

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1846th  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 8 December 1971,  
at 10.30 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 27 ( <i>concluded</i> ):	
General and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament	
Discussion of draft resolutions	1
Agenda item 28 ( <i>continued</i> ):	
Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament	
Discussion of draft resolutions	9

**Chairman: Mr. Milko TARABANOV (Bulgaria).**

**AGENDA ITEM 27 (*concluded*)\***

**General and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8328, A/8337, A/8457, A/C.1/1018, A/C.1/L.588, 589 and 591 (Rev.1))**

**DISCUSSION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS**

1. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): The Committee has before it three draft resolutions: first, the draft resolution submitted by Malta and contained in document A/C.1/L.588; secondly, the 12-Power draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.589; and thirdly, the revised four-Power draft contained in document A/C.1/L.591/Rev.1.

2. Before I give the floor to delegations wishing to speak, I should like to offer an explanation. As you know, it was decided at the beginning of the work at this session not to hold meetings when the General Assembly was dealing with political matters, so that there should be no conflict between the work of the First Committee and of the Assembly. However, although today there is a meeting on the question of the Middle East, as yesterday we were compelled to cancel our meeting because of the extraordinary situation that arose by reason of the discussions, which ended late in the night, on the situation in the Indian subcontinent, we decided to hold a meeting this morning to vote on the draft resolutions submitted. Later we shall see how we can reorganize our work for this afternoon. If I hear no objection we shall continue with this meeting and vote on the draft resolutions before us.

3. There being no objection, we shall proceed with our debate and I shall call on delegations who wish to make statements on the various draft resolutions. I call on the representative of Ireland who wishes to introduce revised draft resolution A/C.1/L.591.

\* Resumed from the 1842nd meeting.

4. Mr. RONAN (Ireland): My delegation is greatly obliged to you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity you have afforded us of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/L.591/Rev.1 under the item of general and complete disarmament, which we have the honour of presenting on behalf of the delegations of Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan and of my own delegation.

5. The basic purpose of the draft resolution, as stated in its fourth preambular paragraph, is that public opinion should be adequately informed about the problems of the arms race and of disarmament so that it might bring its influence to bear on strengthening disarmament efforts. People everywhere yearn for peace but the armaments race, both nuclear and conventional, creates means whereby unprecedented devastation might be inflicted on the entire world. The peoples of all countries should come to realize this and the necessity of achieving disarmament priorities and objectives.

6. During the last decade or two, the field of disarmament has become very complex. In addition to general and complete disarmament there are all the problems related to grappling with nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, conventional armaments, verification and control and more than a dozen collateral measures of disarmament. It has also come to be increasingly recognized that there is an organic link between disarmament, security and economic development. The subject area has become so large and so involved with technological progress and with political, military and economic questions that it has become difficult even for experts to keep up with it.

7. The work of scientific and other expert groups has been of great value in informing not only members of the public but also other experts and members of Governments. I need only refer to the very useful work performed by the Pugwash meetings and the Stockholm International Peace and Research Institute (SIPRI).

8. Moreover, the General Assembly has itself called on the Secretary-General to undertake a number of studies with the assistance of consultant experts. These studies have been invaluable to the Governments of all Members of the United Nations and have served to promote both a fuller understanding of the various problems studied and of possible ways of coping with them.

9. An encouraging development of the last decade was the establishment with a number of Government administrations of arms control and disarmament agencies and study groups. This development has undoubtedly contributed towards the achievement of some of the arms limitation treaties concluded during the decade.

10. During the present decade of the 1970s, which has been designated a Disarmament Decade, the problems of the arms race and of disarmament are likely to become more complex and even more urgent. It is, therefore, indispensable that the best brains in government and in the universities and academic institutions be mobilized to work on these problems and to contribute to a better informed public opinion concerning them.

11. The need for so informing and mobilizing public opinion has, of course, been the concern of the General Assembly previously. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.591/Rev.1 would, therefore, in its first preambular paragraph, recall General Assembly resolution 1149 (XII) on collective action to inform and enlighten the peoples of the world as to the dangers of the armaments race and particularly as to the destructive effects of modern weapons. In that resolution the General Assembly considered it desirable to seek ways and means of organizing an effective and continuing publicity campaign on a world-wide scale, under the auspices of the United Nations and disregarding all ideological or political considerations, and requested the Disarmament Commission to make its recommendations. However, the Disarmament Commission did not meet at that time, and the matter was not pursued further.

12. The second preambular paragraph would recall General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV), which declared the decade of the 1970s as a Disarmament Decade and which, *inter alia*, requested the Secretary-General and Governments to publicize the Decade by all appropriate means at their disposal in order to acquaint public opinion with its purposes and objectives and with the negotiations and developments related thereto.

13. As a corollary, the third preambular paragraph would recall General Assembly resolution 2661 C (XXV) which, *inter alia*, in the context of the Disarmament Decade, recommended to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that it take into account in its further work and its negotiations the comprehensive programme of disarmament contained in document A/8191, as well as other disarmament suggestions presented or to be presented in the future.

14. In operative paragraph 1 the draft would affirm the value of conferences of experts and scientists from various countries on the problems of the arms race and disarmament. Such conferences have been a heartening feature of recent years. By achieving wide publicity they have focused much attention on the whole subject.

15. Operative paragraph 2 would express support for the practice of commissioning the Secretary-General to prepare, with the assistance of experts, authoritative reports on concrete questions relating to the arms race and disarmament. The value of the series of such reports prepared over the past decade is generally if not universally acknowledged. The wide dissemination of these reports is among the best methods of keeping public opinion informed of armaments problems and disarmament developments.

16. Operative paragraph 3 touches on another means of publicity when it would simply declare that progress towards general and complete disarmament would be

promoted if universities and academic institutions in all countries would establish continuing courses and seminars to study problems of the arms race. The role of educators and opinion-makers in this connexion is an important one which should receive every encouragement.

17. Consequently, the draft would request the Secretary-General to bring the resolution to the attention of all Members of the United Nations and also to the attention of UNESCO with a view to its wide publication and dissemination. As it is in close touch with educational and academic institutions, and through its National Commissions, UNESCO would be very well placed to promote the purposes of the resolution. In fact, the draft is very much in accord with the work of UNESCO on the strengthening of the bases for peace. Here I would refer to resolution 8 adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its sixteenth session in 1970 on UNESCO's contribution to peace and its tasks with respect to the elimination of colonialism and the utilization of UNESCO's programme as a means of strengthening co-operation between European States in the interests of peace and security in Europe. In that resolution, the Director-General was invited to strengthen UNESCO's action for peace, *inter alia*, by studies on information media, including the use of information media in favour of peace.

18. I would also refer to the monthly publication *The UNESCO Courier*, which from time to time carries very useful articles on important aspects of the arms race, disarmament and peace research. The United Nations has a good ally in UNESCO for dissemination of information and the promotion of research in that whole field. I understand that a representative of UNESCO is present at our meeting, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if there is no objection you might invite him briefly to address the Committee on the draft resolution under discussion from the point of view of his organization.

