



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 34TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MULLOY (Ireland)
(Vice-Chairman)

later: Mr. NAIK (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

Draft resolutions were introduced by:

Mr. Thunborg (Sweden) - A/C.1/35/L.26
Mr. Garcia Robles (Mexico) - A/C.1/35/L.21

PROGRAMME OF WORK

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/35/PV.34
19 November 1980

ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The names of five representatives - those of India, the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden and Mexico - are inscribed on the list of speakers for this meeting in connexion with the introduction of draft resolutions that have already been submitted. At this time, however, the first speaker on the list, the representative of India, is not yet present, and unless any of the other representatives listed to speak is prepared to do so now I am afraid I shall have to suspend the meeting until the representative of India has arrived.

In doing so I can only appeal to my colleagues to try to respect the tight restraints of our time-table as we near the end of our work in dealing with draft resolutions on disarmament.

The meeting was suspended at 3.15 p.m. and resumed at 3.25 p.m.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): In the statement that I made on behalf of my delegation in the general debate a few weeks ago I discussed a number of nuclear items on our agenda, but I also stated that I would not discuss nuclear-weapon-free zones at that time since I intended to do so during the second phase of our work, that is, during the debate on the draft resolutions. Today we are at the end of that second phase and I now wish to make a statement on behalf of my delegation regarding nuclear-weapon-free zones in general and with reference in particular to some of the nuclear-weapon-free zones mentioned in draft resolutions that in the meantime have been submitted to us.

The question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world has been the subject of discussion in the General Assembly and elsewhere on more than one occasion. The Final Document of the first special session on disarmament addressed itself to nuclear-weapon-free zones in paragraphs 60 and 64.

This year again the General Assembly is faced with draft resolutions on this subject, in particular with reference to the Middle East in documents A/C.1/35/L.6 and L.8 and to South Asia in document A/C.1/35/L.3. We therefore wish to spell out the basic attitude of the Netherlands towards the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones in general, and our attitude towards the proposed nuclear-weapon-free zones in particular derives from those general views.

The Netherlands considers the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones as highly desirable for more than one reason. In the first place, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is obviously a positive step in the context of our efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

A second and equally important consideration is that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone would greatly enhance the stability and security of the region in question by removing the threat of the introduction and use of nuclear weapons in the region. As a consequence this might, in its turn, have the further stabilizing effect of improving the relationships between the nations of the region, thus reducing the incentives for a potential arms race in the conventional field. Furthermore, it would contribute significantly to the efforts to arrive at world-wide nuclear disarmament. My Government subscribes to all these objectives and, indeed, considers all of them highly desirable.

Why then, we may ask ourselves, with all these obvious advantages does it in practice appear to be so difficult to set up nuclear-weapon-free zones, and why can we so far point only to one such nuclear-weapon-free zone, that of Latin America? And even in that case, the treaty concerned, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, has not been signed by all countries of the region and is not yet fully in force.

The answer to that question seems to be that the setting up of a nuclear-weapon-free zone depends on a number of conditions which, if not complied with, would render the effort fruitless. I do not intend to enter now into a profound analysis of all the aspects involved, but I do wish to mention four significant elements, and those are geographic delimitation, participation, verification and, finally, the position of the nuclear-weapon States outside the zone.

As to geographic delimitation, it is obvious that the exact boundaries of a nuclear-weapon-free zone cannot be chosen at random, but rather are to be determined by the States concerned. Constructive proposals should take into full account the political and military realities of any given area.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

As to the participation of countries in a nuclear-weapon-free zone - that is, the second element I mentioned - it is first of all important that the initiative for proposing the establishment of the zone be taken by States from the region concerned and freely arrived at among the States concerned in accordance with paragraph 60 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament. Secondly, it is of course indispensable that all countries of the region, at least all militarily important countries and those advanced in the field of nuclear technology, are willing to participate. If this condition is not met, serious discussions on establishing such a zone cannot be expected. If nevertheless in such a case the Netherlands votes in favour of a particular resolution, we do so because in our view the proposal should deserve consideration by the countries directly concerned. As demonstrated in the case of the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America, an essential element of a nuclear-weapon-free zone would be adequate verification procedures on the peaceful application of nuclear energy. As to the position of nuclear-weapon States outside the region concerned, it is obvious that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone supposes unambiguous negative security guarantees for the countries in the zone involved.

