing the activity of the Ad Hoc Committee on an annual basis.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.34 and of agenda item 48.

(The Chairman)

Unfortunately, that is as far as we can go in the consideration of draft resolutions at this meeting. We had a number of others scheduled for consideration this morning, in particular draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.1, under agenda item 47, "General and complete disarmament", concerning the "Committee on Disarmament". Members will recall that that draft resolution was not put to the vote yesterday because amendments were submitted to it, which now appear in document A/C.1/33/L.54, submitted by the delegations of Argentina, the Federal Republic of Germany, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Sweden and Venezuela.

I have been informed that an amendment to the amendments in document A/C.1/33/L.54 has been submitted in document A/C.1/33/L.57, the effect of which would be to replace the proposed amendment to the first operative paragraph of A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.1 by one calling for a new operative paragraph 1.

Further, I understand that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.1 intend to introduce a further revision. That is ample evidence that we cannot proceed further with this matter now but must leave it until the afternoon meeting.

In addition to the draft resolution and the amendments to which I have just referred, the only other draft resolutions to be decided upon by the Committee at this afternoon's meeting come under agenda item 128, "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States". The first is contained in document A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.1. I understand that a further revision, A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2, has been handed to the Secretariat and that it is hoped to have it distributed at this meeting.

I now call on the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2.

Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I ask representatives kindly to turn their attention to document A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.1, on which I should like now to explain the amendments which the group of sponsors is ready to make in the interest of winning broader support for this draft resolution under agenda item 128.



(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

I shall base my remarks upon the English text.

(spoke in English)

In the first line of the first preambular paragraph, delete the words "political and international legal".

(continued in Russian)

Thus the first preambular paragraph would read as follows:

(spoke in English)

"Convinced of the need to take effective measures for the strengthening of the security of States and prompted by the desire shared by all nations to eliminate war and prevent a nuclear holocaust".

(continued in Russian)

The next amendment relates to the fifth preambular paragraph;

(spoke in English)

In the third line of the fifth preambular paragraph delete the words "and wishing to make them part of international law".

(continued in Russian)

Thus the fifth preambular paragraph would read as follows:

(spoke in English)

"Mindful of the statements and observations made by various States on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States".

(continued in Russian)

In operative paragraph 1,

(spoke in English)

replace the words "the conclusion of an" by the word "appropriate", and in the third line of that paragraph replace the word "convention" by the word "arrangement".

(continued in Russian)

Thus operative paragraph 1 would read as follows:

(spoke in English)

"Considers it necessary to take effective measures for the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States through appropriate international arrangements".

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

In operative paragraph 2, replace the word "relevant" by the word "all". The second operative paragraph would thus read as follows:

"Requests the Committee on Disarmament to consider to that end at the earliest possible date the drafts of an international convention on the subject submitted at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, as well as all proposals and suggestions on effective political and international legal measures to safeguard non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

(continued in Russian)

Finally, in operative paragraph 4,

(spoke in English)

delete the words "Conclusion of an international convention on the" .

(continued in Russian)

That paragraph would thus read as follows:

(spoke in English)

"Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-fourth session the item entitled Strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States .

(continued in Russian)

I should like to express the hope that the inclusion of the amendments to which the co-sponsors have agreed will ensure that the draft resolution receives the broadest possible support, and I hope that as soon as possible the Secretariat will circulate a document incorporating the amendments I have indicated.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for introducing the changes to the text of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.1, the amended version of which will be distributed as document A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2. I am sure the Committee will agree that his indications are very useful to the Committee since it will pronounce itself on this draft resolution this afternoon and, against expectations, document A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 has not yet been distributed by the Secretariat.

Before I called upon the representative of the USSR I saw the representative of Pakistan signalling his desire to speak. I would assure him that I would have gone on to note that the other draft resolution submitted under agenda item 128, A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1, had been submitted to the Committee late yesterday afternoon by the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): At the close of our meeting yesterday afternoon the permanent representative of Pakistan indicated that we would be introducing the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1 at this morning's meeting. With your permission, Mr. Chairman I should like to introduce this draft now, and it will in fact be the first time that Pakistan has formally introduced its draft resolution on the question of security guarantees.

In the intervention made by the representative of Pakistan in the First Committee on 31 October, regarding the item on security guarantees, he expressed the hope that it would be possible during the current session to evolve an agreed course of action on this important subject.

