

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
60th meeting
held on
Friday, 1 December 1978
3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 60TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

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 128: CONCLUSION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF GUARANTEES OF THE SECURITY OF NON-NUCLEAR STATES (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/33/PV.60
5 December 1978

ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEMS 47 AND 128

The CHAIRMAN: As agreed upon this morning, we shall first take up the last remaining draft resolution under item 47 concerning general and complete disarmament, document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, which concerns the Committee on Disarmament. The draft resolution has 43 co-sponsors and it was introduced to the Committee by the representative of Tunisia at the 55th meeting of the First Committee on 29 November 1978. Amendments to that draft resolution have been submitted in document A/C.1/33/L.54, and an amendment to those amendments in document A/C.1/33/L.57.

I take it that it is the intention of the representative of Tunisia to introduce the revisions in document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2.

Mrs. GORDAH (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain the reasons for draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2. It was introduced to Committee members after numerous consultations and negotiations with many delegations. Subsequently, after further consultations with the representative of Mexico, he, together with a certain number of co-sponsors, submitted draft amendments to the draft resolution. The Committee will note that document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 has taken account of several of the results of the consultations among those delegations, and largely takes into account the proposals made by the representative of Mexico, with particular reference to one preambular paragraph and two operative paragraphs.

With respect to the second part of the first preambular paragraph, the Mexican amendment was not accepted by the sponsors because they considered that since the preambular paragraphs had appeared in a given order in an official document of the General Assembly, changing the order would have taken too much time.

(Mrs. Gordah, Tunisia)

With respect to operative paragraph 1, it has been reworded in the light of all the consultations that have taken place, and unfortunately we were not able to accept the proposal of Mexico. We therefore have a new text which seems to reflect the point of view of the majority, but not that put forward by the representative of Mexico.

I should like to say and to repeat, Mr. Chairman, that in resubmitting our text, which you were kind enough to allow us to do by postponing its consideration from the day before yesterday until today, we have attempted to take into account all the proposals and suggestions which had been made to us in order to arrive at a compromise text drawn from among all the points of view and one which seemed likely to be acceptable to a large majority of our Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the Committee that the delegation of Djibouti has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2.

Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): As a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.1, my delegation wishes to state that the basic purpose of this draft resolution is to ensure that the functions and structure of the Committee on Disarmament conform with the accepted practices of other United Nations bodies.

Paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly states, inter alia,

"that the Committee on Disarmament will be open to the nuclear weapon States, and 32 to 35 other States to be chosen in consultation with the President of the thirty-second session of the Assembly; and that the membership of the Committee on Disarmament will be reviewed at regular intervals;". (resolution S-10/2)

The thrust of our draft resolution is to establish the modalities necessary for the implementation of the proposal which calls for the review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament at regular intervals. In preparing the draft resolution, the sponsors have taken into account the need for the Committee to have the nuclear Power States as members on a permanent basis, for obvious reasons.

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia)

With regard to the remaining members of the Committee, we strongly believe that the principle of periodic rotation on a fair and equitable geographical basis is not only necessary but is in keeping with the accepted practices of the United Nations.

My delegation agrees that in technical matters, such as those involved in disarmament discussions, Member States should be allowed to secure a reasonable length of time in order to gain familiarity with the subject matter. On the other hand, there must be an agreed limit to such terms of office; otherwise, we would be defeating our own principle of rotation of membership and fair and equal opportunity for participants in the work of United Nations bodies.

Under the proposals contained in our draft resolution, the initial term of office of members of the Committee would be until 1982. That is a period of almost five years, and is more than reasonable by any standard.

This brings me to the principal point of my statement. We maintain that the Committee on Disarmament should complete a study of the practical modalities for a review of the membership of the Committee and submit its recommendations for consideration by the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session. This proposal is both reasonable and realistic since it gives the Committee a period of two years in which to accomplish this task.

My delegation would like to comment briefly on the proposed amendment in document A/C.1/33/L.54 to operative paragraph 1 of our draft resolution. The implication of this amendment would be to delay the consideration of the question of membership review until the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which this Committee has recommended should take place in 1982. We believe that this is an unacceptable proposal for more than one reason. First, it would extend the term of office of the present members of the Committee on Disarmament well beyond the second special session on disarmament - in other words, beyond a

(Mr. Hussen, Somalia)

period of five years. Secondly, it is essential that as many procedural questions as possible, and particularly those relating to the Committee's structure, should be tackled well in advance of the special session on disarmament. In other words, we would find that the special session would be obliged to devote a substantial part of its valuable time to these questions when it should be tackling the complex and substantive issues of disarmament.

We appreciate the importance of ensuring some form of continuity in the membership of the Committee, and for this reason we recognize that it might be necessary to phase the retirement of serving members, as has been the case in other United Nations bodies.

I should like to add my voice to the voices of others in this Committee which support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Mexico to introduce the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.1 contained in document A/C.1/33/L.54.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): In considering the text contained in document A/C.1/33/L.54, I should like to highlight the fact that, in the opinion of its sponsors - which, as everyone knows, are Argentina, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Sweden, Venezuela and my own country, Mexico - in this matter perhaps more than any other regarding disarmament it is desirable to apply the wise, old adage that one must not lose sight of the forest because of the trees and also the converse that one must not lose sight of the trees because of the forest. Here one of these trees - a fruitful, bountiful tree, which we must not forget - is the need for consensus. There must be consensus for the Committee on Disarmament to exist and, particularly, for it to be able to work effectively.

For 16 years many delegations - among them that of Mexico - have worked unflinchingly to create conditions making it possible for the two nuclear States not members of the Committee on Disarmament - originally called the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and later the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) - to be brought into the Committee on Disarmament. One of them was legally a member, but from the outset its delegation in fact refused to participate in its work; the other had never been a member for well-known reasons.