19. I might mention, too, that the contents of our draft resolution would be complementary to the item submitted to the General Assembly on the initiative of Belgium, entitled "Scientific work on peace research", which is the subject of the 15-Power draft resolution in document A/L.645 and Add.1 and 2,<sup>1</sup> and also to the work of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and those specialized agencies which are active in the field of peace research.

20. Finally, I wish to stress on behalf of the sponsors our view that continued and sustained publicity is necessary, particularly during this Disarmament Decade, to disseminate the facts about the arms race and efforts to achieve disarmament, so that the peoples and Governments of the world will be in a better position to understand the problems and to influence solutions.

21. The draft resolution focuses attention on the continuing need for enlightening and informing public opinion in this field and on certain methods of doing so. We consider it timely and appropriate that the General Assembly should formally endorse the value of these methods—namely, expert conferences, expert reports by the Secre-

<sup>1</sup> Subsequently became resolution 2817 (XXVI).

tary-General and courses and seminars of academic bodies on the problems of the arms race—and so up-date the record of its position on informing public opinion concerning this vital question. No expenditure of United Nations funds is involved, apart from the normal cost of reproducing and disseminating the resolution. Accordingly, on behalf of the sponsors, my delegation would commend the draft resolution for the support of all members; it is certainly not controversial and it accords with the repeated views expressed by all delegations here.

22. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Ireland has suggested that I should give the floor to the representative of UNESCO. If there is no objection, I am prepared when the time comes to call on him, if he wishes to speak.

23. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation did not think it necessary to participate in the general debate on disarmament—not because of any lack of interest in a matter rightly regarded as the most important of all those our own suggestions and initiatives may enrich and those that the great military Powers may take, either in the Committee on Disarmament or in bilateral talks—but because on a number of occasions my delegation had already, without any possible ambiguity, expressed its position on nuclear disarmament and on general and complete disarmament, on partial and collateral measures, on concerted action among the great Powers, and on the role which should be played by the small and medium-sized Powers in those joint efforts.

24. Similarly, there is no new element in the world disarmament situation at the moment, generally speaking, that would justify our taking new or original positions. Nevertheless, my delegation would like to clarify its position on various points that we regard either as controversial or as being the subject of near unanimity.

25. I should like to begin by speaking about the draft resolutions on the question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. My delegation was among the sponsors of two draft resolutions, those contained in documents A/C.1/L.596 and 579/Rev.1. There is no need, therefore, for me to explain my delegation's affirmative vote on those two draft resolutions. Nevertheless, I should like to offer a clarification: my delegation is convinced that unanimous support could have been secured for those two draft resolutions had the question of verification found its rightful place in the convention annexed to document A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1.

26. Indeed, we have noted that in all disarmament problems discussions have always been brought up short on the means of control. We do not doubt the good faith of any of the parties, but the stake is too important for solid guarantees not to be necessary for all concerned. We do not think it is sufficient to emphasize the importance of verification; it is also necessary to specify its modalities in a sufficiently precise and factual manner in order to create a climate of real confidence. We believe that it is necessary to proceed to a stage-by-stage destruction, with verification that each preceding stage has been carried out, and that at the end of the period of destruction periodic or emergency verifications should be authorized.

27. Our acceptance of the draft convention does not mean that we have renounced that important provision on the modalities of verifications, and we have not lost hope that it will be possible to provide for them adequately, either in an annexed convention or in a protocol when the question of chemical weapons has found a definitive solution.

28. As regards the social and economic consequences of the arms race, my delegation can only welcome the new Romanian initiative [A/C.1/L.593]. It will be recalled that at the twenty-third and twenty-fourth sessions my delegation proposed that the General Assembly should adopt a practical measure which would enable all countries—and particularly the developing countries—to benefit from the resources, or a part of the resources, which would be liberated by effective disarmament measures.

29. At that time many countries reproached us with having issued a further substantive appeal to which certain States would be unable to subscribe because of obligations already undertaken either bilaterally or multilaterally. Accordingly, pending the adoption of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade, we agreed to postpone consideration of our proposal in the expectation that firm commitments would be undertaken by the developed countries. However, we see more and more clearly that the commitments are becoming “moral obligations” without binding force.

30. We are nevertheless happy to see that the idea we initiated has been fortunately taken up by the Romanian delegation, and we hope that in the course of this decade—the so-called disarmament and development decade—it will be possible to study to what extent, or better in what proportion, the reduction of military expenditures and the adoption of effective measures with a view to general and complete disarmament can promote the economic and social development of all countries and increase the resources available to the developing countries.

31. We shall be tireless in pursuing the appeal we launched four years ago, convinced as we are that when peace and security are about to be ensured generous minds will be found to recall that no security, no peace will be valid until they have been given adequate expression in economic and social development.

32. The last point of my statement concerns the Ceylonese proposal regarding the Indian Ocean [A/8492 and Add.1]. It would be paradoxical for a country whose 5,000 kilometres of coastline are washed by the Indian Ocean not to be interested in the question. If we have not intervened until now it was to enable the delegation in question to carry on its consultations in full tranquillity and quiet without being in any way embarrassed by differences of view which might emerge among the littoral countries themselves.

33. In order to dispel any ambiguity I should state that my delegation is in favour of the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. I might even go so far as to say that we accept the concept of the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean, but within the context, of course, of general, complete and simultaneous disarmament. That is why we welcomed with sympathetic interest the initiative of the

Ceylonese Government. The concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace does honour to its promoters, and it is a concept that should be understood within the context of collateral disarmament measures which my delegation has always supported. For we believe that such measures strengthen the small progress made towards real disarmament and may serve as a framework for more comprehensive agreements. Besides, if only through their cumulative effects these measures are likely to create a climate propitious for genuine negotiations on general and complete disarmament.

34. Nevertheless, in the present situation we must study the proposal to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace in the light of a number of factors. First, the riparian countries, with a few exceptions and because of a lack of information and documentation, are poorly informed as to the exact nature and gravity of great-Power confrontations in the Indian Ocean, with their motives, consequences and prolongations; secondly, any riparian country, I take it, must be able to concern itself with its national defence and enjoy the right to assure it by whatever means that country finds most appropriate, as well as the right to collective defence as established under Article 51 of the Charter; thirdly, a proposal—even from the international organ par excellence, the United Nations—must take into account the commitments freely undertaken, in regard to co-operation in the field of defence, by riparian countries vis-à-vis a State or a community of States to which they may themselves belong; fourthly, national interest or interests regarded as vital by the riparian States may dictate that the notion of national jurisdiction—which must necessarily be borne in mind in the delimitation of the zone of peace—should be dissociated from the more restrictive notion of territorial waters; fifthly, the proposal itself should be studied in the more general framework of the up-dating of the law of the sea, for which a conference is scheduled.

35. The result is that for us the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean is an objective to be attained. It must be effected with the consent of all the geographically and legally riparian States with the co-operation of all those who have not inconsiderable interests in the region. If we recognize that it is an objective, a formal declaration by the General Assembly will serve neither our intentions nor our interests. Far be it from us to denigrate a declaration of the General Assembly, but is it not true that if such a declaration were to be adopted the very conditions of its adoption would make it an ineffective instrument?