Here I should mention that while the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones appears to be difficult enough in regions which are in fact so far free of nuclear weapons, the proclamation of a particular region that does already have nuclear weapons is obviously infinitely more complex.

In those regions where nuclear weapons form part of the military balance and where therefore the security of all or some of the component States is involved, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, however desirable in theory, will be extremely difficult to achieve and can only be envisaged as a goal to be pursued in the context of all-embracing mutual security arrangements.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

If therefore in our order of priorities we accept what is not only desirable, but also attainable as the objectives to be pursued in the first place, then we should strive to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to those regions which are still free of nuclear weapons, and we should encourage and help the nations in those regions to enter into negotiations in order to set up nuclear-weapon-free zones.

We would hope that this could be achieved in Africa, in the Middle East, in South Asia and in South-East Asia, thus forming a contiguous zone matching the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America.

I should now like to say a few words about the nuclear-weapon-free zones that are proposed in the draft resolutions so far submitted. The Netherlands welcomes the fact that with regard to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East there appears to be significant progress this year. We are gratified that draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6, introduced by Egypt, might be passed by consensus, as stated the other day by the representative of Israel. Although there are differences between the approaches of the countries concerned, we welcome the fact that participation of all countries concerned has been brought nearer, a principle to which we attach much importance, as I stated in my general remarks. Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.8, introduced by the delegation of Israel, is also considered by my delegation as a constructive contribution to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

We will also support draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.3 containing a proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, although it is clear that some of the elements I mentioned before, such as geographic delimitation and full participation by the States concerned, still present serious difficulties. With our positive attitude towards the draft resolution, we wish to place on record our support for efforts aimed at keeping the region free of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

This seems all the more necessary in view of reports on possible developments according to which this situation might change in the not too distant future.

These considerations will guide my delegation in its attitude towards the draft resolutions which have already been submitted to this Committee or those yet to be submitted.

Mr. MISHRA (India): As this is the first time I am speaking in this Committee this year, may I add to those which have already been given by my delegation my personal congratulations to you, Sir. I should also like to wish you and the other officers of the Committee great success in guiding the deliberations of this Committee this year.

I should like to address myself to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean (A/35/29).

In view of the great importance of the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace contained in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI), India has been participating in the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee ever since its inception. We welcomed the expansion of the Ad Hoc Committee consequent to the adoption of resolution 34/80 B last year in the hope that the addition of new members would go a long way towards fulfilling the Committee's general mandate as well as the specific task of completing preparations for the convening of the conference on the Indian Ocean to be held in 1981 in Sri Lanka.

This year, however, the meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee have been noticeably different from those of previous years. To an extent this is understandable, given the expanded composition of the Committee. There is, nevertheless, an increasing perception that the Ad Hoc Committee is being diverted from both its general mandate and its traditional moorings by the introduction into its work of a whole series of extraneous issues. Even a cursory review of the deliberations of the Committee would bear out this impression.

Early this year, the Ad Hoc Committee started with what purported to be informal technical discussions on issues relating to preparations for the Conference. We were informed that those technical discussions were specifically related to the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, but the actual issues raised in the discussions went far afield. Despite the difficulties that plagued the work of the Ad Hoc Committee early this year, an informal list of topics was eventually agreed upon and read out by the Chairman under the general title of "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

(Mr. Mishra, India)

But then the attempt to divert the attention of the Committee continued also in the July-August meetings, where in the course of substantive discussions we encountered a further effort by delegations at turning a Nelson's eye on the 1971 Declaration, concentrating instead upon so-called regional disarmament issues. On that occasion, my delegation clearly emphasized to the Committee that if it is to continue under its existing mandate, this should clearly be understood as consisting of the implementation of the 1971 Declaration.