Those efforts were fortunately crowned with success, because of the patient and persevering work done first in the Preparatory Committee of the tenth special session during five sessions and later during the work of the special session itself throughout five whole weeks. I shall not here mention all the obstacles which we had to overcome to arrive at a consensus. I am sure that those memories are still fresh in the minds of representatives. It will be recalled that it proved impossible to surmount the last of those obstacles at the special session itself and that, therefore, that point was left to be settled by the President of the thirty-second session - who was also President of the special session - so that, in consultation with the members, he could arrive at a conclusion of the matter first with regard to the number - whether there should be five or eight new members - and, secondly, which countries they would be.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The President was eventually able to complete the task entrusted to him and, shortly after the present session began he announced the complete membership of the Committee on Disarmament, which, as agreed in paragraph 120 of the Final Document, will meet at the latest next January in Geneva.

As someone rightly said yesterday in the course of some of our informal talks, the ink has not yet dried on that agreement. Accordingly, we the sponsors of the amendments believe that we must be extremely careful in regard to what is proposed here and what we try to decide here. In our opinion, it would really be a great pity if that consensus which we succeeded in reaching barely four months ago should now be destroyed.

That - and no other - is the purpose of the amendments which we are submitting. We the sponsors do not know whether it can be said that our amendments will preserve the consensus; but we do believe that they would make it less difficult to preserve than would the original text. We believe that from the very beginning - since 1961- the General Assembly which was about to set up the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament clearly defined the criterion governing the establishment of a committee on disarmament.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

At that time it requested the Soviet Union and the United States of America to agree between themselves on the composition of a committee that, in the words of the resolution, would be satisfactory to them and the rest of the world. If the Committee must deal with disarmament, and if, in the context of disarmament, nuclear disarmament must, as we have decided time and time again, receive the highest priority, the participation of the nuclear-weapon States is clearly essential.

That explains our efforts over 16 years to make it easier for the two absent States to join. Fortunately, one has already announced that it will return in January 1979. That is why, as I have said, we must now be very careful in our decisions on the subject.

To come now to the specific text of the amendments and of the proposal that was distributed a few minutes ago in document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, I would begin by saying on behalf of the sponsors of the amendments and on my own behalf how very much we appreciate the decision by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 to accept one of the preambular paragraphs we suggested. which now appears as the third preambular paragraph in the revised text.

We venture to hope that in the same spirit of flexibility it will also be possible to include in the revised text the second preambular paragraph of our amendment, which would then become the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2. That paragraph reads:

"Recalling also that, as a result of the decisions adopted in the above-mentioned special session, a Disarmament Commission composed of all Member States of the United Nations has been established as a subsidiary organ of the Assembly, and that it has been constituted, as a negotiating body, a Committee on Disarmament open to the participation of the nuclear-weapon States of the following thirty-five States" -
and then follows the list.

I repeat that we venture to hope that that will be possible, to include this preambular paragraph because, in the first place, it fills a regrettable gap in the present text of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2. That draft is entitled "Committee on Disarmament", and its fourth preambular paragraph reads as follows:

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

"Recalling that membership of the Committee on Disarmament is to be reviewed at regular intervals ...".

But nothing is said about the membership of the Committee, so in this respect our paragraph would fill a most regrettable gap and would thus represent an improvement on the present text. The only reason mentioned by the representative of Tunisia for not including this paragraph was that it was too long.

I really do not think we should take fright at that. Six lines covering the list of members of the Committee on Disarmament would not encumber the set of resolutions of the thirty-third session nor the text of the draft resolution. On the other hand, their inclusion would bring the draft resolution into accord with the uninterrupted tradition of the General Assembly concerning resolutions of this kind.

May I appeal to the representatives to do something that is very easy for them? As I said yesterday, volume II of the documents of the Preparatory Committee of the Special Session contains a compilation of all General Assembly resolutions on Disarmament. They should consult resolution 2602 B (XXIV) of 16 December 1969. In the second preambular paragraph of that resolution mention is made of each of the States which the General Assembly decided should be members of what was called the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee. Later, in resolution 2602 B (XXIV) of 16 December 1969, when the composition of the Committee was increased to 26 members, every single member was listed. Finally, in resolution 3261 D (XXIX) of 19 December 1974, the same was done in respect of the number of States, which had then risen to 30.

We therefore fail to see why an exception should be made in the resolution the Committee is about to adopt on the Committee on Disarmament, which is the first resolution we shall be adopting on the subject subsequent to the special session - all the more so if we bear in mind that the Final Document approved by the General Assembly incorporates resolution S-10/2 of 30 June 1978 does not contain such a list because that was impossible for the reasons I explained at the beginning of this statement.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

This is why we venture to hope that the sponsors also will accept the inclusion of this preambular paragraph. We are grateful that they have agreed to include in the operative part what are now paragraphs 3 and 4, which are taken in toto from those which appeared as paragraphs 2 and 3 in the amendment.

However, even with the inclusion of the preambular paragraphs I have mentioned, and while taking into account and fully acknowledging the great concession made in including these two paragraphs as operative paragraphs 3 and 4, we consider that, in the light of all the informal exchanges of views we have had with representatives of the various United Nations groups, that there is little likelihood and even less any certainty of the revised text being adopted by consensus. Even if all our amendments were accepted, we could not be certain that a consensus would be the end result.

I have not had time to consult the sponsors, so I am now speaking on a procedural motion on behalf of the delegation of Mexico only. Given what is at stake, I think it would be worth while at this time to make a final effort which might enable us to vote, or even perhaps to adopt this draft resolution in the certainty that that adoption would be by consensus. For this reason I take the liberty of suggesting that the meeting should be suspended for 35 minutes and that at most one or two representatives of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution, and representatives of the authors of the amendments and of each of the nuclear-weapon States, who actively participated in the negotiations during the special session and made possible a consensus on paragraph 120 should be invited to meet. I believe that at the end of the 35 minutes we would know whether or not it would be possible during this session to adopt a text by consensus. That is the procedural motion that I am taking the liberty of making.

The CHAIRMAN: As members will have noted during the statement made by the representative of Mexico, the amendments are no longer the same as they appear in document A/C.1/33/L.54. This is in consequence of the subsequent issuance of a second revision of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42 to which these amendments purport to make changes. The following amendments have already

(The Chairman)

been incorporated in the revised text of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42. The first preambular paragraph of the first amendment appears word for word as the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2. Equally, the text proposed in the third amendment for an operative paragraph 2 now appears as operative paragraph 3 in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 and the text proposed for an operative paragraph 3 appears as operative paragraph 4 in the revised draft resolution. So with regard to document A/C.1/33/L.54 the situation stands as follows: the representative of Mexico proposes that without changing anything the second preambular paragraph beginning "Recalling also that ..." be taken directly into draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2. That is the first amendment.