36. As we see it, there is need to study in precise and detailed fashion the means of attaining this objective—not in themselves, but within the framework of the prevailing situation and that of general, complete and simultaneous disarmament. It follows that we must choose the path to be followed. Should we undertake a series of bilateral conventions? Should we commit ourselves to multilateral treaties? Should we still follow a single road, or convergent roads? Whatever the methods adopted, they must be usefully negotiated in order to make them generally acceptable.

37. Once we have identified the ways and means it will be essential to study interim measures before the definitive establishment of the zone of peace. Finally, we must not

forget means of control, verification and guarantees, because competition or rivalry among riparian States should not be substituted for other forms of competition.

38. From the foregoing we draw the following conclusions. First, appropriate studies should be undertaken, and they should bear upon the following points: the part reserved to national defence in the framework of the Indian Ocean zone of peace; the role of collective defence arrangements in this zone of peace within the meaning of Article 51 of the Charter; the commitments and effective presence of the great Powers in the region; the positive or—why not say so—negative consequences of establishing the zone of peace.

39. The second series of conclusions concerns the consultations themselves. In our opinion, these consultations should be the most intensive, the most comprehensive and the broadest possible and should concern ways and means of attaining the objective, the programming of the enterprise, possible interim measures, and control, verification and guarantees.

40. However, we must note that these studies, no matter how important and necessary, are not available to us, and the consultations, even though they were initiated more than a year ago, have not been sufficiently broad. For all those reasons, and to our great regret, we cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/L.590/Rev.1. We should have far preferred a procedure borrowed from that proposed by the Indonesian delegation at the 1840th meeting which is similar to that adopted by the Latin American countries before the adoption of the Tlatelolco Treaty and the Additional Protocols.<sup>2</sup> In brief, the outline that could have won our support would have been as follows: first, studies and consultations in the light of the principles of the United Nations concerning measures to be taken for the attainment of the objective of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace; next, a declaration supported by all riparian countries to be subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly; the framing of a treaty on the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, which would likewise be approved by the General Assembly; and, lastly, adoption of additional protocols of guarantee.

41. At the present stage, the General Assembly in all objectivity can do no more than take note of our intention to declare the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, encourage consultations for the drafting of such a declaration and make available to us, through the Secretary-General, technical facilities for the studies and consultations necessary for the drafting of such a declaration.

42. I should like to state that this position is shared by a number of riparian countries, and I wonder, given the short time we have had for the serious study of this question here and in our capitals, whether the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.590/Rev.1 could accept my delegation's suggestion not to press the text to a vote, on the understanding that the Committee, through you, Mr. Chairman, would recommend that the question be kept on the agenda of the twenty-seventh session, that the documents submitted

<sup>2</sup> Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068).

remain before the Committee, and that meanwhile consultations continue on the basis of the Ceylonese-Tanzanian letter [*ibid.*], of the declarations made on this subject in the course of this session and of draft resolution A/C.1/L.590/Rev.1.

43. I make this appeal in order to preserve unanimity within this Committee on a question of great importance and to preserve the whole-hearted support of all riparian countries, without which the declaration itself would be impracticable, inoperative and in danger of remaining a dead letter.

44. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I give the floor to the representative of UNESCO, who wishes to make a brief statement.

45. Mr. VARCHAVER: I am pleased to respond to the request of the representative of Ireland and to confirm how very close to the interests and preoccupations of UNESCO are all matters pertaining to studies on peace and increasing communications among the peoples of the world.

46. The very Constitution of UNESCO states that the organization is created

“for the purpose of advancing, through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind for which the United Nations Organization was established and which its Charter proclaims”.

It states further that to realize this purpose UNESCO will, *inter alia*,

“collaborate in the work of advancing the mutual knowledge and understanding of peoples, through all means of mass communication” and to “maintain, increase and diffuse knowledge”.

47. In pursuance of this constitutional mandate UNESCO has conducted a number of studies over the years, has organized various seminars and round-table discussions and has issued publications concerning peace and disarmament. The full lists of these would be too time-consuming to mention here. Let me refer only to the “International Repertory of institutions specialized in research on peace and disarmament” published a few years ago and now being revised and updated for republication next year.

48. At its last session, in autumn 1970, the General Conference of UNESCO adopted a resolution—to which the representative of Ireland referred in his statement—on UNESCO’s contribution to peace and its tasks with respect to the elimination of colonialism, and utilization of UNESCO’s programme as a means of strengthening co-operation between European States in the interests of peace and security in Europe.

49. Part II of this resolution is especially relevant here. It concerns the Organization’s long-term plan of action for the advancement of peace and invites the Director-General, *inter alia*, to implement this resolution and strengthen

UNESCO’s action for peace, particularly as regards the carrying out of—and I shall quote from the resolution here:

“(i) interdisciplinary studies and research on: peace and racialism, and, in particular, their sociological and economic aspects; socio-economic, psychological and ethical factors in the behaviour of individuals and communities and in the relations among nations; effects of social change in the world on peaceful relations between nations and individuals; conditions under which international contacts and exchanges produce the maximum beneficial effect; sociology of international co-operation; interaction between peace and development; role of the United Nations system in the development of peaceful co-operation between nations and the development of the human personality; social prerequisites for strengthening international peace and co-operation among different countries and peoples;

“... ”

“(iv) studies on information media, in order to: (a) determine and examine the obstacles which in the minds of men oppose intellectual co-operation between nations; (b) examine the contribution that information makes to development of education, science and culture and thus to the strengthening of the bases for peace; (c) examine the way in which the technical revolution in information media could contribute to strengthening peace by facilitating greater dissemination of information.”

Still further, the Director-General is asked to implement this resolution as regards:

“(v) the use of information media in favour of peace (improvement of the content of information and its impact on international life);

“(vi) the promotion of the fundamental principles of international law and their application to international co-operation in UNESCO’s fields of competence;

“(vii) the normative action of the Organization and its application in favour of peace”.

50. The programme and budget of UNESCO for 1971/1972 has translated the above resolution of the General Conference into a work plan and a budget to be carried out primarily under the organization’s activities in the fields of social science, education and mass communication. A project concerning research on problems of peace is directly concerned with the understanding and teaching of problems relating to world peace. It aims at stimulating and developing peace research and teaching activities throughout the world, in co-operation with the United Nations and other United Nations agencies, such as UNITAR, international organizations and national research institutes. In addition to the revision and publication of the repertory to which I referred earlier, and which should greatly facilitate communication among researchers in the field of research on peace and disarmament throughout the world, efforts will

be made to encourage institutions of higher learning to establish, as part of their regular curricula, programmes about the problems of peace and the resolution of conflicts.

51. Furthermore, a series of studies will be undertaken in 1972 on such subjects as the social premises for international peace and for peaceful co-operation between different countries and peoples, the role of international organizations, the strengthening of universal peace and the development of peaceful co-operation for the purposes of human progress. Various aspects of human aggressiveness will also be investigated. Lastly, it is intended to publish relevant teaching materials and a guidebook for the establishment of peace research, programmes and institutions.

