

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION
*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE
36th meeting
held on
Friday, 16 November 1979
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 36TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (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-3338.

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: It is now my intention to begin the voting procedure with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.10, entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 33/58 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

This draft resolution has 23 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the thirty-third meeting of the First Committee on 12 November 1979. The sponsors of this resolution are: Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

After the voting procedure has commenced, rule 128 of the rules of procedure provides that no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting. Does any delegation have any objection to beginning the voting procedure or have any comment to make before the procedure begins?

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I have asked to speak simply in order to recall that in introducing the draft resolutions I ventured to suggest that as far as A/C.1/34/L.11 was concerned, which takes note of the successful culmination of the General Assembly's efforts concerning Additional Protocol II, it might perhaps be adopted by acclamation.

The CHAIRMAN: I now propose to put draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.10 to the Committee. The sponsors have requested that this resolution be adopted without a vote. A recorded vote has not been requested.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.10 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Brazil for an explanation of vote.

Mr. DE SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): Our Committee has just taken action on agenda items 30 and 33. The Brazilian delegation joined the consensus of the Committee on both draft resolutions because it attaches great importance to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the first and so far the only international instrument establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

My delegation is confident that the conditions embodied in the Treaty concerning its entry into force will be fulfilled in the very near future.

It is however the wish of the Brazilian delegation to place on record its concern at the fact that the signature or ratification of Protocols I and II of that Treaty have been accompanied by declarations formulated by several of the signatory or ratifying States containing unilateral interpretations of the Treaty which may have detrimental implications for its effectiveness.

The CHAIRMAN: I now propose to put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.11, entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 33/61 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).

This draft resolution has 23 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the thirty-third meeting of the First Committee on 12 November 1979. The sponsors are: Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The sponsors of draft resolution L.11 have requested that this draft also be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objections it is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.11 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded its work on draft resolutions L.10 and L.11.

(The Chairman)

Before proceeding to the next draft resolution I should like to provide some information regarding sponsorship of draft resolutions. Uruguay is a sponsor of L.13, L.14, L.15, L.19 and L.20. Venezuela is a sponsor of L.18/Rev.1. Ireland and Norway are sponsors of L.19. Bangladesh is a sponsor of L.5/Rev.1, L.18/Rev.1 and L.19. Romania is a sponsor of L.13. Mauritius is a sponsor of L.5/Rev.1 and L.18/Rev.1.

It is now my intention to put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.18/Rev.1 on item 34 entitled, "Consideration of the declaration of the 1980s as a Disarmament Decade".

This draft resolution has 16 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the thirty-fourth meeting of the First Committee on 14 November 1979. The sponsors are, in addition to the ones I announced earlier as additional sponsors, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Jamaica, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Sierre Leone, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

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

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States certainly does not oppose the designation of the 1980s as a second disarmament decade: in fact, we support this proposal in principle. We cannot, however, vote for a draft resolution which once again attempts to set deadlines for the completion of negotiations on major disarmament measures. The attempt to do so runs counter to the view held by the United States - and, we believe, shared by others - that it is unrealistic to try to establish a rigid sequence, or target dates, for the conclusion of particular agreements, given the technical and political complexity of the issues, the fundamental nature of the interests involved, and the impossibility of foreseeing with any degree of precision relevant future developments, both strategic and technological. So we regret that the language of operative paragraph 3 requires us to abstain from voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. ADEMIJI (Nigeria): I should just like to make sure that representatives are aware that there is a revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.18, which I introduced the other day. In draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.18/Rev.1 we have sought to take account of some of the preoccupations that had been expressed to the sponsors by various delegations, including the delegation of the United States.

Accordingly, as can be seen, we have slightly modified operative paragraph 3 of the original draft by deletion of the word "specific". We have also, of course, amended the sixth preambular paragraph to bring it closely into line with the wording agreed upon at the special session, which spoke of the close relationship between disarmament and development.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

There is an additional operative paragraph - paragraph 4 - in draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.18/Rev.1, which

Requests the Secretary-General to seek the views and suggestions of Member States as well as relevant specialized agencies and the International Atomic Agency on possible elements in the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade". (A/C.1/L.18/Rev.1)

It was the hope of the sponsors that thanks to these amendments and modifications it would be possible for the draft resolution to be adopted by consensus, because we believe that the new operative paragraph 4 will give States an opportunity, when the draft resolution that would proclaim the Decade is being prepared, to express the kind of views which the representative of the United States has indicated.