The second amendment concerns the first operative paragraph which, if I understood it correctly, would be the real subject of the eleventh-hour consultations, as I believe the representative of Mexico put it, in order to try to find a way whereby draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 could be adopted by consensus. At the end of his statement, I understood that the representative of Mexico was for this purpose formally proposing a suspension of this meeting for 35 minutes to resolve the problem. Rule 118 of the rules of procedure pertaining to such proposals read as follows:

"During the discussion of any matter a representative may move the suspension or the adjournment of the meeting. Such motions shall not be debated but shall be immediately put to the vote".

(The Chairman)

Consequently, the Chair has no alternative but to put immediately to the vote the proposal of the representative of Mexico for a suspension of the meeting for 35 minutes. I know that the United Kingdom has also proposed an amendment and I will call on him immediately after the suspension is over. Therefore, I ask the representatives to be good enough to indicate their decision on the motion for the suspension of the meeting for 35 minutes.

The motion to suspend the meeting was adopted by 66 votes to 11, with 36 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN : The motion for suspension of the meeting has been carried. This meeting will be suspended, but I hope not necessarily for 35 minutes. I understood from the representative of Mexico that he considered this disagreement to be a minor one. I, therefore, very much hope that we could actually come back here earlier. And if I may say so, at this stage of our proceedings, I do not think that the Chair or the Committee should cause further delays, and then we will proceed to decide on the issue by a democratic vote.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. President, as you and other representatives here no doubt heard, the purpose of the suspension was to make this one last effort to find a solution which would earn a consensus. For that purpose I venture to make a suggestion and through you, Sir, to issue an invitation to the four nuclear-weapon States which took an active part in the negotiations in the special session which produced paragraph 120 to appoint a representative for each of them who would go into the next room.

I would also suggest that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 appoint, not one representative because that might not be enough in view of the number of sponsors, but perhaps three representatives; and that the authors of the amendments appoint two representatives. We would meet together for a half hour or maybe even less, as you suggested, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps - since we should never give up hope - we could come back with a solution which could obtain a consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: Although the rules of procedure imply that if there is no discussion before the motion for suspension, there should certainly be no discussion after that decision has been taken, I nevertheless still call on the representative of Turkey.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 have already shown a great deal of flexibility and understanding. It was in this spirit, I believe, that a majority of those sponsors agreed to a suspension of the meeting. But I should like to make one thing very clear. We accepted this suspension in the hope that we could produce a text which would enjoy a consensus.

The meeting was suspended at 4.10 p.m. and resumed at 4.40 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue its work with a view to concluding consideration of all outstanding draft resolutions and draft amendments, as needed.

It is my intention that at this point the Committee should continue its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, document A/C.1/33/L.54 which contains the two remaining amendments to that draft resolution and document A/C.1/33/L.57, which contains a United Kingdom amendment to the proposals contained in document A/C.1/33/L.54.

I shall call upon the representative of the United Kingdom who inscribed his name before the meeting was suspended, I take it, in order to introduce the amendment in document A/C.1/33/L.57.

Sir Derek ASHE (United Kingdom): It certainly was my intention, to introduce the amendment we have proposed, but I must admit that I am at a certain disadvantage in not knowing how the negotiations have gone in the interval. If the Chair agrees, I should nevertheless like to set out the considerations we have in mind in introducing our amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I most decidedly agree. Please proceed.

Sir Derek ASHE (United Kingdom): I asked to speak in order to introduce and commend to the Committee document A/C.1/33/L.57, which proposes an amendment to one paragraph of the amendments appearing in document A/C.1/33/L.54, introduced by the representative of Mexico just before the suspension of the meeting.

I should make it quite clear that my delegation is perfectly prepared to support the text of the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 as it was presented by the representative of Tunisia. However, since the representative of Mexico expressed a wish to press the amendments proposed in document A/C.1/33/L.54, my delegation feels bound to insist on the consideration as well of the alternative language in our own amendment (A/C.1/33/L.57).

(Sir Derek Ashe, United Kingdom)

Our amendment concerns the proposed amended version of operative paragraph 1. set out in the draft resolution I have just mentioned. That amended version - and by that I mean the Mexican version - as drafted implies that the question of the review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament would be part of the business of the second special session devoted to disarmament. I do not think that can be the case. Although closely linked to the United Nations - and I think this is a point which the representative of Mexico would agree with - the Committee on Disarmament is not a United Nations body as such and its membership is accordingly a question wholly within the competence of the member Governments of that Committee and of other Governments which might be candidates for membership. That fact was clearly recognized at the time of the first special session and is safeguarded by the wording of paragraph 120 of the Final Document of that session. The alternative version of the paragraph in question, contained in the amendment which I am now introducing, is intended to avoid the implication that the second special session would actually make decisions on the question of the composition of the Committee on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe I understood correctly that the representative of the United Kingdom was saying that he would have no difficulty in accepting, in its revised form, the language of paragraph 1 as it stands in document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, but that his delegation would not be prepared to accept the amendment to that paragraph proposed by the delegation of Mexico, together with a number of other delegations. From a look at the hall, I conclude that the consultations are still proceeding. The only question of contention, really, at this point is operative paragraph 1.

(The Chairman)

It would be well for the members of the Committee to know that if the consultations now going on lead to a situation where the language suggested in the Mexican amendment to operative paragraph 1 is accepted by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, we would in that case proceed to the vote by putting forward, first, the amendment of the representative of the United Kingdom. I think that this is a correct rendering of the procedural situation.

The Chair hopes that some of the main parties to the consultations will at this time inform the other members of the Committee of the result of those consultations.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico)(interpretation from Spanish): I regret that I must inform the Committee that our efforts to arrive at a consensus on a resolution on this subject have so far failed. If the Chairman feels that it is essential to proceed at once with the procedural voting, I suggest that some of the participants in the consultations, who have a clearer idea than I do, be asked to explain the exact situation.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point or order.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I do not think that anybody can have a clearer idea of the situation than the representative of Mexico. I do not believe that the Chairman is bound to inquire as to how many people would like to clarify what I think he has already done. We would be protracting the debate on a procedural matter and we would never finish.