The Pakistan delegation has held extensive consultations with a large number of countries represented here, including the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and China. Taking into account the views of all concerned, we have modified the draft resolution originally submitted in document A/C.1/33/L.15. The text that has now been circulated in document A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1 takes into account the views of all concerned States, nuclear and non-nuclear, and reflects in a balanced way the substance and thrust of the Committee's deliberations on this question during the current session of the Assembly.

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

Let me explain briefly the preambular and operative provisions of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1. As we stated in our intervention of 31 October, Pakistan considers it necessary to set out in the preambular part of the draft resolution the perspective in which the non-nuclear-weapon States of the world view the threat posed to their security by the existence and deployment of nuclear weapons. Therefore, in the preambular part of the draft resolution, we have enumerated that security is the legitimate concern of all States, that nuclear weapons pose the greatest threat to international peace and security, that nuclear disarmament is the best assurance of security against the nuclear threat, and that the use of nuclear weapons is something to be deplored in any circumstances. These propositions are reflected in preambular paragraphs 1 to 6 inclusive of the draft resolution.

The concept of negative security guarantees must be seen as an interim measure to provide some assurance to non-nuclear-weapon States against the nuclear threat until nuclear disarmament and the complete prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons are achieved. Nuclear weapons were developed by the nuclear Powers not because of any threat from non-nuclear-weapon States; thus there is no reason why the non-nuclear States should continue to be exposed to the threat of the use of nuclear weapons. This thinking was endorsed in resolution 3261 G (XXIX) by the General Assembly four years ago and is reflected in preambular paragraphs 7, 8 and 10 in our draft resolution.

Two years ago, the General Assembly, in resolution 31/189 C, invited the nuclear-weapon States to consider a specific undertaking for negative guarantees. This is mentioned in preambular paragraph 11.

At the recent special session on disarmament some of the nuclear Powers responded by making unilateral declarations regarding the circumstances in which they would use nuclear weapons. The General Assembly did not consider these declarations as sufficient assurance to non-nuclear-weapon States, and therefore in paragraph 59 of the Final Document, urged the nuclear-weapon States

"... to pursue efforts to conclude, as appropriate, effective arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons." (resolution S-10/2)

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

This decision of the special session is recalled in preambular paragraph 12 of our draft resolution.

Despite the fact that most of the preambular paragraphs of our draft resolution contain language already approved in previous General Assembly resolutions, my delegation has sought to accommodate the genuine preoccupations of all concerned. Thus, two new preambular paragraphs have been added. One of these, the fifth preambular paragraph on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1, refers to the principle of non-use of force, first reflected in the draft resolution sponsored by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. However, we have deemed it appropriate not to mention some of the resolutions and declarations on the subject of the non-use of force in view of their somewhat controversial background.

Secondly, preambular paragraph 9 has been inserted in the draft resolution to reflect the view held by many delegations - a view which Pakistan shares - that effective security guarantees

"... can constitute a positive contribution to the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons, ...".

We have also modified the language in preambular paragraphs 4, 6, 11 and 12 of the draft resolution in response to the comments and views expressed by various delegations.

Let me say in passing that the material difference between the text in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1 and the text submitted by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6, now revision 2, lies in their preambular parts. My delegation believes that the text in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 does not reflect adequately the concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States and the history and evolution of the idea of effective arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the nuclear threat.

For example, the first preambular paragraph in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6 speaks of the security of States rather than the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. This draft resolution notes the desire of States to keep their regions free of nuclear weapons. This is indeed a laudable desire, but it is not

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

strictly relevant to the obligations incumbent on the nuclear-weapon States to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States that nuclear weapons will be not be used against them. The entire case of the non-nuclear-weapon States is that these obligations of non-use should not be restricted to only those States which are parties to the nuclear-weapon-free zones, or those which subscribe to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. They should be applicable to all non-nuclear-weapon States, whose very status implies the renunciation of the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

The operative part of the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1 has been reduced from six to three paragraphs. Its text reflects what we believe to be the highest common demonimator of agreement that can be reached on the subject at the current General Assembly session.

The debate on item 128 and the informal consultations held on the subject have revealed that there is now an almost unanimous view that something effective ought to be done to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. As I have mentioned, the special session has already adopted a categorical recommendation in this context.