52. From all this it may be seen, therefore, that UNESCO is already engaged, in part at least, in endeavours related to those proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/L.591/Rev.1, with funds provided for this purpose. Should the draft resolution be adopted, it will be communicated to the next session of the Executive Board of UNESCO and, in due time, to its General Conference. In the meantime, it will serve to encourage the organization in implementing its resolution 8, specifically when the Director-General enlists, as he had been invited to do, the effective help of member States and of their National Commissions for UNESCO.

53. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): No other delegation is on my list, but I would like to draw the Committee's attention to rule 129 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly under which the Chairman may permit members to explain their votes either before or after the vote.

54. Mr. SHARIF (Indonesia): In explaining its votes on the draft resolutions relating to disarmament that are now before the Committee, my delegation would like, first of all, to recall and emphasize the points in its statements at the 1835th and 1840th meetings, on 24 and 30 November, as the guiding principles for its position.

55. Thus, when my delegation emphasized that we should continue to work in good faith on the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, which are now separated from the bacteriological weapons, my delegation joined 12 States members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/L.580 and, with several others, the amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.582 to draft resolution A/C.1/L.579.

56. Fortunately, the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/L.580 and 581 have been able to merge them into one draft resolution, A/C.1/L.596, of which Indonesia is also a sponsor.

57. As to draft resolution A/C.1/L.579, my delegation, on 24 November, made its comments and reservations on the draft convention itself, which is now to be prepared and commended as the new convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction. We have also noted the spirit of good faith and understanding with regard to continuing our work on

chemical weapons, as clearly indicated in article IX of the draft convention.

58. We are grateful that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.579 have been able to accept our amendment, contained in document A/C.1/L.582, on the principle that a substantial portion of the savings derived from the measures in the field of disarmament should be devoted to promoting economic and social development, particularly in developing countries, which has now been incorporated in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1. We realize that the present draft convention seems to be the maximum result that we can achieve at this time.

59. In a spirit of co-operation and goodwill, my delegation will therefore, in spite of its misgivings on certain parts of the draft convention, cast its vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1. We would like it to be noted, however, that this vote is not to be interpreted as an approval of the draft convention annexed to the draft resolution; nor does it prejudice the opinion of my Government or its decision on the signing of the convention. In fact, as I stated earlier, my Government was not given sufficient time to examine the draft convention and will continue to study the matter further.

60. My delegation will also vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.592/Rev.1, on the moratorium on the production, development and stockpiling of chemical agents for weapons purposes, pending agreement on a convention on such weapons which will strengthen our determination to complete a draft convention on chemical weapons at the earliest possible time.

61. My delegation will further vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.587, on the status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2666 (XXV), as we believe that in order to ascertain the effectiveness of any establishment of a nuclear-free zone the co-operation of the nuclear weapon States is necessary. Such co-operation would take the form of commitments in a formal instrument which is legally binding, and we hope that the nuclear Powers will not fail to heed that resolution.

62. Consistent with my Government's policy on the urgent need for the suspension of all nuclear and thermonuclear tests, and our serious efforts to obtain a comprehensive test ban treaty, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.584, on a moratorium on all nuclear weapon tests at the earliest possible date and the indication of an exact date for such cessation, and will also vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.585, on other ways and means for the early entry into force of a comprehensive ban on all nuclear weapon tests in all environments, by all States.

63. The amendments submitted by New Zealand in document A/C.1/L.595 may diminish in some degree the importance of the scope of our efforts towards the prohibition of all tests in all environments all over the world. Considering, however, that my country is also located in the area in which many of these tests are conducted, my delegation does not find it difficult to vote also in favour of that amendment.



64. In emphasizing our efforts towards the early attainment of our ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/L.588, 589 and 591/Rev.1.

65. My delegation, further, will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.593, on the economic and social consequences and the harmful effects of the arms race. We express our appreciation to the Secretary-General and the 14 experts who have rendered assistance in the preparation of the report in document A/8469. We believe, however, that for its financial implications it is not practicable or desirable to provide additional reproduction of the report as a United Nations publication and to give it the widest possible publicity in many languages, as requested in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. If that particular paragraph is voted on separately, my delegation will abstain.

66. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/L.590/Rev.1, on the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, my delegation has noted the improvements that have been made on the original working paper. As stated in its comments on 30 November, politically my delegation is in support of the high ideals in the declaration, as particularly spelled out in operative paragraphs 2 and 3. We preferred, however, another procedure to be followed for their realization, since we have some doubt about the practicability of the consultations emphasized in those two paragraphs. In the opinion of my delegation we would achieve greater certainty of results by following another course of action, as we suggested. We shall therefore abstain in the vote on those two paragraphs if they are voted upon separately.

67. Nevertheless, since the overriding consideration in our political Organization is no doubt political, my delegation has ultimately decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

68. In the spirit of the declaration, my delegation joins the sponsors in calling upon the major Powers to call a halt to further escalation and expansion of their military presence in the Indian Ocean and to respect the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

69. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I should like to request delegations who intend to explain their votes to do so in respect of the draft resolutions on which we are about to vote, because if we begin to speak on all the draft resolutions long before they are voted on, we shall have lengthy explanations which will delay the actual voting.

70. Having said that, I am prepared to call on those who wish to explain their vote on the draft resolutions on item 27 while pointing out once again that the Bureau would prefer the explanations to be given after the voting rather than before, so that we may begin to vote on the draft resolutions.

71. Mr. ADUKO (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): While we appreciate the importance of the work that has been accomplished, the delegation of the Ivory Coast cannot but regret that the Conference of the

Committee on Disarmament has not considered security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States in the event of the outbreak of a nuclear war, nor a draft treaty concerning the total prohibition of nuclear tests. In the matter of security guarantees, the nuclear Powers should, in a formal declaration, confirm the immediate and unconditional assistance to be rendered to non-nuclear States which are exposed to aggression through the use of nuclear weapons. In the second case, the memorandum contained in document CCD/354, of 30 September last [A/8457, *annex C, sect. 34*], very judiciously recalled that under the 1963 Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water,<sup>3</sup> the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom, all three nuclear Powers, had solemnly undertaken to ensure the cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests and to pursue negotiations to that end.

72. Now, what do we see? First, that despite this solemn undertaking, these great Powers, particularly the United States of America and the Soviet Union, imperturbably continue their nuclear testing; secondly, that nuclear States like France and China have neither participated in the negotiations nor adhered to any treaty on disarmament; thirdly, that some States are not even parties to the 1963 Treaty. Unless all States, whether nuclear or non-nuclear, take a positive attitude towards a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear tests, the non-application of the 1963 Treaty will threaten the value of all other treaties concluded to date on disarmament and will compromise the pursuit of negotiations with a view to the conclusion of other instruments on the subject.

73. It is for this reason that the delegation of the Ivory Coast believes that, in our approach to great problems, particularly those relating to disarmament, it is desirable that world public opinion be taken into account. Accordingly, in the important negotiations on the limitation of strategic weapons—negotiations that should open the way for new efforts in the field of nuclear disarmament—the United States and the Soviet Union should admit the effective presence of the three other nuclear Powers, namely, France, the United Kingdom and China. An agreement between those five nuclear Powers, permanent members of the Security Council, on such a subject would indubitably lead to adherence by the world community as a whole.