Since the situation is clear in the minds of each one of us as to how we want to vote - and putting the matter to a consensus does not apply here - I believe that you will be in your right as a Chairman to do this. I know that you are very kind and very flexible, although sometimes you appear to be quite inflexible. Why do you not be a little inflexible on this question? Here you are in your right to be inflexible as a Chairman. Therefore, if you open the door for all those representatives who want to clarify what the representative of Mexico

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

already made very clear about the dissent, I think this would be in keeping with your objective of trying not to protract the debate but of having us decide this question by a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I am most grateful to the representative of Saudi Arabia. I must say, as he was good enough to say, that although normally I am quite inflexible, from time to time a moment of weakness seems to come over me and I am kind. But then the representative of Saudi Arabia reminds me that the Chairman has no right to be kind, and I am very glad to be reminded of that. So we shall proceed to take a decision on this by the democratic process of voting if necessary. But before doing that, I shall call on the last speaker, the representative of Nigeria.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I ask for the floor to see if perhaps we can simplify our method of decision-taking on this particular subject, since, as the representative of Mexico pointed out, it appears, unfortunately, as if there is no indication of a consensus on a draft irrespective of the wording.

That of course is unfortunate because the whole point of the suspension was to see if there could be a meeting of minds between the various co-sponsors so that a draft resolution could be adopted by consensus. Now the problem militating against the achievement of a consensus has nothing to do, from the point of view of my participation in the consultations, with the inability to find wording which everyone can live with, provided of course everyone does want some form of wording. It so happens that there are some who would not go along with any text. Therefore, taking account of that element, the effort which I wish to try to make is designed to achieve a form of consensus among those who want some form of draft resolution adopted on this subject.

I am basing myself on what I understood to be the outcome of the consultations which we had. I would suggest - and I stand corrected by the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 in this respect - that there was a wording for the crucial operative paragraph 1, which both the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 and the co-sponsors of the amendments in A/C.1/33/L.54 felt could meet their concern, as well as of course at least three of the four nuclear-weapon States which participated in the consultations.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

For draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, operative paragraph 1, I suggest the following formulation: in the second line after the words "should be completed", insert the phrase "following appropriate consultations among the Member States", which is a direct quotation from paragraph 120 of the Final Document. Operative paragraph 1 would then read:

"Recommends that the first review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament should be completed, following appropriate consultations among Member States, during the next special session devoted to disarmament;"

Operative paragraph 2 would remain as it is.

In operative paragraph 3, from the first line the words "pending that review" would be deleted. Operative paragraph 3 would then read:

"Requests further, the Committee on Disarmament to make arrangements for interested States ..."

The rest of the paragraph would remain the same.

Operative paragraphs 4 and 5 would remain the same.

With respect to the preamble, no reason has been adduced for not including the second preambular paragraph proposed in document A/C.1/33/L.54, which merely completes the agreement reached in paragraph 120 of the Final Document. That paragraph would appear after the third preambular paragraph. In other words, after the present third preambular paragraph which recalls that two kinds of bodies are required, the fourth preambular paragraph would read:

"Recalling also that, as a result of the decisions adopted ..."
and the entire second preambular paragraph as set out in document A/C.1/33/L.54 would be inserted here.

That is my understanding of the agreement reached during the consultations. As I have said, the whole intention here is to make our procedure very simple. I understand that operative paragraph 1 as I have outlined it is acceptable even to another delegation that had submitted an amendment to that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee is in the following position. The Committee has before it the two amendments contained in document A/C.1/33/L.54 which have not been withdrawn, namely, those concerning the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, and the amendment to the latter presented by the United Kingdom in document A/C.1/33/L.57, proposing a new text of operative paragraph 1.

That being the situation, I am perfectly prepared to follow the normal procedure of putting those amendments to the vote in their pre-ordained order.

At the same time, however, the representative of Nigeria has presented suggestions which he thinks reflect the consensus that emerged from the consultations and which refer directly to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, and, if it is the Committee's preference, I would be perfectly willing for us to start with those.

I am concerned at this time with not prolonging this discussion. The Committee has other important matters to deal with this afternoon. After the explanations and my rulings on how to proceed, I wonder whether there really is anything to add. I shall be prepared to call on those speakers who wish to take a stand on how I propose to proceed, but not on speakers who wish to deal with other matters.

Mrs. GORDAH (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): I should like to say, on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, as already indicated by the representative of Nigeria, that the sponsors agree to the text of operative paragraph 1 as read out by the representative of Nigeria. The sponsors also accept the deletion in operative paragraph 3 of the words "pending that review". That is the agreement that was arrived at.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): I should like to add some clarifications in regard to what my Tunisian colleague has said. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 have already demonstrated a great deal of understanding and flexibility, and they are not ready to come to terms with a whole series of changes. In my view, they might possibly agree to the two changes that have just been read out by our Tunisian colleague, provided that only our draft resolution is put to the vote and that any formal or oral amendments are withdrawn by those who submitted them.

In that case, as the representatives of Nigeria and Tunisia have just pointed out, the great majority - including three of the five nuclear Powers - would be able to vote in favour of this draft resolution.

That is our latest agreement, and that is how I interpret it on behalf of the sponsors.

The CHAIRMAN: If I understood the representative of Turkey correctly, he has just put forward a procedural ultimatum.

I shall now call on the next speaker on the list, but I insist on my request that the statements to be made at this stage refer to the procedural situation and that they be very brief, without too many reasons.

Mr. BROOK (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer to your exposition of the effects so far of what has happened owing to the acceptance of some of the proposals contained in document A/C.1/33/L.54, specifically the third amendment proposed in that document.

As I understand the situation, unless that third amendment is withdrawn, its effect is not yet exhausted for the reason that, although the two additional operative paragraphs contained in it have been accepted, the intention of that amendment was also to delete three of the original operative paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Australia for his statement, but my interpretation is that the word "replace" has the same effect as to delete and substitute something new, which has been done.