But I think that perhaps a second look at some of these revisions may enable those who might have had reservations about the original draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.18 to support the text now. I thought I should call attention to these changes - not by way of campaigning for the draft resolution, but merely by way of giving explanatory information.

Mr. CHERKAOUI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): I should like to announce that my delegation has decided to become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.18, as revised.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.18/Rev.1, my delegation is grateful for the changes introduced and explained to us by the representative of Nigeria, Ambassador Adeniji. I wonder, however, whether the sponsors might consider a further change in order to give the draft resolution the importance it deserves. Here I refer to operative paragraph 3, from which, we were happy to learn, it has been decided to delete the word "specific", which we found not altogether appropriate.

May I say that even the setting of target dates for the possible events is not justifiable. My delegation is of the opinion that we should try to give this draft resolution lasting value. By proposing the fixing of dates, we run the risk that after 10 years results may be measured in relation to those dates and we may find that we have been unable to live up to expectations.

I would therefore ask the representative of Nigeria, representing the sponsors of this draft resolution, to consider the deletion also of the word "dates" from operative paragraph 3, and the modification of the preceding word, "target" to "targets". We should then, of course, be obliging ourselves to fix targets, but the reference to specific dates would not meet the purpose: we would be running the risk of downgrading the value of such an important draft resolution by proposing the setting of dates which we might subsequently find we could not live up to.

Mr. SY (Senegal) (interpretation from French): I wish to state that my delegation would like to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.18/Rev.1.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): I wish to express my delegation's appreciation to Mr. Adeniji for the efforts he has made in meeting the concerns of some of us with regard to the draft resolution he is co-sponsoring, particularly operative paragraph 3. The efforts he has made enable my delegation to change its vote and to vote in favour of this draft resolution. However, we would ask for a separate vote first on operative paragraph 3, which would enable us to indicate by an abstention the few remaining doubts we have with regard to the fixing of target dates. After abstaining on operative paragraph 3, we would then with pleasure vote for the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. BERG (Belgium)(interpretation from French): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.18/Rev.1, I have no comment to make on the substance, which presents no difficulty for us, but we have a minor problem with regard to the translation. The English text refers to "target dates", whereas the French version refers to "dates limites", which are not quite the same thing. I am not sure how this appears in the other versions, and it might be useful to see whether there are any difficulties with them. I think "target dates" would be better rendered in French as "dates indicatives", instead of the present "dates limites", which means rather "deadlines".

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): In response to the observation made by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, who suggested a modification of operative paragraph 3, I would say that the co-sponsors would have been pleased to consider such a suggestion if it had been brought to their attention a little earlier. With the deletion of the indication of target dates, there could be a certain conflict between what would be interpreted as targets and what is contained in the latter part of paragraph 3, "the major objectives and goals of disarmament". We feel that with the declaration of this Decade these "major objectives and goals" would in fact be targets before us, and the important thing would be a consideration of which of them could be accomplished during the Decade and at what time. However,

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

since the draft resolution has a number of sponsors and since the main problem with it, as far as several delegations are concerned, is this operative paragraph 3, perhaps the rules of procedure would permit a little time for consultation on it between the sponsors and interested delegations. If so, 15 or 20 minutes might be sufficient time for us to see whether we can iron out the differences on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN: Especially since it means that the view expressed by the representative of the Netherlands will be incorporated, I am willing to allow that time for consultations.

The meeting was suspended at 11.05 a.m. and resumed at 11.30 a.m.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): I am speaking as one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.18/Rev.1. We have held consultations with the interested delegations, and I assure the Committee that the 20 minutes were very usefully spent; but, unfortunately, so far we have not been able to reach any agreement on the matter. We would therefore appreciate, if at all possible, having the vote put off until Monday afternoon so as to give us more time for consultations. We feel that it should be possible to adopt this draft resolution by consensus. We would therefore like to make further efforts in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN: I am willing to defer taking a decision on it to Monday, with the hope that there will not be any further requests for extension.