74. The universality of our Organization, it has been said, will ensure fulfilment of its action because the whole world would participate in its work, thus ensuring the implementation of its recommendations. For our part, we believe that universality is susceptible to positive results only if it is possible to reduce the different fractions, the sum of which represents the Organization of the United Nations, to a small common denominator expressed with objectivity, impartiality and political honesty. It is in that context that we recognize the importance and timeliness of the Soviet proposal on the convening of a conference on disarmament with the participation of all the States in the world.

75. Nevertheless, for the sake of efficiency alone it would be desirable to allow participants sufficient time to prepare

<sup>3</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964.

for the success of such a conference. This year we are asked to pronounce ourselves on a draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction [*ibid.*, annex A]. We rejoice at the spirit of compromise manifested by the super-Powers which has made it possible for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to submit that draft convention for our consideration. But, while we appreciate the remarkable efforts made by the Committee to draw up such an important instrument, we deplore the fact that all the nuclear Powers did not take part in its elaboration; and that the text of that instrument was not communicated in sufficient time to enable our Government to study it and to make appropriate remarks on it. Independently of these considerations we would have preferred the convention in question to have dealt both with chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. However, we take note of article IX of the draft convention which stipulates that the parties to the convention shall continue their negotiations in a spirit of goodwill with a view to reaching an agreement in the near future on effective measures for the prohibition of chemical weapons.

76. Moreover, we note with satisfaction the principles under which the convention is of unlimited duration and which reaffirm the provisions contained in the Protocol concerning the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925.<sup>4</sup>

77. All those considerations of course militate in favour of an affirmative vote by my delegation in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1, which recommends the adoption by Member States of the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction.

78. However, for the reasons I have just explained, my delegation's vote must not be construed as systematically committing my Government as to its final position on the signature or ratification of the convention.

79. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): If no other delegation wishes to speak, I should like to announce that the Philippines has joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.591/Rev.1.

80. The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/L.588, 589 and 591/Rev.1.

81. A roll-call vote has been requested for draft resolution A/C.1/L.588.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Yugoslavia, having been drawn by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Yugoslavia, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet So-

cialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Zambia, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo, France, India, Israel, Kuwait, Peru, Romania, Senegal, Spain, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 76 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.*

82. Mr. FARHANE (Afghanistan): Unfortunately, I was not present during the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.588. I should like my vote to be shown as being in favour of that text.

83. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.589.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 92 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

84. I call on the representative of France in explanation of vote.

85. Mr. SCALABRE (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation wishes to explain its abstention. It wishes to recall that general and complete disarmament under international control is and will continue to be one of the major objectives of our policy. Our representatives have affirmed this at each of the sessions of the General Assembly. However, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.589 seeks essentially to entrust the task of completing the study of this question to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Our reservations regarding that body are well known; they have compelled us to abstain in the voting on this draft.

86. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.591/Rev.1.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 94 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

87. With the vote on those three draft resolutions, and if no other delegation wishes to explain its vote, we have completed our consideration of item 27.

<sup>4</sup> League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV, 1929, No. 2138.



## AGENDA ITEM 28 (continued)\*

**Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8457, A/C.1/L.578, 579/Rev.1, 582, 592/Rev.1 and 596)**

## DISCUSSION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

88. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): The Committee has before it the following documents: first, a working paper submitted by Mexico [A/C.1/L.578], containing a proposal for the inclusion of an additional article in the draft convention; secondly, draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1; thirdly, draft resolution A/C.1/L.596, which replaces draft resolutions A/C.1/L.580 and 581; fourthly, draft resolution A/C.1/L.592/Rev.1. I shall first call on delegations that wish to make statements on the draft resolutions.

89. Mr. VAN USSEL (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): We believe that the essential objective which should enjoy priority in regard to chemical weapons is as rapid as possible a quest for true agreement. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.596, of which we were a sponsor and on which we are now to vote, is aimed at defining the ideal framework and the necessary conditions for this quest. As we have already said, Belgium regards it as an urgent duty for members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to go beyond the earlier debates and to try to frame a system of control which would ultimately be acceptable to all our Governments.

90. The field of application of the prohibition and also verification of compliance therewith in our view remains the key problem in any agreement. For this same reason we do not believe that Governments can accede to the request contained in draft resolution A/C.1/L.592/Rev.1 without genuine verification machinery being provided in advance which would ensure compliance by everyone with the measures advocated. Furthermore this text, despite its very praiseworthy objective, does not seem to us likely to advance the negotiations with a view to agreement on prohibition. Those are the reasons which impel my delegation to abstain on the draft resolution.

91. Mr. ECKERBERG (Sweden): In her statement at the 1834th meeting the leader of my delegation, Mrs. Myrdal, drew the attention of this Committee to the procedures in the draft convention on biological and toxin weapons regarding complaints. She asked for clarification and reassurance regarding the exact meaning of article VI, which deals with the role of the Security Council in this respect. Many other representatives have voiced similar concern during our debate.

92. In connexion with the vote on the draft resolution commending this draft convention [A/C.1/L.47579], I am instructed by my Government to make the following statement: when the Swedish delegation casts its vote in favour of the draft resolution it will do so on the understanding that this convention is to be entered into by all parties on the basis of equality. We take it for granted

that all States that undertake not to develop, produce, stockpile or otherwise acquire or retain biological and toxin weapons also accept the same measure of obligation to co-operate in an investigation, should a question about a treaty violation be raised.

93. To be more specific, article VI would not be utilized by the permanent members of the Security Council in such a manner as to prevent the investigation of complaints. It is our understanding that under article V of the convention a clarification of complaints can take place. There is an obligation spelled out in that article to co-operate in solving any problems which may arise in relation to the objective of, or in the application of the provisions of, this convention.

94. It is also envisaged that appropriate international procedures within the framework of the United Nations should be used for this purpose. This should mean that any appropriate organ or officer of the United Nations could also be used in gathering all necessary information on which the Security Council will then discuss the matter and take its decision. Thus it seems clear that a kind of investigation should in fact take place before the matter is dealt with by the Security Council.

95. All factual evidence available would be presented to the Council; the consideration of such evidence by the Council is, of course, a procedural matter, to which a majority vote would apply.

96. While the question we have raised may—and I hope will—be settled by a satisfactory construction of article VI, there is a lesson to be learned for the future rules about control of disarmament measures. I think we all agree that we want to achieve non-discriminatory treaties on disarmament. Future treaties should be clearer in this regard than the present one. The Swedish Government will not consider the provisions in article VI of the draft convention on biological and toxin weapons as a suitable precedent.

97. Mr. HAINWORTH (United Kingdom): As the United Kingdom delegation is one of the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1 and 596, I should like to say a few words on the subject of chemical and biological weapons. I shall, at the same time, take up some comments made on this subject by a number of representatives in their statements during our general debate.

98. Some delegations have expressed their regret that there is no explicit undertaking in the draft convention never to use biological or toxin weapons. As I think representatives are aware, this is a point to which the United Kingdom delegation attaches great importance. In the British draft convention submitted in Geneva in 1969,<sup>5</sup> there was such a provision, whereby parties to the convention would have undertaken never in any circumstances to make use of biological weapons for hostile purposes.