It is, of course, up to individual delegations to decide whether they should seek to revise the existing mandate of the Committee or whether they should set out a new mandate. In such an event, however, a new committee would have to be constituted under a new resolution, and my delegation would then decide whether or not it would support such a new resolution or participate in the work of such a new committee. As it stands, however, the consensus draft resolution recommended by the Committee this year renews the general mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee as defined by the relevant resolutions. It is our understanding, therefore, that the mandate of the Committee has not been changed.

With regard to the question of the conference on the Indian Ocean decided upon in resolution 34/80 B last year, here again we notice a degree of dissimulation on the part of certain delegations that is, to say the least, curious. While there has been no delegation in this Committee which has openly or directly indicated that it would not favour the convening of the conference on the Indian Ocean in 1981 at Colombo, Sri Lanka, the chief reasons for the difficulties of the Ad Hoc Committee in arriving at a consensus during the July-August session stemmed from a lack of readiness on the part of several delegations to commit themselves unequivocally to the holding of such a conference.

(Mr. Mishra, India)

My delegation wishes to reaffirm that the principal thrust of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee throughout the years of its existence has been its preoccupation with the increasing threat posed by the presence in the Indian Ocean of the warships of the great Powers and the panoply of their military might and mettle conceived in the context of their confrontation. There are studies prepared by the Secretary-General of such great-Power military presence in all its aspects, and with special reference to their naval deployment. They can be found in the records of the Ad Hoc Committee, and they have been referred to in resolutions of the General Assembly.

These are facts that cannot be denied or wished away. For the large multitude of the peoples of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean which after a tenacious struggle, have secured the emancipation of their land from colonial bondage, it is unthinkable that a new kind of overlordship should be exercised by those same Powers from a distance of a few miles outside their territorial waters. Whether such control is exercised through frigates, aircraft carriers or island or continental bases, they fulfil the same functions, perpetrate the same tyranny and contribute to the same grand design, namely, the perpetuation of spheres of interest or military-economic outposts to serve the ambitions and interests of Governments harking back to an earlier era.

With reference to the draft resolution which has been worked out by the Ad Hoc Committee, my delegation would like, in the first instance, to convey its congratulations to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Ambassador Balasubramaniam, for his painstaking and untiring efforts in guiding it towards a consensus text. There were several occasions when the differences appeared unbridgeable, but both as a result of his own personal efforts and through the "Friends of the Chairman", of which my delegation had the privilege of being a member, it was possible to arrive at a highest common denominator of agreement among the various positions. This consensus now appears under part III of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

(Mr. Mishra, India)

My delegation, like most of the other non-aligned countries, would have preferred a draft resolution patterned on the Non-Aligned text presented at the August meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee. It is that text which corresponds most faithfully to the position which we have held consistently in the Ad Hoc Committee over the years. We are conscious that in the process of trying to obtain a consensus there has been a severe dilution of the non-aligned position. Some of those concessions have been made in a spirit of compromise and in order to facilitate agreement on the part of the permanent members of the Security Council and others who have recently joined the Ad Hoc Committee.

(Mr. Mishra, India)

While saying this, however, my delegation would like to make the following points in clarification of our understanding of the consensus as it has emerged in paragraph 30 of the report:

First, the draft resolution clearly and categorically relates to the "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". This fact appears in the very title of the draft resolution.

Secondly, we consider that the decision taken by the General Assembly in resolution 34/80 B to convene a conference on the Indian Ocean during 1981 in Colombo stands re-affirmed in the present draft resolution, and all efforts should now be made by members of the Ad Hoc Committee to see that the Conference is held within that time frame and not to scuttle it.

Thirdly, my delegation is convinced that the continued escalation of great-Power military presence in the Indian Ocean and the deteriorating political and security situation, far from serving as an excuse to postpone the Conference, only give greater urgency to the need for its convening.

Fourthly, the question of harmonizing differing approaches, which has been referred to in the draft resolution, should relate to the modalities of implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. These approaches should not be divorced from, or be in contradistinction to, the 1971 Declaration.