We shall now turn our attention to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.7/Rev.1, entitled "Conclusion of an international convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons". This draft resolution has two sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the United States of America at the Committee's 31st meeting on 6 November 1979.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. KHALACHEV (Bulgaria): The Bulgarian delegation would like to express its support for the draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America entitled "Conclusion of an international convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons" and contained in document A/C.1/34/L.7/Rev.1. In my delegation's view, this draft resolution correctly reflects the significant development attained on the question of the complete prohibition of the radiological weapon and the need to take advantage of this development in efforts to reach a final solution to the problem without delay. Obviously, the attainment of this goal rests today on genuine elements.

First of all, I should like to point out the clearly expressed desire of the international community for the elaboration and conclusion of such a convention. This desire was reaffirmed by the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Secondly, the proposal submitted to the Committee on Disarmament on major elements of a convention concerning the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons constitutes a viable basis for reaching agreement on a final text. In the view of my delegation, the long and thorough bilateral negotiations have resulted in a comprehensive document which meets the requirements to this end. Furthermore, we have at our disposal a draft preamble for such a convention.

Thirdly, it is very important to note the intention of the Committee on Disarmament, as expressed in its report to the General Assembly (document A/34/27), to continue negotiations on a draft convention at its next annual session.

We consider that the existence of the conditions I have just described provides the possibility of intensifying the negotiations on this matter with a view to a successful conclusion. In our opinion this is feasible, together with the continuation of active negotiations on other outstanding items on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament.

At the last session of the Committee on Disarmament, the socialist countries, including Bulgaria, together with several other delegations, did their utmost to ensure that the Committee make a start on the drafting of a convention. I wish, in this respect, to reaffirm the readiness of my country to participate actively in the forthcoming negotiations with the

aim of ensuring that an agreed text is submitted for the approval of the General Assembly as soon as possible, perhaps at its thirty-fifth session. In keeping with our endeavour to add to the vigour of the efforts to achieve total prohibition of yet another type of weapon of mass destruction before it has entered the arsenals of States, my delegation will fully support the draft resolution.

Mr. KOMIVES (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation considers the submission of the agreed joint USSR-United States proposal on the prohibition of radiological weapons this summer in Geneva to be the result of long negotiations by the two major military Powers and as an important contribution to the disarmament process with a view to the elimination of a potential weapon of mass destruction. Furthermore, we consider it to be a significant step towards the realization of the Final Document of the tenth special session.

The report of the Committee on Disarmament takes note with satisfaction of the submission of the agreed joint proposal. It also notes the draft formulations submitted for the preambular part and for certain operative paragraphs. In contributing to the elaboration of the treaty, the Hungarian delegation also presented a working paper containing a proposal on the preambular part of the draft treaty. Owing to lack of time, the Geneva Committee could hold only preliminary discussions on the joint agreed proposal. It should certainly have the opportunity at its next year's session to take up this matter energetically.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.7/Rev.1, submitted and introduced by the delegations of the USSR and the United States, serves this very purpose in requesting the Committee on Disarmament to proceed as soon as possible to achieve agreement through negotiation on the text of such a convention. Taking into account the fact that the matter is now ripe for action and the real possibility of reaching an early agreement, the Hungarian delegation considers it important that the Geneva Committee, in the light of the aforementioned points, should do everything possible to elaborate and adopt a common text. In stressing this, we would like to hope that every country or group of countries represented in the Committee on Disarmament will do its best to attain these ends. The Hungarian delegation welcomes and supports the draft resolution and recommends its unanimous adoption.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): I wish very briefly to thank the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union for accepting the suggestion which my delegation made earlier on in the Committee to include, in operative paragraph 2, the words "through negotiation". We are grateful to the United States and the Soviet Union for accepting that proposal because it will underline the role of the Committee on Disarmament as a negotiating body, which is of importance not only in relation to this text on radiological weapons which was submitted to the Committee, but also to other texts which we hope will be submitted to the Committee in the near future.