Sir Derek ASHE (United Kingdom): In view of the amendment to operative paragraph 1 in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 - which my delegation can fully accept - I am perfectly prepared to withdraw the amendment that I put forward in document A/C.1/33/L.57, thus, I hope, simplifying your task.

The CHAIRMAN: I am most grateful for that announcement by the representative of the United Kingdom. He will appreciate, however, that, unless I hear another announcement, I shall next put to the vote the amendments in document A/C.1/33/L.54, which still stand, and those were the texts that were not acceptable.

In that case, I suppose that the representative of the United Kingdom would wish me to begin the voting by putting his amendment to the vote first.

Sir Derek ASHE (United Kingdom): No, Mr. Chairman. I am perfectly prepared to withdraw my amendment and to allow the amendment of the representative of Mexico to stand its chance, after which I shall then be able to vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.42 with a clear conscience.

The CHAIRMAN: I am glad for that clarification, and the situation is now perfectly clear.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Nigeria has with his usual clarity made a statement with which I am entirely in agreement. I did not venture to make it myself because I feared that one or more of the sponsors might hold an opinion different from my own. I do not know whether that is already the case, in light of what the representative of Turkey just told us. But, in any case, I repeat that my opinion is the same as that of the representative of Nigeria.

Consequently, I agree with what you said, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the procedure; and if the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 have not arrived at the same conclusion as that of the representative of Nigeria, namely, that what appears as the second preambular paragraph in document A/C.1/33/L.54, which begins with the words "Recalling also", could advantageously be added to the draft resolution, as amended, after the present third preambular

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

paragraph, which says: "Recalling that in the same resolution ...", and if they are not willing to accept this inclusion, which would be the most simple procedure, then it would be necessary for you, Mr. Chairman, to put the draft resolution to the vote, as you have indicated.

In order to simplify the procedure, my delegation - I cannot speak for the other sponsors, but they can indicate what they think about this, as they are all represented in this room - would be prepared, if the inclusion of this second preambular paragraph beginning "Recalling also" is accepted, not to insist on the amendment appearing in document A/C.1/33/L.54 referring to operative paragraph 1, and to accept the paragraph in document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 in the revised form explained a few minutes ago by Ambassador Adeniji. Perhaps your task would be facilitated, Mr. Chairman, if you were to put this specific question to the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Mexico for conditionally withdrawing the amendments which still remained in document A/C.1/33/L.54. It was actually my understanding from the two statements of the representatives of Tunisia and of Turkey, made on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, that they would see no difficulty in accepting the oral amendments first offered by the representative of Nigeria.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): I thought I was quite clear in my first statement. Personally, I could agree with the representatives of Mexico and Tunisia, but there is now some confusion among the sponsors. It is not so much the content of the third change which concerns us, but the fact that for hours the sponsors of this draft resolution have had to take account of suggestions and requests, at times contradictory, on the part of members of the Committee on Disarmament. This final draft which has emerged at this late hour reflects that tremendous effort, and I think that now, in order to simplify the task, two small changes could be made: one in operative paragraph 1, as suggested by the representative of Nigeria; the other, the deletion of three words from operative paragraph 3. These could be explained without confusion to all the sponsors. But if we embark on yet a third change, I fear that that may create problems for us. But as a last effort, I might suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you ask the sponsors of document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 if they have any formal objection to a third change.

(Mr. Ersun, Turkey)

For my part, and in so far as concerns the delegations of Tunisia and, I believe, Ghana, which were delegated to take part in the informal consultations, there is no substantive problem. But some of our colleagues consider that we showed little understanding, and if we can agree on those two changes, I think that we shall have done a good piece of work today. Of course, it is up to you, Sir, to put that question to the sponsors.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that our time is rapidly running out and I shall not go through the list of co-sponsors individually. Instead, I would ask them collectively whether any of them objects to the suggestion in document A/C.1/33/L.54 that the second preambular paragraph in that paper, being of a factual character, be incorporated in the text of A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 as a fourth preambular paragraph. That preambular paragraph reads as follows:

"Recalling also that, as a result of the decisions adopted in the above-mentioned special session, a Disarmament Commission composed of all Member States of the United Nations has been established as a subsidiary organ of the Assembly, and that it had been constituted, as a negotiating body, a Committee on Disarmament open to the participation of the nuclear-weapon States and of the following thirty-five States:"

- and the names follow.

Does any of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42 have a formal objection to that? And I will not call on anyone except a co-sponsor of that draft resolution.

I call on the representative of Niger on a point of order.

Mr. CARBA (Niger) (interpretation from French): I should like, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, to comment on the second preambular paragraph of the draft amendment in document A/C.1/33/L.54. I do so because, as a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, I have taken part from the start in the consultations which we have had. I fully agree with the account given by the representative of Tunisia but I have some difficulty in agreeing to all the changes just read out by the representative of Nigeria. I understood that we had agreed, because I was among those who participated in the consultations on modifying operative paragraph 1 by adding the words "following appropriate consultations among members", and deleting from operative paragraph 3 the words "pending that review". That phrase has been eliminated, but I do not believe that in the course of consultations the members who were present managed to reach consensus on the second preambular paragraph of the proposed amendment in document A/C.1/33/L.54. We differed on that.

I do not think, as the representative of Turkey has just said, that there is any confusion among the sponsors. I believe we know what we have agreed to. We were unable to take a decision on the second preambular paragraph beginning "Recalling also that". If the Chairman will allow me to make a statement on behalf of my delegation before the vote, I will deal with that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that after the statement of the representative of Niger it is very clear how we should proceed, and I propose to proceed by declaring that the voting has started, as follows: that we take a vote on the second part of the amendment contained in document A/C.1/33/L.54, starting with the words "Recalling also that, as a result of the decisions ...".

I call on the representative of Spain in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting.

Mr. PINIES (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to know whether what we are going to vote on is what you just read out, Mr. Chairman -- namely, "Recalling also that, as a result of the decisions adopted in the above-mentioned special session ...", and whether, if that paragraph is adopted, the rest of the amendment would be withdrawn. It seems to me that this was the proposal of Mexico. Before we proceed, I should like to have that clarified.

The CHAIRMAN (intepretation from Spanish): That is perfectly correct.