Next, we firmly oppose the introduction of extraneous elements into the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, either in the substantive discussions or in the preparatory phase, in the form of pre-conditions to the convening of meetings and the like. These issues should be dealt with in other forums of the United Nations, and not in the Ad Hoc Committee, which has a specific mandate to fulfil.

Finally, we continue to hope that the preparatory meetings envisaged for 1981 will be utilized in order to arrive at a harmonization of positions on these questions, and not face further dilatory efforts on the part of individual delegations.

While we are naturally conscious of the need for adequate preparations for the Indian Ocean Conference and for detailed clarification of all the issues involved, we should like to make it clear that we do not see the preparatory work of this Committee in terms of similar preparatory work in the context of security

(Mr. Mishra, India)

and co-operation conferences in other parts of the world. To my delegation, such a parallel is not self-evident, in so far as there is already a basic blueprint for our tasks in the case of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. That blueprint is the Declaration itself contained in resolution 2832 (XXVI). Any suggestion for the setting up of arbitrary baskets or multistage approaches will, to our mind, result in a dispersion of efforts and will not be altogether constructive.

As we have stated before, it is our hope that, with the participation of the permanent members of the Security Council in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, we shall now be in a position to proceed expeditiously towards the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace as originally envisaged by most of the non-aligned littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean in 1971. We are firmly convinced that such a development would strengthen international peace and security and, in the long run, be in the interest of the great Powers themselves. If anything, the developments of the past weeks, months and years should indicate that the great Powers stand as much to lose from a breakdown of the fabric of peace in this region and to gain from international co-operation as do the weaker States. The transition from an old order based on colonial domination, imperial protectorates and great-Power rivalries to a new one founded on sovereign equality, independence and international co-operation would be in the true interest of the entire world community.

Mr. FRELLESVIG (Denmark): In our statement in this Committee on 24 October we introduced a draft resolution on the carrying out of a study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces. The draft resolution is contained in document A/C.1/35/L.2. As stated on that occasion, it was our hope that those countries which had reservations over the idea of such a study when it was presented to the United Nations Disarmament Commission in May this year would now be in a position to go along with the study.

The informal consultations we have had with other member countries during the last three weeks have revealed wide support for the Danish proposal, which we highly appreciate. At the same time, valuable suggestions for amendments to the text as contained in document A/C.1/35/L.2 have been presented to us. Consequently, we have decided to introduce two amendments to the text of the draft resolution.

These two amendments are contained in the revised draft resolution, document A/C.1/35/L.2/Rev.1, which will be distributed shortly.

I should like to comment briefly upon those two amendments.

The third preambular paragraph is a new paragraph, which reads:

"Reaffirming the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, regarding priorities in the disarmament negotiations."

By introducing that reference to the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament the General Assembly reaffirms its decision on the priority items of the disarmament negotiations, among which is the item on conventional disarmament. At the same time, the General Assembly reaffirms that nothing shall preclude States from negotiating all priority items concurrently.

Operative paragraph 4 in its revised version reads:

"Further requests the Secretary-General to submit a progress report of the study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and a final report to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly."

In the original version we proposed that a final report should be presented to the second special session on disarmament in 1982 in order to serve as a basis for discussion. Many members of this Committee have convinced us that though this was, of course, desirable, it was nevertheless hardly possible for practical reasons. By changing the time-table so that a progress report will be presented to the second special session on disarmament and a final report submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, we have tried to accommodate the need for a report as a basis for consideration at the second special session on disarmament and, at the same time, the expert group is allowed reasonable time for a more comprehensive study.

We hope that with those two amendments the study will be approved by this Committee and the General Assembly.

Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden): It is rather commonplace to say in this Committee that measures to eliminate the danger of a nuclear war are the most urgent of our tasks in the field of disarmament. If such statements are to be taken seriously, it follows that in order to carry out its work this Committee needs such factual information as can be obtained on nuclear weapons, in particular on the size and composition of nuclear arsenals, on their effects should they ever be used, on the strategic doctrines of the nuclear-weapon States and on the trends that may lead us to conclusions about the future technological developments as well as about the strategic and security implications of those developments.