I must not neglect also to express our gratitude to the United States and the Soviet Union for having reached this basis for an agreement on radiological weapons and for having submitted it to the Committee on Disarmament. We are aware of the Committee's responsibility to bring forward at the next session of this General Assembly a text for approval by its full membership. We too support the unanimous adoption of this resolution, A/C.1/34/L.7/Rev.1.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution before us, A/C.1/34/L.7/Rev.1. We wish to point out that the insertion, in paragraph 2, of an explicit reference to negotiation played an important role in our decision to vote for the draft resolution. Indeed, we feel that the insertion was essential on this occasion to reaffirm the responsibility of the Committee on Disarmament as a negotiating body. By this we mean that any text submitted by parties for negotiation in the Committee on Disarmament is a text on the basis of which the Committee is entitled to negotiate; in other words, we do not consider documents submitted in such circumstances as immutable, but rather as a basis for negotiation.

The reaffirmation of this, through the insertion of that reference to negotiations, therefore meets with our satisfaction, and we wish to thank the sponsors for having thus amended the text. We are happy on this occasion to affirm our view of the Committee on Disarmament as a negotiating body and we hope that at its next session it will have an opportunity of fully discharging its responsibilities to the international community, not only with respect to the convention on radiological weapons, but also with respect to any other question or draft treaty that may come before it for discussion.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation is happy to join the consensus as a result of which we hope that draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.7/Rev.1 will be adopted. I merely wish to state for the record that this position is based on our understanding that negotiations and any other activities to be carried out by the Committee on Disarmament on this matter are without prejudice to the oft-designated priorities set by the General Assembly on some items on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.7/Rev.1, the Soviet Union and the United States, have asked for the draft resolution to be adopted without a vote.

As there is no objection, it is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.7/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.5/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session", on which we shall vote next, now has 14 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Cyprus at the 24th meeting of the First Committee on 31 October 1979.

The sponsors are Algeria, Argentina, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, India, Ireland, Mauritius, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Before the Committee votes on this draft resolution I wish to draw attention to a few small alterations in the text.

Originally, the second paragraph of the preamble read, "Reaffirming the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament". This now becomes, "Reaffirming that the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament", which is more in accordance with the Final Document.

Another slight amendment is that in paragraph 3, after the words, "Calls upon all States to eliminate tensions and conflicts in their relations and proceed towards", the word "measures" becomes "effective collective measures under the

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Charter". Also, the words "and peace" are added to the text, so that the complete paragraph, as revised, now reads,

"Calls upon all States to eliminate tensions and conflicts in their relations and proceed towards effective collective measures under the Charter for a system of international order, security and peace concurrently with efforts at disarmament measures".

Paragraph 4 now reads, "Calls upon all States also to pursue policies to strengthen international peace and security and to build confidence among States". This omits the phrase "to take measures", which we did not wish to repeat since it had been dealt with earlier.

Paragraph 5 read originally:

"Requests the organs of the United Nations to initiate or accelerate work on developing and strengthening institutions for maintaining peace and security".

The words "in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations." have been added to that paragraph.

These additions and alterations have been made following the acceptance of suggestions aimed at clarifying what was meant by the indefinite term "measures".

Mr. CHERKAOUI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): With regard to the second preambular paragraph of A/C.1/34/L.5/Rev.1, and the reference by the representative of Cyprus to the wording of the Final Document, I would point out that, whereas the word "central" is used in the English text of the revised draft resolution and in the Final Document, the word "crucial" is used in the French version of the draft resolution. Would it be possible to correct the French text to read "rôle central"?

The CHAIRMAN: Note has been taken of the request of the representative of Morocco that the French version of the draft resolution should be corrected to accord with the English text and the Final Document.

(The Chairman)

Before we proceed to the vote, I should perhaps summarize the changes just made in draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.5/Rev.1. Preambular paragraph 2 now reads:

"Reaffirming that the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament".

Operative paragraph 3 reads:

"Calls upon all States to eliminate tensions and conflicts in their relations and proceed towards effective collective measures under the Charter for a system of international order, security and peace concurrently with efforts at disarmament measures".

Operative paragraph 4 reads:

"Calls upon all States also to pursue policies to strengthen international peace and security and to build confidence among States".