99. However, over the months in Geneva it became apparent that a number of delegations sincerely held

\* Resumed from the 1842nd meeting.

<sup>5</sup> *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1969, document DC/232, annex C, sect. 19.*

deep-seated views that such an explicit provision could in some way damage the Geneva Protocol of 1925. We were not, and are not, of this opinion ourselves; but since our objective was also to avoid any calling into question of the proven efficacy of the Geneva Protocol, we eventually agreed to join in sponsoring a draft convention without such an undertaking contained directly in its provisions. In so agreeing we took note of the arguments advanced by a number of delegations that it would be impossible in practice for States to use biological agents or toxins for non-peaceful purposes when they had bound themselves not to develop, produce, or otherwise acquire or retain biological agents or toxins except for peaceful purposes. We also took note of the force of the words "never in any circumstances", which appear in article I at the suggestion of the Egyptian delegation.

100. Furthermore, we noted that in the draft convention the penultimate preambular paragraph expressed the determination of eventual States party to the convention, for the sake of all mankind, to exclude completely the possibility of bacteriological (biological) agents and toxins being used as weapons. We believe, therefore, that even though reservations to the Geneva Protocol may remain in force, there will never be any question of States making retaliatory use of biological weapons, and that, for all practical purposes, the risk of biological weapons or toxins being used for hostile purposes will have been reduced to negligible proportions.

101. A separate group of comments has centred on the procedure for dealing with complaints and on the feeling that it would have been better to make the provision for investigation of complaints not only impartial but also virtually automatic. There have also been suggestions that involvement of the Security Council in initiating the investigation of complaints could in some way involve discrimination.

102. From the start it has been the British contention that an automatic, impartial and speedy procedure for the investigation of complaints—above all, of allegations of use of biological weapons and toxins—would be the most effective deterrent against possible violations. My delegation put forward these views in some detail this summer in Geneva and on a number of occasions. Despite the fact that we are a permanent member of the Security Council, we felt not only that our proposals were likely to strengthen the effectiveness of the draft convention but that this was a point to which smaller countries would attach the greatest importance. To our surprise and disappointment there was little support voiced for these views by the non-aligned delegations in Geneva. None the less, we recognize that although the procedures envisaged in our own draft of 1969 have not been incorporated in the draft convention there are a number of improvements to that draft which have been proposed and adopted in a spirit of helpful compromise.

103. It seems clear to us that the provisions of article V for consultation and co-operation to be undertaken through appropriate international procedures within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter would, on appropriate occasions, allow for the involvement of the Secretary-General's good offices, as the representative of Ghana suggested would be desirable.

104. Moreover, the wording of article V makes clear that its provisions concern not only the application of the explicit prohibitions of the convention but also the objective of the convention. The consultation procedure under article V is separate from, but closely related to, the complaints procedure in article VI. As such it is entirely consistent with United Kingdom suggestions for a procedure, when appropriate, preceding the activation of the Security Council, a procedure which, for example, by establishing the facts in a given situation, might help the Security Council in its consideration of a complaint. Such evidence, obtained under the procedures envisaged in article V, could then be used as the basis for a factual report to be submitted as an integral part of a complaint made to the Security Council under article VI.

105. On occasion, however, there may be reasons why parties would not wish to go through the procedures envisaged in article V. There may be interests of speed or other reasons that would make a party wish to take a complaint direct to the Security Council. It is the view of my delegation that, given a majority vote in favour, normally the Security Council will decide to initiate an inquiry into the facts of the situation if there has been no prior inquiry under the provisions of article V. Political consideration by the Security Council of the results of the inquiry would normally be a second and subsequent stage. Naturally the results of an inquiry would be part of the information conveyed to parties.

106. Another point of importance to my delegation has been the commitment on further negotiations on chemical weapons. Enough has now been said on the terms of the undertaking in the draft convention itself. I should, however, like to record my satisfaction at the development of draft resolutions on this subject this year. I think we must acknowledge that in the past there has been a certain amount of rancour, motivated undoubtedly for the best of reasons but not, I fear, altogether conducive to a spirit of fruitful negotiations. It has accordingly been most encouraging to my delegation that these past differences have been put aside and that the two draft resolutions on chemical weapons [A/C.1/L.580 and 581] not only were very similar in concept but have now been satisfactorily merged into one draft resolution [A/C.1/L.596] of which my delegation is glad to be one of the sponsors.

107. Such an attitude of co-operation must hold out increased prospects for success in Geneva in our common search for ways to make progress on this most difficult subject.

108. Unfortunately, however, the United Kingdom delegation cannot regard the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.592/Rev.1 as assisting progress in these negotiations. The views of my delegation on the value of unverified moratoriums are well known. We consider—and history teaches us this lesson—that they can actually lead to increased concern about the intentions of other States and even to their being disregarded in secret in the hope of gaining advantage over others who are observing them. Such fears and suspicions do not assist negotiations designed to resolve the difficulties which concern us all equally and which cannot be ignored. We want to see chemical weapons effectively banned and we share the wish to see the most

lethal chemical weapons effectively banned, but we must remember that one important factor in the prevention of use of these dangerous weapons has been the certainty of immediate retaliation. We must therefore ensure that any further international instrument designed to ban chemical weapons will be at least as effective.

109. As I said, we find the approach in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.596 a more constructive approach to help our work forward. Our work undoubtedly will also be helped by the largest possible favourable vote for the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1, commending the draft convention on bacteriological (biological) weapons. With a solid and comprehensive agreement on bacteriological (biological) weapons behind us we shall the better be able to turn our undivided attention to chemical weapons.

110. Mr. CARACCILO (Italy): I wish to make a statement on draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1. The Italian delegation participated actively in Geneva in the negotiations that led to the drafting of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and their destruction. The discussions for the improvement of the original text were pursued in Geneva for over two years, until our delegation realized, together with other delegations, that any further effort on our part would only jeopardize the possibility of reaching an agreement on a convention which represents a major event in the history of disarmament negotiations as the first measure of effective disarmament prepared by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. At that stage we therefore decided to join the group of delegations which submitted the present text to the General Assembly of the United Nations. But we reserved for ourselves the possibility of calling the attention of this Committee to two specific problems, bearing in mind the implications they may have for future disarmament negotiations.

111. The first and most important is the problem of verification. We would have wished to find a more effective solution to this problem. That is why we repeatedly expressed our doubts in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on the wisdom of relying exclusively on the action of the Security Council, which might be paralysed at the moment of decision by the veto of a permanent member. We also feared that an immediate intervention of the Security Council on a complaint based upon mere suspicion might trigger a political conflict before any technical inquiry had ascertained the nature of the activities giving rise to the complaint. Therefore, there would be a risk of giving a political character to all disputes relating to the implementation of the convention. Furthermore, the Security Council might in each case request a different organ to carry out the necessary inquiry and the inquiries might thus not be based on uniform criteria, although uniformity of criteria would be necessary in order to prevent different interpretations of similar cases which would weaken the credibility of the convention.