Mr. PAQUI (Benin) (interpretation from French): Earlier I raised a point of order, and unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, you called on my colleague from Niger. Since my delegation is not at all a sponsor of that amendment, my delegation would like to explain its vote before the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I have formally declared that the voting has begun. Therefore no explanations of vote will be allowed before the vote. However, after the voting I shall be glad to call on speakers who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

I now ask representatives to pronounce themselves on the second of the two new preambular paragraphs contained in document A/C.1/33/L.54.

The paragraph was rejected by 41 votes to 32, with 43 abstentions.

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

Mr. GARBA (Niger) (interpretation from French): My delegation is one of those that in the course of the general debate expressed the desire that the principle of the review of the membership of the Committee should not be lost sight of. That was our desire because we thought it was a wise decision on the part of the Member States of our Organization, which adopted the Final Document at the special session devoted to disarmament.

In our opinion document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 has but one purpose: to reaffirm at this thirty-third session a principle which representatives now present approved in broad terms a few months ago. We were therefore somewhat surprised that the draft caused hesitancy on the part of certain Member States. While we sympathize with their desire for effectiveness, we cannot agree with their attempt to give permanency to the presence of some States members in the Disarmament Committee because it runs counter to what we accepted a few months ago. The need to safeguard an accepted principle should not be lost sight of by the non-nuclear members of the Committee, in particular those which agree to the decision, taken at the special session, to expand the Committee.

If, in fact, additional States have become members of the Committee, that is because of the will of the General Assembly, which recognized the justice of the attitude of the States Members which always wish to have the Committee function on a more democratic basis. Do those States now wish to bring into question a principle that was accepted at the special session? It is the opinion of my delegation - and this is why we voted against the second preambular paragraph proposed in document A/C.1/33/L.54 - that a listing of the members of the Committee is not necessary for draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 to be complete.

(Mr. Garba, Niger)

In our opinion non-acceptance of the listing does not at all run counter to paragraph 120 of the Final Document, which recognizes that the Committee would be open to all nuclear States and from 32 to 35 other States but does not specify which those States should be. It could not be otherwise since, when the Final Document was adopted, the Assembly did not know which the new members would be, and that was borne in mind by the authors of the draft resolution.

The delegation of Niger therefore believes that it was not at all necessary to list the members of the Committee, and that so as not to cause any confusion of understanding concerning the draft resolution, the purpose of which remains to reaffirm a principle we accepted during the special session.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on the main draft resolution, contained in document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2. I would remind representatives that the following two changes have been made.

As proposed by the representative of Nigeria and accepted by the sponsors of the draft resolution, in operative paragraph 1, after the words "should be completed", the words "following appropriate consultations among the Member States" have been added, so that the paragraph reads as follows:

"Recommends that the first review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament should be completed following appropriate consultations among the Member States during the next special session devoted to disarmament."

The other change refers to operative paragraph 3. In the first line of that paragraph, the words "pending that review" have been deleted.

Those are the only changes.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I have a suggestion that may simplify your work, Mr. Chairman.

If the second amendment in document A/C.1/33/L.54 is not withdrawn, and so far it has not been, I believe it should be put to the vote. My delegation will not insist on a vote on that amendment, but I would ask the Chairman to ask the other sponsors whether they are of the same opinion. If they are, he will not have to put that amendment to the vote. But if even only one member wishes there to be a vote on the second amendment in document A/C.1/33/L.54, a vote will have to be taken.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Furthermore, since you have called on me, I should like briefly to state my position on the draft resolution as a whole.

My delegation whole-heartedly regrets that every effort made to arrive at a text which could enjoy consensus has failed. As I said today, resolution 1660 (XVI) of 28 November 1961 very clearly stated the essential elements required for a disarmament committee to be able to work effectively. This resolution asked the Soviet Union and the United States to agree on a membership which would meet with their approval, and that of the rest of the world. These are two essential elements which we should never forget since it is not a matter of academic exercise, but a committee on disarmament. I repeat that as regrettably at this time it has not been possible to achieve these two things with regard to the text we are now considering, much to its regret, my delegation will have to abstain from voting.

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the request of the representative of Mexico, I collectively ask the sponsors of the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.54 whether or not they insist that amendment 2 which pertains to the first operative paragraph of the draft resolution be put to the vote.

Since none of the sponsors has requested to be allowed to speak, I take it that amendment 2 in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.54 no longer stands.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 was adopted, by 110 votes to 9, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on representatives wishing to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States of America): In voting for draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, my delegation wishes to draw attention to those provisions of the agreement recorded in paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament, in which it is noted that the Committee will adopt its own rules of procedure and its own agenda which of course, would take into account the recommendations of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Floweree, United States)

Further, subparagraph (f) of paragraph 120 records that the Committee will

"Submit a report to the General Assembly annually ... and provide its formal and other relevant documents to the States Members of the United Nations ...". (resolution S-10/2, para. 120 (f))

Those reports would include any consideration of the modalities of the review of membership undertaken by the Committee. Therefore, we believe that the report requested by operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution should be incorporated in the regular reports of the Committee's activities in the same manner in which its deliberations on other subjects suggested by the General Assembly are reported.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation, too, would like to explain its vote. First, we wanted to stress that we understand and welcome the wish of States Members of the United Nations to take an active part in the discussion of questions of disarmament, and this includes the negotiating organ. It would appear that this was precisely the guiding motive of the co-sponsors of the resolution just adopted. I repeat, we do understand their wish and we share it. However, being guided precisely by this consideration the Soviet Union, in the course of the special session of the General Assembly, as the Committee will recall, took an active part in producing the agreement which is endorsed in the Final Document in paragraph 120. In particular, we find in this agreement the following:

"that the membership of the Committee on Disarmament will be reviewed at regular intervals;" (A/RES/S-10/2, para. 120)

We based ourselves precisely on this. As the Committee will recall, agreement was achieved in the course of the special session on another matter. We may assume that the Disarmament Committee when it meets, and it is meeting in less than two months, will undertake work on its own rules of procedure - another point upon which agreement was achieved in the course of the special session - and will be guided by those rules in its everyday work.