Finally, paragraph 5 reads:

"Requests the organs of the United Nations to initiate or accelerate work on developing and strengthening institutions for maintaining peace and security in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter".

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I should like to propose that the draft resolution - which now becomes document A/C.1/34/L.5/Rev.2 - be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Cyprus has asked that draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.5/Rev.2 be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.5/Rev.2 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We have dealt with all the resolutions scheduled for our meeting today, but before adjourning the meeting I should like to make a few brief announcements.

First of all, due to an oversight when draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.21 was submitted Mexico, an original sponsor, was inadvertently omitted from the list of sponsors. I should like the records to show that Mexico is an original sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.21.

I now call on the representative of India, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.26.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): On behalf of the delegations of Argentina, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran, Nigeria, Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia, as well as my own, I introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.26. This draft resolution is related to agenda item 42, which deals with the review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session. The Committee will recall that at the session last year, the Assembly adopted, by an overwhelming majority, resolution 33/71 B, which called for the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons pending nuclear disarmament and which further called upon Member States to transmit their views regarding the non-use of nuclear weapons and the avoidance of a nuclear war.

My delegation was happy that several Members responded to the Secretary-General's letter inviting their views and those views are available in document A/34/456 and Add.1. The draft resolution in A/C.1/34/L.26 is of a procedural nature. It is a very simple text, in accordance with the custom of Indian

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

delegations of drafting resolutions in very simple language, and we trust that the draft will be acceptable to all delegations. The first preambular paragraph merely recalls resolution 33/71 B, which, as I stated earlier, was adopted by a very large majority last year. The second preambular paragraph would take into account the proposals submitted by States concerning the non-use of nuclear weapons, the avoidance of nuclear war and other related matters. In operative paragraph 1 the Assembly would decide to transmit those views to the Committee on Disarmament for consideration and in operative paragraph 2 it would request the Committee to take those views into consideration when it considers other items on its agenda and to report on its considerations to the Assembly at its next session.

I would not like to take any more of the Committee's time since the draft resolution is really very simple and self-explanatory, and on behalf of the sponsors I would request and express the hope that the resolution be adopted without a vote when it is taken up.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): For representatives to have a clear understanding of the matter I am about to raise they should have before them document A/34/588, of 7 November 1979, which contains the report of the Secretary-General on the item "United Nations studies on disarmament". This report of the Secretary-General deals with a report which had originally been submitted to the Secretary-General by the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies. In his report the Secretary-General sums up that report by the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies as follows:

"In conclusion, the Board agreed to recommend that a study should be made on the subject of a nuclear test ban which should consist of the following chapters: introduction; a brief background summary, analytical summary of the negotiations which have led to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (partial test-ban Treaty); the partial test ban Treaty and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; proceedings in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the Committee on Disarmament; three /nuclear/-Power negotiations; major unresolved issues; and conclusions. There should be appendices on the present nuclear arsenals, nuclear weapons tests from 1945 to 1963 and nuclear weapons tests from 1965 to 1979. The study should be completed in time for its results to be submitted to the Committee on Disarmament at its 1980 session, i.e., in the spring of 1980." (A/34/588, para.14)

In paragraph 15 of that report reference is made to other subjects that were suggested for possible study and that the Board decided it would take up next year. The report goes on as follows:

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

"As he has stated on previous occasions, the Secretary-General considers the conclusion of an agreement on a comprehensive test ban as an indispensable step to halt the qualitative nuclear arms race. Although this matter has been the subject of much study in the past, the Secretary-General feels that any measures which may contribute to the conclusion of an agreement are welcome. The Secretary-General envisages that this study could be carried out in the United Nations Secretariat, with the help of four consultant experts engaged for a period of approximately two months. The cost involved, including salaries and travel of the experts, would amount to approximately \$51,000." (ibid., para.16)

The report concluded:

"The Secretary-General points out that these costs cannot be met from the regular budget of the United Nations and that, if the General Assembly were to share the view that it is desirable that such a study be made, it would have to take a decision to that effect, including the administrative and financial implications thereof." (ibid., para.17)