112. For those reasons we stressed in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament the desirability of establishing two distinct phases in the verification procedure: the first should have been, in our opinion, a preliminary

technical inquiry to be entrusted to an organ capable of ensuring an impartial examination of complaints; the second phase should have consisted in the intervention of the Security Council. Those suggestions did not obtain.

113. We therefore made it clear in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that our support for the solution approved by the majority did not imply acceptance of a precedent for other agreements on disarmament to be negotiated in the future, for we still believe that any agreement in this field should be associated with an effective and adequate system of controls.

114. The second point I wish to mention is more of a procedural character, although it could have some implications of substance. It concerns the choice of the Governments with which the instruments of ratification and accession shall be deposited. In Geneva we left a blank in the text to be filled in, and I understand now that the possibility has been envisaged of filling in this blank with the names of the three nuclear Powers participating in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

115. It goes without saying that we appreciate at its full value the particular contributions to the success of our negotiations that have been made by the Governments of the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom—indeed the United Kingdom set the negotiations in motion three years ago. Nevertheless, since the draft convention now before us is related to non-nuclear weapons, we wonder whether the system that has been hitherto adopted for arms control treaties in the nuclear field, that is, the designation of these three Powers alone as depositary Governments, could be considered as the most satisfactory.

116. We must in that respect take into account the implication that the choice we make must have in the case of other agreements on conventional armaments which may be concluded in the future. That is why we believe it would have been more desirable in this case to include among the depositary Governments representation of non-nuclear Powers also.

117. The Italian delegation has in the General Assembly and in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament constantly stressed the importance of the connexion between disarmament and the development of our society at a higher level of civilization and welfare. May I recall that as long ago as 1967 Italy submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament a specific proposal in this regard. We cannot, therefore, but agree with the proposal aimed at reaffirming in the preamble to the draft convention the interrelation between disarmament and social and economic progress in the developing countries.

118. Having made those few remarks, I wish to assure the Committee of the Italian delegation's support for draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1.

119. Mr. KHATTABI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to make a brief statement on draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1.

120. The draft convention on the prohibition of bacteriological and toxin weapons annexed to the draft reso-

lution prompts my delegation to make the following comments.

121. The entry into force of this convention would render unnecessary the reservations formulated in regard to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 concerning bacteriological and toxin weapons. The unlimited scope of the ban in article I and the obligations under articles II and III of the convention, exclude all possible use of such weapons, even in time of war. The meaning of the term "for prophylactic, protective . . . purposes" in article I is, we believe, confined to allowing States to have the means of preventing the outbreak or spread of disease, and to combat contamination resulting from the possible use of bacteriological agents, without any notion of reprisals by means of weapons of the same kind.

122. Furthermore, it would be highly desirable for the international community to be informed of the implementation of article II by States parties possessing bacteriological and toxin weapons when they undertake their destruction or conversion for peaceful purposes. Notification to this effect could be addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and, through him, to all States parties.

123. Moreover, the assistance advocated in article VII, if it is to be effective, must be prompt and spontaneous, without the need to await the conclusions of the Security Council and, of course, without prejudging those conclusions in any way, because the assistance would fundamentally be dictated by consideration of human solidarity.

124. Finally, I should like on behalf of my delegation to affirm that the various provisions of the convention on bacteriological weapons form a totality of obligations binding each of the parties without discrimination. Article VI, which concerns the complaint procedure, cannot be an exception to the rule. Consequently, any discriminatory application of the obligations flowing from the convention—such as, for example, use of the veto to prevent a possible inquiry by the Security Council under the provisions of article VI—would tend to jeopardize the effectiveness and legal validity of the instrument in question, for such discrimination would be likely to hamper implementation of other parts of the convention while obliging other States parties, in order to preserve their own interests, to take all necessary steps including the right to withdraw from the convention.

125. It is in that spirit that my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1.

126. However, before concluding I would venture to draw attention to a procedural question concerning the deposit of instruments of ratification and accession to the convention on the prohibition of bacteriological weapons. This has already in a way been referred to by the representative of Italy: we need to fill the gap still existing in article XIV, paragraph 2, of the draft convention. Perhaps it would be desirable in this regard to follow the example of various other treaties concluded in the field of disarmament, leaving it to the Governments of the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States to act as the depositary Governments for this convention. I place that suggestion before the Committee for its consideration.

127. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): First of all, the delegation of the Soviet Union would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.592/Rev.1, which was submitted by 14 delegations.

128. As is well known, the Soviet Union along with other socialist countries consistently advocates the complete prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons. On the basis of that position the Soviet delegation supports the draft resolution, which provides that all States should undertake to refrain from any further development, production or stockpiling for military purposes of those chemical agents which have the highest lethal effects and are not usable for peaceful purposes.

129. Although the draft resolution under consideration provides for only a partial solution of the problem of a complete prohibition of chemical weapons, the Soviet delegation feels that even that solution to the problem could be a step forward in the direction of complete success in the task facing us—the prohibition and elimination of all forms of chemical weapons.

130. The Soviet delegation will vote for this draft resolution on the understanding that the undertakings provided for in the draft should be entered into by States under an international agreement to be drafted and agreed upon among them.

131. Furthermore, in connexion with the question raised today by the representative of the United Kingdom and also by the representative of Sweden concerning the interpretation of article V of the draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction, the Soviet delegation would like to state that it adheres to the interpretation of the provisions of that article given by the Soviet representatives during consideration of this question in the Committee on Disarmament.

132. With regard to the question raised by those representatives and also, a moment ago, by the distinguished representative of Morocco, about the procedure for taking decisions under article VI of the draft convention, concerning the investigation of complaints of violations of the convention, the Soviet delegation feels it must state that in considering cases under article VI of the draft convention just as in considering other questions, the Security Council must act strictly in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

133. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, in Geneva, on 24 August last, a working paper which subsequently was also distributed at our request, on 12 November, as a document of the First Committee [A/C.1/L.578].

134. The aim of draft resolution A/C.1/L.592/Rev.1, sponsored by the delegations of Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Ireland, Malta, Morocco, Peru, Sweden, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela and Mexico, which I now have the honour to present,

is in substance the same as that in the working paper to which I have just referred and, for the purposes of the vote in this Committee, it should be regarded as replacing that document. That aim is to ensure that while agreement is being achieved on the complete prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction, all States undertake to refrain from further developing, producing or stockpiling for warlike purposes chemical agents which, by reason of their degree of toxicity, have the most powerful lethal effects and cannot be used for peaceful purposes.

135. The sponsors of this draft are convinced that the adoption of the moratorium we propose for a specific category of chemical weapons offers a number of advantages and no disadvantage.

136. Among the advantages, it might be worth-while mentioning that it would mean, if not the elimination, at least the freezing of a more or less broad group of chemical agents which, because of their degree of toxicity, are more dangerous and cannot be used for peaceful purposes, as, for instance, the so-called neurotoxic agents. Such a moratorium would also have the not inconsiderable advantage of providing convincing proof that the Powers possessing chemical weapons are genuinely prepared to ensure that the commitments referred to in article IX of the convention on micro-biological weapons do not remain merely on paper but will be reflected in action as early as possible.