It was with such considerations in mind that Sweden took the initiative, at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, for a comprehensive study on nuclear weapons, to focus on those questions that I have just enumerated. The study is now before the Committee in the form of a report by the Secretary-General, contained in document A/35/392.

I had the privilege of being the chairman of the Group of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General to carry out the study mandated through resolution 33/91 D. I shall not attempt to summarize the contents of the study. I should, however, wish to make a few observations.

First, it is important to note that the report of the Group of Experts was unanimously approved, that experts, serving in their personal capacities but nevertheless representing a wide spectrum of political background, could arrive at a common view over the whole range of issues dealt with in the report.

My second point concerns the very essence of our responsibilities as the main Committee for questions relating to international security, including disarmament matters. The reason why we have no choice but to find our way to a system of international security other than the one based on the ongoing arms race is not only that the balance of terror is precarious because of the risk of human error or technical malfunctioning leading to nuclear war by mistake, or that immense resources are squandered on military expenditures. There is also a distinct danger that technological developments will sooner or later upset the balance of terror -- or be perceived by one side as threatening to do so in favour of the other side.

(Mr. Thunborg, Sweden)

Should that day arrive, the present system of international security will have failed. The very real danger that this will happen is brought out in the report. Consequently, a system of mutual deterrence and a continued arms race cannot be relied upon for the maintenance of international security and the preservation of world peace.

Let me add as my third point that I believe the discussion in the report of the probable effects of a nuclear war has its main value in the rather detailed and reasoned description, which goes beyond the abstract and generalized treatment that is often given to this subject.

There is no task more urgent than contributing in every way possible to the creation of the political will that can bring about a real effort to seek an alternative to the arms race as a basis for the system of international security. One of the ways to foster this crucial political will is to encourage the awareness among the general public of the danger of the arms race and of the need for disarmament measures. For that reason, a document such as the Study on Nuclear Weapons ought to be made easily accessible to the public and its dissemination should be promoted by Governments and non-governmental organizations.

I have the honour, on behalf of the delegations of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Ghana, India, Ireland, Mexico, Pakistan, Romania and Yugoslavia, as well as on behalf of my own country, Sweden, to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.26. The draft resolution, in essence, takes note of the Secretary-General's report entitled "Comprehensive study on nuclear weapons" and commends it to the attention of Governments and of the Committee on Disarmament.

When the report is issued as a United Nations publication, it should, according to the draft resolution be issued in as many languages as is practicable. Governments would be asked to contribute further to the wide distribution of the report, as would the agencies of the United Nations system and interested non-governmental organizations.

It would be my expectation that the proposals contained in the draft resolution will meet with the approval of all Members of this Committee and that the draft resolution will be approved by consensus.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish):

Before saying a few words to introduce document A/C.1/35/L.21, I should like to state that, in my opinion, it is necessary to publish a revised version of this draft resolution for technical reasons. A number of verb tenses have been changed in the Spanish and English texts, I know not by whom. I shall give one instance, so that members may understand what I have in mind.

In the fourth paragraph of the preamble of the Spanish text, the word "eran" should read "son". In the English text, the word "are" is correct. There are, as I say, two or three other changed verb tenses which should be corrected so that these two texts shall be strictly in accord with the original versions given to the Secretariat.

Having made that clarification, I should now like to introduce the draft resolution on behalf of the delegations of Algeria, Argentina, Burma, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslavia, and the delegation of my own country, Mexico.

I shall begin by saying that the subject of this draft resolution could be compared to an accordion. It could be treated, as we have endeavoured to treat it, in the most concise manner possible, but it could also be drawn out over 10, 12 or more pages.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

There is a wealth of background material as well as implications involved in the subject, but we have tried to confine ourselves to the most relevant and essential points.

In the first preambular paragraph we recall something that is to be found in many paragraphs of the Final Document of the special session but which, in essence, can be stated by saying, as we do, that at that special session the General Assembly decided that effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war had the highest priority and that it was essential to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of war involving nuclear weapons.