The reason for my taking the time of the Committee on this matter is that, as we all know, today is the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions; hence, if it were to be felt that a draft resolution was called for on this matter, my delegation, together with a number of others, would submit such a draft today. If, however, we were to decide that a mere decision on this matter might suffice, I would propose right now that, within the time-limit set for the submission of draft resolutions, we take a decision along the lines that I have outlined, and that we do so as soon as possible, since that decision would still have to be submitted to the plenary Assembly and, as I understand it, the Fifth Committee has set a binding deadline for the submission of any decisions having financial implications.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)(interpretation from Spanish: With regard to the report of the Secretary-General entitled "United Nations studies on disarmament" (A/34/588), I wish to state that the detailed and lucid comments made by the representative of Mexico, my friend Ambassador Garcia Robles, make it unnecessary for me to do more than express my delegation's wholehearted support the initiative of the Mexican delegation.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

We consider that the study recommended by the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies is imperative and cannot be delayed if we wish to encourage the attainment of a treaty to put an end to nuclear weapon testing. The subject was widely considered by the Board, and the conclusion was reached that it was the only subject on which a recommendation would be submitted to the General Assembly at the present session. This in itself indicates the importance the Board attached to this study, which the Secretary-General also recommends - at, I must say, the rather moderate cost of only \$15,000.

As I have said, I shall not dwell on this subject at this time, because the representative of Mexico has already put the matter before us with his well-known skill and ability. I also believe that, as was the case in the past, the General Assembly might well adopt a decision on this matter, which I feel could be by consensus, without the need for the submission of a draft resolution. However, if it is felt that a draft resolution is required, the Argentine delegation would be ready to join the Mexican delegation in sponsoring such a draft resolution for presentation today.

If we were to decide on the first course, that is, a decision, then I would suggest that that decision clearly take account of the time element stressed in the Secretary-General's report and given great importance in the discussions of the Board. The time element is important because the study recommended should be completed in time to be of use to the Committee on Disarmament at its spring session in 1980. Therefore, if such a decision were to be adopted and a draft resolution were not required, the element of urgency would have to be taken into account in the drafting of the decision.

As a matter of relative importance, I should like to make one correction in the Spanish text of document A/34/588. In paragraph 13, on the last line, "United Nations Centre for Disarmament" is rendered as "United Nations Centre for Disaster". "Disaster" may be a synonym for the arms race, but it certainly is not a synonym for disarmament. I think the Centre has well earned the title of Centre for Disarmament, rather than for disaster, and that it deserves that correction in the Spanish text.

The CHAIRMAN: We can always rely on Mr. Ortiz de Rozas to bring some levity to our discussions. However, I think the use of that particular word there might have great importance, but the error in the Spanish text has been noted, and a correction will be made.

The Committee has heard the initiative proposed by the representative of Mexico, supported by the representative of Argentina, with respect to the report contained in document A/34/588. If I understand correctly, the representative of Mexico has suggested two possibilities: one a draft resolution, and the other a draft decision. I feel that, as a draft decision was taken when the Committee dealt with the film, this might be the better procedure to follow, and it seems to me that both sponsors of the initiative, if I may so describe them, would agree to a draft decision. If that is so, and if the Committee would accept it, I should like to ascertain whether the representative of Mexico is willing to act with the urgency indicated by the representative of Argentina. If so, I think the Committee may decide that a draft decision should be presented to the plenary General Assembly to deal with the report contained in document A/34/588.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the report referred to in the statement by the representative of Mexico, Mr. Garcia Robles, it is indicated that during the discussion of the question of the studies that are to be carried out by the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament different views were expressed in regard to the appropriateness of conducting the whole range of studies contemplated and also in regard to specific conditions. In view of the fact that these different views had been stated and are set out in the report (A/34/588), I consider that it is appropriate at the present time that we not pass any definite judgement concerning whether we adopt a decision or a draft resolution but hold further consultations. In any event, my delegation would be unable at this stage to support a proposal concerning the adoption of a decision on this question.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not sure whether the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union was a formal proposal, but if it is I shall be willing to deal with it from that point of view.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I am in fact making a formal proposal that we should not prejudge the question concerning the form of the adoption of our decision on this matter, whether it be a draft resolution or a decision, but that further consultations be undertaken.