Pakistan believes, like the Soviet Union, that the effective arrangements which should be adopted can be in the form of an international convention, although we have differences about the substance of the convention. Other Member States represented here have suggested alternative ways and means of achieving the same objective. For instance, the other major Power, the United States, proposed that the Security Council should take note of the unilateral declarations made by the nuclear Powers at the special session. We did not think that this was sufficient, but were prepared to reflect it, as is apparent from operative paragraph 1 of the initial draft resolution contained in A/C.1/33/L.15. However, it seems that the sponsor of the idea is not altogether enthusiastic about having the General Assembly approve the proposal for the Security Council endorsement of the declarations made by nuclear Powers. Therefore, we have agreed to drop this reference in our revised draft resolution.

There are also other ideas which have been expressed in this debate, but the predominant view which has surfaced in what has been said by various delegations has been that the most viable means of assuring non-nuclear-weapon States is through the adoption of a binding international instrument, and most have stated that this

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

should be in the form of an international convention. The language contained in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15 was evolved after intensive consultations, and was proposed to my delegation by a nuclear Power as reflecting the general sentiment in the Committee. Thus, we have agreed to insert this language in our draft resolution.

The first part of this paragraph contains language of paragraph 59 of the Final Document of the special session, as will be apparent. It is further elaborated that effective arrangements which are to be concluded to assure non-nuclear-weapon States should include consideration of an international convention and alternative ways and means to achieve this objective.

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

This language does not prejudice the position of any State, while making it explicit that the idea, the proposal for an international convention, which was the main theme in the statements of many delegations here, is to be kept alive and is to be a part of the consideration of the Committee on Disarmament.

We see from the latest revision of the Soviet draft resolution in A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2, unfortunately, that the specific reference to an international convention no longer figures in that text, and we, for that reason, feel that that reference does not fully reflect the deliberations in the debate in this Committee.

The second operative paragraph in document A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1 combines the substance of operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of our original draft resolution. In response to the positions of various delegations the present operative paragraph 2 of our draft resolution does not specifically mention the draft conventions submitted by the Soviet Union and by my delegation in documents A/C.1/33/L.6 and A/C.1/33/L.15 respectively. Instead, these proposals are mentioned in a foot-note on an equal footing with other views expressed on the subject, such as the views submitted by the United States in document A/C.1/33/L.7, as well as the verbatim records of this Committee's deliberations on this item. The Committee on Disarmament has been asked to consider these proposals as well as the views, that is, both the draft conventions as well as other ideas, and has been asked to report on progress to the next session of the General Assembly.

Finally, the last paragraph of our draft resolution proposes the inclusion of an item on the agenda of the next session of the General Assembly. Pakistan is flexible about the title of this item. We could agree to refer specifically to the conclusion of a convention, as was the case in the previous draft in A/C.1/33/L.6. We could agree to reflect the language which is adopted in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution or we could agree to maintain the present language in our text, that is, A/C.1/33/L.15, which reflects the item as it was considered in the 1974, 1976 and 1977 sessions of the General Assembly. The latest modification in the last paragraph of the draft in A/C.1/33/L.6 has brought that text very close to our own, but there are still very minor distinctions between the titles of the items for next year contained in that draft as well as our own.



(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

In conclusion, let me say that we have been inspired throughout the last few weeks by a desire to obtain an agreement on this question which could satisfy all concerned and which could enable the Committee on Disarmament to make material and substantial progress on this question during the next year. My delegation believes that the text contained in A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1 reflects the positions of all States equitably, that it meets the genuine concerns of all countries and that, if the positions of countries are divested of other extraneous issues, the text in A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1 could form the basis for a consensus on this subject at the current session of the General Assembly.

Mr. MESHARRAFA (Egypt): In the light of the various amendments proposed to the Committee by the representative of the Soviet Union, and in particular the deletion of the word "conclusion" from operative paragraphs 1 and 4, may I address myself to the representative of the Soviet Union and ask him whether he found this appropriate also to amend the title of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6 by deleting the words "conclusion of an international convention" and making its title, "The strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States".

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to thank the representative of Egypt for expressing satisfaction with the amendments which I mentioned a few moments ago. With regard to the title of documents A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.1 and Rev.2 I should like to explain that this is not the title of the draft resolution but, rather, of item 128 of the agenda of this session. Of course, we cannot change the title of an agenda item. I hope this explanation will satisfy the representative of Egypt.

## ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the business for this morning. This afternoon we have three draft resolutions to take decisions on. First, under item 47, "General and complete disarmament", draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42, and the amendments that have been proposed to it, and then the two under agenda item 128, draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 and A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1. That would conclude the consideration of all the draft resolutions this afternoon, which was the original plan, and I trust that nothing will prevent our adhering to that plan.

Before we adjourn I would inform the Committee that the delegation of Iraq has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.