Once that fact had been clearly articulated, it seemed advisable also to explain with equal clarity what is now to be found in the second preambular paragraph, namely that the General Assembly recognized that the achievement of nuclear disarmament would require the urgent negotiation of agreements at appropriate stages and with adequate measures of verification satisfactory to the States concerned, and the results should be pursued in each one of those stages. All of this is made quite clear in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly.

From that point we moved on to the wording in resolution 34/83 B, the last resolution on this subject adopted by the General Assembly, in which it reiterated its conviction that the Committee on disarmament, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating body, should become urgently and most directly involved in substantive negotiations on priority disarmament questions.

Bearing in mind that the Assembly decided that effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war had the highest priority; that it recognized that those measures required the urgent negotiation of agreements at appropriate stages; and that directly thereafter it was reiterated that the Committee on Disarmament, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating body, as defined by the General Assembly, should become urgently and most directly involved in substantive negotiations on those priority questions, we come to the next step.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Taken by the so-called Group of 21, that step was to try to indicate the best available machinery for achieving the desired results. That was done by the Group of 21 in working paper CD/64 of 27 February 1980 referred to in the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. The Group of 21 said that working groups were the best available machinery for conduct of concrete negotiations within the Committee.

The purpose of the last preambular paragraph is to refer to the experience of the Committee on Disarmament at its latest session this year. From that session it emerged that the performance of the four ad hoc working groups established by the Committee on 17 March 1980 to deal, respectively, with the items relating to chemical weapons, radiological weapons, the so-called negative guarantees and the comprehensive programme on disarmament demonstrated the validity of the assertions of the Group of 21. Those working groups did in fact produce positive results, which suggests that similar procedures should be used in the future for those items, especially those requiring priority attention.

On the basis of those preambular paragraphs the sponsors of the draft resolution suggest to the Assembly that it urge the Committee on Disarmament to establish, upon initiation of its 1981 session, an ad hoc working group on the item which in its agenda for 1979 and 1980 was entitled "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament".

The sponsors suggest to the Assembly, in operative paragraph 2, that it should consider that in the light of the exchange of views held on that subject during the last two annual sessions of the Committee, with which all Members of the Assembly are familiar from the reports of the Committee and the annexes thereto, it would be advisable for the working group to begin by addressing the question of the elaboration and clarification of the stages of nuclear disarmament envisaged in paragraph 50 of the Final Document, including identification of the responsibilities of the nuclear-weapon States and the role of the non-nuclear-weapon States in the process of achieving nuclear disarmament.

The sponsors of the draft resolution venture to hope that it will command general support among members of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: We have noted the discrepancies in the text of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.21 pointed out by the representative of Mexico. Since the original text of the draft resolution was in English and Spanish, the Secretariat will see to it that the two versions are brought into accord.

(The Chairman)

As no other representative wishes to speak at this stage I would inform the Committee of the following additional sponsors of draft resolutions: Mozambique and Yemen, A/C.1/35/L.18; Yemen, A/C.1/35/L.20; Yemen and Qatar, A/C.1/35/L.22, Qatar, A/C.1/35/L.19; Mali, A/C.1/35/L.25.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: At our last two meetings a list was given of a number of draft resolutions that will be put to a vote beginning on Thursday, 20 November. After consultations with members of the Committee, I have to announce that the following should be added to the list: draft resolutions A/C.1/35/L.12, L.21, L.29, L.6, L.8 and L.18.

Accordingly, the complete list of draft resolutions on which we will be taking decisions from Thursday is: A/C.1/35/L.7, on preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament; A/C.1/35/L.9 and L.10, on the reduction of military budgets; A/C.1/35/L.11, on confidence-building measures; A/C.1/35/L.13, on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present; A/C.1/35/L.14, on the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament; A/C.1/35/L.15, on the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons; A/C.1/35/L.16, on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security; A/C.1/35/L.17/Rev.1, on a study on all aspects of regional disarmament; A/C.1/35/L.19, on a study on the relationship between disarmament and international security; A/C.1/35/L.12 and L.21, on nuclear weapons in all aspects; A/C.1/35/L.29, on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 34/71 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America; A/C.1/35/L.6 and L.8, on the establishment of a nuclear weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East; and A/C.1/35/L.18, on the Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.