The CHAIRMAN: Since it seems to me that the majority of the delegations here agreed to the idea that a draft decision might be possible, I should like to learn from the representative of Mexico whether he is willing to have consultations, and the time needed for such consultations. if we are to deal with this question at the present session.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico)(interpretation from Spanish): Quite frankly, I do not know which points call for consultation. In the Advisory Board, where there are, of course, on an individual and personal basis, a number of representatives or spokesmen from many countries, the conclusion was arrived at by consensus, and, as the representative of Argentina has pointed out, it was the sole study of the many that were submitted to the Board on which the Board, as paragraph 14 says, agreed to recommend that it should be made. However, by the same token, my delegation is, as representatives know, always ready to hear the views of other delegations, and we have no objection to our postponing a decision on the adoption of the decision we shall have to arrive at in order to comply with the terms of paragraphs 16 and 17 of the Secretary-General's report.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Therefore, if we postponed a decision on that matter until Monday, I think that would give us adequate time. We might deal with it on Monday. I do not know whether the Chairman is planning to have two meetings on Monday. If so, we could postpone taking a decision on this matter until Monday's afternoon meeting.

As I have said, the reason for haste is the deadline that has been set by the Fifth Committee for the adoption of decisions that have financial implications.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would be wise if I dealt immediately with the point concerning our next meeting in order to answer the question raised by the representative of Mexico.

In view of the fact that draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.18/Rev.1 should be ready for Monday, we shall have a meeting on Monday morning. I do not have any speakers listed for Monday afternoon, but I think there will be speakers to introduce draft resolutions on Monday morning. After first dealing with resolution A/C.1/34/L.18/Rev.1, and after hearing any speakers ready to introduce draft resolutions, the Committee could once again return to this matter and come to some decision with respect to the report contained in paragraphs 16 and 17 of the document in question.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I wish to refer to the decision the Committee has already taken on the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions. My delegation has, of course, tried to respect that decision. Therefore, in the course of one of our meetings, we introduced all the draft resolutions in the elaboration of which we had been involved. But the Committee will appreciate that there remains an issue connected with agenda item 35, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa", that has been evolving and that had not been finalized when we submitted the draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.16. Since the submission of that draft resolution, the Secretary-General has submitted a report on that question, and we have also had another report that is not reflected in the Secretary-General's report but has a bearing on this problem.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Since this matter is also being dealt with partly in the plenary, my delegation has tried to determine if perhaps, as a result of the action in plenary, it may not be necessary to take any further action in the First Committee. But, quite frankly, up till now we have not determined that the action in the plenary may render further action in the First Committee unnecessary.

I would therefore crave your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, and ask you to extend until Monday the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions, just in case it proves necessary. We may not have to take advantage of that indulgence if the plenary takes care of this preoccupation. On the other hand, if the matter is not completely taken care of in the plenary, we may need to consult and submit a very short draft resolution that will take account of the activities of the Secretary-General in relation to agenda item 35 and whatever further action may be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to respond immediately to the request of the representative of Nigeria.

At the very beginning of our work, I pointed out that I would be willing to be flexible, and I gave a definition of the word "flexibility". Fortunately, what Ambassador Adeniji has said falls within my definition of flexibility. He mentioned Monday. I have been hearing slight rumours about an extension of the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions, and the Bureau has met to give the matter some consideration. In the light of the request just made by the representative of Nigeria, I should like to say that, rather than making an exception for that one item, we may extend the deadline to Monday morning at 8 o'clock. I hate to force any delegation to work over the week end, but I should like once more to refer to the fact that we have had a number of meetings that had been intended for consultations and negotiations. I am sure they were so used, but I should like once again to reiterate that when time is available, if it is used effectively, that would make it easier for the Committee to go on with its work rather than its having to postpone certain draft resolutions, especially for reasons of lack of agreement on the context or language of such drafts.

I realize that these things will happen, and I am very pleased by, and appreciate, the support that members have been giving me. But I should like to

(The Chairman)

state that all draft resolutions should be presented by 8 a.m. on Monday, because I doubt that I shall be able to give a further extension, especially since we have already announced the deadlines for the submission of drafts for the remainder of our work.