There is no doubt that one of the important matters which the Committee on Disarmament will be considering will be the question of how its membership will be periodically reviewed. Therefore, the Soviet delegation saw no basis whatsoever at this session, before the Committee on Disarmament has even met, to adopt an additional resolution and, as it were, to predetermine a decision of the Committee on Disarmament. We, along with a group of countries, did appeal to the co-sponsors not to be in a hurry over this matter. This is not a question which gives rise to any doubt. The membership of the Committee will be subjected to appropriate periodic review. We requested them to wait a while, particularly because it is not an urgent question, and revert to it at a later stage.

I very much regret that they did not heed our appeal and we were thus compelled to vote against. But once again, I should like to stress that we understand and indeed share and even welcome the desire of all States Members of this Organization to take an active part in the negotiations on disarmament.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation supported the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 which is the result of discussions between delegations in which we took part.

It has been our concern from the very beginning that the understanding reached during the special session on disarmament on the structure and organization of the Committee on Disarmament be maintained. The new negotiating body has to continue its work on the basis of consensus, and on the understanding that membership of the Committee on Disarmament will be reviewed at regular intervals.

Besides this, the new negotiating body should be given the time it needs to work out its own rules and to develop its potentialities, taking into account existing experience, competence and expertise. We hope that this will materialize in line with the relevant paragraph in the Final Document of the special session on disarmament.

It is our understanding that this position is reflected in the draft resolution we have just adopted.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): In voting for draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 my delegation wished to signify to the co-sponsors of the draft two things. First, the fact that we appreciate the spirit of compromise which they showed, the gesture which they made to the various proposals that had been made to them in the course of the various revisions of this draft resolution. What we adopted this afternoon, of course, is a far cry from the original draft which the co-sponsors had submitted. And I think it is only human on their part that at this final stage they felt unable to accept another suggested addition which is infinitely more innocuous than some of the things that they had been willing to accept. But that is human nature.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The Nigerian delegation also wished, by voting in favour of this draft resolution, to indicate to the co-sponsors that we ourselves have always been in the forefront of the moves within the former Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to bring a certain measure of reform into that organ so as to make it more democratic and to bring it more in line with the practices and procedures within the United Nations system. In doing so, however, I think we would have to bear in mind that the First Committee does not operate in a vacuum and that whatever decisions it takes will have to be consistent with decisions being taken in other Committees of the General Assembly and in other forums of the United Nations.

We will have to realize that the whole aim of the review of membership of the Committee on Disarmament is that the practice would have to be consistent with what obtains with comparable organs of the General Assembly. For instance, we have the Committee of 24 on decolonization. Nigeria has never been a member of that Committee; but this has not in any case inhibited us from playing a very full and active role in the work of decolonization. There is also the Special Committee against Apartheid; there is the Council for Namibia; there is the Executive Committee of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Now, these are all organs of the United Nations. If we should lay down certain principles applicable to the Committee on Disarmament, like the four-year principle which I heard the representative of Somalia lay down this afternoon, I hope we will bear in mind that it is likely to snowball and that it may create certain inconsistencies and contradictions in some of the stability which we wish to bring to some of these organs.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2. At this point it must be said that it was the urgent hope of the Chair these would be the last explanations of vote. It was the intention of the Chair earlier to suggest that explanations of vote be deferred to Monday. I will give my reasons. As agreed and decided by the Committee, it was hoped that today it would conclude the consideration of all the draft resolutions before it. Since we had to face an unexpected delay in taking a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42, the Chair asked the Secretariat to make sure that we could have their services at least until 7 o'clock tonight, by which time I think we would have been able to decide the two remaining and very important draft resolutions concerning the conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States.

The Chair has been informed, however, that the Secretariat will only be able to provide services until 6.30 p.m., for reasons which have not been elucidated but which might be pertinent since this request was sent to them several times.

It would therefore be the suggestion of the Chair that we leave until Monday further explanations of vote on the draft resolution which we have just adopted, and that we proceed to take up the two draft resolutions under agenda item 128 and to ensure their adoption in the half hour which remains to us. In accordance with rule 106, there will be a time-limit of three minutes on speeches, with the exception, in fairness, of the two delegations which are the main protagonists of these draft resolutions which we would now take up. If I hear no objection we will proceed accordingly.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now take up item 128 and the two draft resolutions presented under that item. The first draft resolution is A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2. This draft resolution has 20 co-sponsors and was introduced in its second revised form to this Committee by the representative of the USSR at the 59th meeting of the Committee this morning.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): My delegation has had several opportunities to discuss with its sponsors draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6 from its first text to its second revised text. I would like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's appreciation to the sponsors of the draft resolution for incorporating several amendments that we had suggested to them.

At this stage, which I believe is not too late, I would like to submit a brief oral amendment to the third preambular paragraph in document A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2. I believe that the amendment which I will suggest would bring the language of this paragraph in conformity with the language of the Final Document of the tenth special session.

The amendment would be in the third line of the third preambular paragraph. After the words, "... establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones", add "on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned". This is the language of paragraph 33 of the Final Document.

I have reason to believe that this small amendment will not be objected to by any delegation. The text as amended by my delegation would then read: "... the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and being anxious to contribute to this objective,".

The CHAIRMAN: The paragraph now reads:

"Noting with satisfaction the desire of States in various regions to prevent nuclear weapons from being introduced into their territories through the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and being anxious to contribute to this objective,"

Is there any objection to this new formulation?

Mr. MADADHA (Jordan): If the paragraph introduced by the representative of India is to be incorporated into the new text of A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2, I would ask for a separate vote on that paragraph.

Mr. BUENO (Brazil): It has been the consistent view of my Government that one of the essential requirements for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is the acceptance by all States of the regions concerned of the obligations embodied in the arrangements creating such zones. My delegation therefore supports the oral amendment presented by the representative of India, which aims at bringing into line draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 with such a requirement and also with the language of paragraph 60 of the Final Document adopted by the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, and through you the attention of the sponsors of the draft resolutions concerned to paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 and paragraph 3 of A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1. In both cases a request is being made for the inclusion of the same item in the provisional agenda of the thirty-fourth session, but as this request is now drafted it would appear that there would be two distinct items. I would request that an effort be made by the proponent delegations to standardize the item. In draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 the item is listed as "Strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States", while in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1 it appears as "Strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

Mr. BROOK (Australia): We wonder whether it would be acceptable to the Committee, even at this very late stage, to agree by consensus to incorporate into the preambular part of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 one of the preambular paragraphs which already appears in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1, namely, the ninth preambular paragraph which reads:

"Recognizing that effective measures to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons can constitute a positive contribution to the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons."

(Mr. Brook, Australia)

We were very pleased indeed to see that paragraph included by Pakistan in its revised draft. We have this afternoon consulted, as rapidly as we could, a number of delegations which seem to agree with us that there should be no objection, in the interests of consensus, to incorporating that language into draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 also. There may be other delegations which have been active in this area but which we have not had time to consult. In that case, we apologize to them. This language, I think, recognizes the importance of the concern of non-nuclear-weapon States for their security and the value to non-nuclear-weapon States of freedom from the threat of nuclear weapons. This, in our view, is one of the most significant factors in the consideration of the question of international guarantees of restraint in the use of nuclear weapons. We understand that this language might be acceptable to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 if it is acceptable to the Committee as a whole, and we would commend it to the Committee.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has no difficulty in agreeing to the proposal of the Australian delegation and, if it does not give rise to any objection on the part of the other sponsors, that preambular paragraph could be put in as the fourth preambular paragraph, after the one which begins: "Noting with satisfaction the desire ...".

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask whether any of the other sponsors of the draft resolution has any objection to the Australian proposal? I understand it is the wish of the representative of the Soviet Union that I should ask that. I hear no objection so we may proceed to the decision-making phase on the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2, presented under agenda item 128 and relating to the conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States.

The text is as it stands with two additions proposed at this meeting.

The first is that in the third preambular paragraph after the words "nuclear-weapon-free zones", the following words should be added:

"on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned".

(The Chairman)

A new fourth preambular paragraph, after the preambular paragraph which I just referred to, will appear as the following text - and it now appears in document A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1, as the second preambular paragraph on page 2. The language is as follows:

"Recognizing that effective measures to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons can constitute a positive contribution to the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons,". This then constitutes a new fourth preambular paragraph to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2.

The representative of Jordan has asked for a separate vote on the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. The Committee will now vote on the third preambular paragraph.

The third preambular paragraph was adopted by 111 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolutions as a whole. 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, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe.

Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia.

Against: Albania, China.

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Greece, Pakistan, Somalia, Turkey.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 was adopted by 117 votes to 2 with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: In connexion with another draft resolution, there was no objection by the Committee that the remaining explanations of vote be postponed until Monday. Since we are pressed for time, it is the suggestion of the Chairman that we do likewise.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take up draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1. This draft resolution is sponsored by the delegation of Pakistan, and this morning the representative of Pakistan officially introduced to this Committee the revised version of the draft resolution.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): My delegation believes, in its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1, that the question of security assurances has been dealt with in an appropriate way in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2, which this Committee just adopted. To adopt yet another resolution on this subject would not only be redundant but potentially confusing. We are therefore proposing to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1. To make it clear, I point out that this is not a procedural motion, merely an explanation of why we are abstaining.

The CHAIRMAN: After this statement, the Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1.

Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): I hesitated to interrupt the representative of the United States. But in accordance with the Chairman's ruling that there was not going to be any explanations of vote today, I think it was rather unnecessary for the representative of the United States to have taken the floor when we were just about to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: It is very rarely that I disagree with the representative of Pakistan. However, I have not ruled out explanations of vote both before and after the vote, and particularly statements before.

I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): The Chairman requested us to defer our explanations of vote until Monday. And although one can stretch a point, one would have thought that the representative of the United States wanted to say something with regard to the voting.

I am in full agreement with the representative of Pakistan that the remarks of the representative of the United States were uncalled for, unless he wanted people with whom he could not get in touch to know how the United States will be voting, and I thought that this was an irregular procedure.

The CHAIRMAN: After these exchanges I hope that we can now proceed to take a decision and vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted by 108 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): After the Committee's adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2 this afternoon, the representative of Nigeria made a special reference to the brief statement that I had made at the opening of this afternoon's meeting, in which I stressed the need for the functioning and structure of the Committee on Disarmament to conform to the accepted functioning and practice of the other United Nations bodies - practice which is based on the principle of periodic rotation.

I therefore fully agree with the representative of Nigeria that this principle should be applied in those bodies where it has not been applied so far, including the Committee of 24 and the Committee Against Apartheid, of which both Nigeria and Somalia are members, with Nigeria holding the chairmanship of the latter Committee.

Mrs. GORDAH (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): We were very happy to hear the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union concerning the reaffirmation of his delegation's support for the principle of the review of the composition of the Committee. We should have liked, however, the comments we have just heard to have been made at a time earlier than yesterday morning, as we had insistently desired. We would also have liked to have been able to arrive at a consensus and all our spirit of conciliation and compromise made this amply clear in the successive revisions. It was for lack of all the necessary efforts but we were never able to obtain any comment in one sense or the other.

I feel that I am obliged to reply, because the representative of the Soviet Union said that they had drawn attention to this, but unfortunately were not heard. I wish to say that the sponsors do not in any way feel responsible for the absence of a consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.2, which the Committee adopted this afternoon. That does not prevent me from deploring the absence of such a consensus, as the representative of Mexico did, and to hope that it will emerge in the Committee on Disarmament, when the question of the review of the composition of the Committee comes up.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to indicate what we shall do on Monday. We have voted on all the draft resolutions and have concluded our consideration of all the items on disarmament, with the exception of the explanations of votes which, because of lack of time now, we shall hear on Monday.

As members know, the Committee still has the next week at its disposal. In accordance with our original schedule of work, next week will be devoted to agenda item 50, the remaining item on the agenda of the First Committee, which concerns the strengthening of international security. In that connexion, I intend to close the list of speakers on that item on Tuesday.

Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to express my thanks and offer my congratulations to the Committee for the tremendous amount of work that it has been able to carry out during this week. When we were planning our work schedule I stated that the task would be formidable but that it could, nevertheless, be done and it has been done. I think that every member of this Committee has the right to be duly proud of that performance.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.