The deadline has, then, been extended until Monday next at 8 a.m.

I now call upon the representative of Iraq, who wishes to introduce certain revisions to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12.

Mr. AL-ATIYYAH (Iraq): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12, after consultations with the other sponsors of this draft and further discussion with the Secretariat, and in the hope that we shall give the Secretariat and the qualified experts enough time to prepare a study on Israeli nuclear armament, we should like to introduce the following revisions to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12.

In operative paragraph 6, the words "thirty-fifth session" should be replaced by the words "thirty-sixth session".

A new operative paragraph 7 should be added, reading as follows:

"7. Requests the Secretary-General to submit a progress report on the work of the Group of Experts to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session".

Consequently, the present operative paragraph 7 will become operative paragraph 8.

These revisions are made to facilitate the work of the Secretary-General and the qualified experts and to give them enough time to prepare a thorough and objective study.

I should also like to say that the names of some countries are missing from the list of sponsors appearing in the document. Also, in the Arabic version, there is what is probably a misprint regarding Saudi Arabia and Syria.

The CHAIRMAN: In view of the remarks of the representative of Iraq, the draft resolution now carries the symbol A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1.

I should like once again to point out that the next date for voting is Wednesday, 21 November, when we hope to take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.2, L.4, L.12/Rev.1, L.13, L.14, L.15, L.16, L.17, L.19, L.20 and L.21. In addition, I would be willing to accept any other drafts that sponsors may deem to be ready for action.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): Since we shall deal with several draft resolutions the next time we meet to take decisions, I should like to take advantage of the time at our disposal now to make a short statement on agenda item 121, which is the subject of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1.

During the course of the debate, my delegation made a brief reference to the collaboration that exists between the Government of South Africa and Israel. We did so, of course, because of our preoccupation with the issue of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Reports about the possible acquisition of nuclear weapons - not just a capability - by Israel have appeared from time to time in the international press and in several journals. Those reports have become so persistent and some are so authoritative that we believe the United Nations cannot ignore them, particularly at this time. More than ever before, last year at its special session devoted to disarmament the international community analysed the danger posed to the world by nuclear armaments in particular. It affirmed that the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, ran counter to efforts to achieve further relaxation of international tension, establish international relations based on peaceful co-existence and trust among all States and develop broad international co-operation and understanding. The achievement of nuclear disarmament is therefore the most important priority item on the disarmament agenda.

Side by side with effective steps by the five nuclear-weapon States to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race and to embark upon the dismantling of their arsenals, it is also important in my delegation's view that no other State join the ranks of the nuclear-weapon States. The non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is therefore an essential ingredient in efforts to stem the danger posed by nuclear weapons.

The situation in regions such as the Middle East and southern Africa is volatile enough at present. Those are two areas where, owing to the policies of Israel, on the one hand, and South Africa on the other, continuous threats to international peace and security exist. It is absolutely clear that effective and durable solutions to the problems in those areas cannot be found in armed domination, or attempted armed domination, by some countries there over other countries.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Yet we see increasingly that, instead of embarking upon measures prescribed by the United Nations for the solution of the problems in the two areas, both Israel and South Africa have chosen the path of defiance. Part of their strategies appear to be nuclear blackmail of other States in the regions. The consequences for international peace and security that will result from the introduction of nuclear weapons in the Middle East and Africa, especially by any of the countries in those regions, are so grave that the United Nations would be committing a grave dereliction of duty were it not to do all in its power to prevent such an eventuality.

In spite of their protestations, Israel and South Africa have refused to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, notwithstanding the fact that other States in the Middle East and Africa are parties to it and have thereby renounced the acquisition of nuclear weapons. According to all the facts available, Israel has a nuclear programme far in advance of any other State in the Middle East region - a programme that should therefore be subject to full-scope safeguards in order to ensure that it is not being diverted to the production of nuclear weapons.

That is why my delegation believes that the question of Israel's nuclear-weapon capability deserves to be studied, because of the concern of the international community with the issue of non-proliferation. We believe therefore that the draft resolution which has been submitted under this agenda item is timely and my delegation will support it when it comes before the Committee for a decision.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.