137. As for the lack of disadvantages, suffice it to say it would appear that the question of verification—the main argument adduced against the total prohibition of chemical weapons—cannot be adduced in this case, since a system of control which is accepted as satisfactory to guarantee the prohibition of all micro-biological weapons and all toxins must perforce also be satisfactory for the supervision of simply freezing those supertoxic chemical agents which cannot be used for civilian or peaceful purposes.

138. Of course, the most desirable procedure for the moratorium to acquire its maximum effectiveness would be a procedure resulting from a multilateral agreement. This, however, should be no obstacle, while such an agreement is being sought, for States to assume the undertaking we seek, on a provisional basis, by unilateral declarations.

139. For all of the foregoing reasons, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.592/Rev.1 nurture the conviction that the resolution, which we trust will be adopted by the General Assembly on the basis of our text, will constitute a positive contribution to the progress of future efforts aimed at achieving the definitive elimination of all chemical weapons.

140. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I should like to announce that Romania and Singapore have joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1, and that Singapore has also become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/L.596.

141. Mr. ČVORIVIĆ (Yugoslavia): At this stage, when we are approaching the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1, I should like to make two points. First, my delegation views that draft resolution as being closely and

inseparably linked to draft resolution A/C.1/L.596. Negotiations on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of both chemical and bacteriological weapons represent a continuous and indivisible process aimed at their effective elimination from the arsenals of all States.

142. Consequently, the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons is only the first positive step towards an early agreement on the elimination of chemical weapons as well. This approach served as the basic orientation for the activity of my delegation, together with other delegations of the group of 12 non-aligned countries, in the work of the Committee on Disarmament on this issue.

143. The final draft of the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction, annexed to draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1, in our view reflects this approach and contains solemnly expressed commitments to continue negotiations until agreement—early agreement—is reached on the effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons.

144. The second point which I should like to mention is the matter of savings resulting from disarmament. Since the adoption of the convention on the prohibition of bacteriological (biological) weapons would mark the first step towards disarmament, we would prefer to see the link between disarmament and the promotion of economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries, reflected in the text of the convention itself, as proposed by the group of 12 countries in the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva. However, in order to facilitate agreement on this important issue, a group of 16 countries, supported by many others, submitted the amendment in document A/C.1/L.582 to the original draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.579. In view of the fact that the idea was generally accepted by the sponsors of this draft resolution, the negotiations between them and the sponsors of the amendment resulted in agreement on the new tenth preambular paragraph as it appears in the revised text of the draft resolution. Consequently the amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.582 was withdrawn.

145. In the light of what I have just said, my delegation is ready to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1.

146. I should now like to say a few words concerning draft resolution A/C.1/L.596. First of all, we should like to express our satisfaction at the successful negotiations between the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/L.580 and 581, resulting in a joint draft. The new draft is sponsored by my delegation and by a majority of the sponsors of the original draft, A/C.1/L.581. In sponsoring the new draft, my delegation was guided by the following considerations.

147. First, the new draft resolution is consistent with the approach and the points agreed upon on previous occasions and particularly endorsed by General Assembly resolution 2662 (XXV), namely, that the prohibition of both chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons should be dealt with as a continuous question.

148. Secondly, the new draft points out clearly all references contained in the draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction, expressing the determination and commitment to continue negotiations towards achieving early agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons also, and underlining the importance and urgency of acting resolutely to this end.

149. Thirdly, the new draft, on the one hand, contains an expression of satisfaction with the agreement reached on the draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and, on the other hand, endorses the view concerning the continuation of negotiations as a high-priority item on the conclusion of an agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons.

150. Fourthly, the new draft recognizes the efforts of the group of 12 non-aligned countries and its contribution towards the initiation of negotiations on chemical weapons, and to this end requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to take into account, in its future negotiations, the nine elements contained in the joint memorandum on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction, submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament by the group on 28 September 1971.

151. Finally, the new draft contains a very important provision in which the General Assembly urges Governments to take all steps that may contribute to a successful outcome of the negotiations and facilitate early agreement on the effective prohibition of chemical weapons.

152. My delegation certainly hopes that the above-mentioned considerations will be implemented through negotiations which should resume without delay.

153. Finally, may I be permitted to state that my delegation will also vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.592/Rev.1. We are of the opinion that the objective of this draft resolution falls within the generally recognized objective of facilitating and speeding up negotiations on the effective prohibition of chemical weapons.

154. Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): I should like to make two brief points. First, the United States delegation is pleased that it has been possible to work out a generally acceptable formula on the matter of savings resulting from disarmament. This has permitted wide agreement on the text of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1. This draft resolution has now been sponsored by 40 countries, including the United States. In the achieving of this result, we must recognize the untiring efforts of the representative of Yugoslavia and the co-operative spirit of the other sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.582. The formula is now included as the tenth preambular paragraph in the draft resolution. It states the conviction that the implementation of measures in the field of disarmament should release substantial additional resources, which should promote economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries.

155. The second point is that we have listened with interest to the remarks of the Ambassador of Sweden relating to the implementation of the draft convention on biological weapons, particularly articles V and VI thereof. I am sure that we all share the objective of making certain that the convention will be implemented fairly and effectively—an objective that has been expressed by many other Members of the General Assembly. The position of the United States regarding the importance attached to the implementation of articles V and VI is more fully set forth in the intervention I made in this Committee at the 1838th meeting, which I shall not at this time repeat.

156. In conclusion, we hope that the amended draft resolution commending the convention on biological weapons will be adopted by a very large majority of the members of this Committee.

157. Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): I should like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1.

158. During the negotiations at Geneva my delegation had the opportunity to state that we attach great importance to this draft convention because it is the first one in the course of such long deliberations that offers us a real measure of disarmament. At the same time my delegation stated its position regarding the principle of the savings from disarmament measures for the goals of economic and social development.

159. We felt that so strongly that we wished that principle to be included in the text of the convention itself. Because of some difficulties and lack of agreement, and in a spirit of compromise, my delegation has agreed that the principle should be recognized in this draft resolution in its preambular part—and not in the text of the convention. For that reason, my delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution.

160. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

161. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): I too should like to apply myself briefly to document A/C.1/L.592/Rev.1 and to explain my delegation's vote on the draft resolution contained in it which would have the Assembly urge all States to refrain from any further development, production or stockpiling of those chemical agents for weapons purposes which, because of their degree of toxicity, have the highest lethal effects and are not usable for peaceful purposes.

162. We shall vote for that draft resolution for two main reasons: first, because we are in accord with its objective, which is to reduce the possibility of chemical warfare with highly toxic agents; and, secondly, because it is in line with the policy of the Australian Government in the sense that we are not developing or stockpiling chemical weapons which, owing to their degree of toxicity, would have the highest lethal effects.

163. At the same time, my delegation does have some misgivings about the draft resolution. The first is that we are given no definition or statement of the chemical agents



that would fit into the category described by the operative paragraph. This, presumably, would mean that there will be an area in which States have to interpret the resolution for themselves. Secondly, we would assume that any action taken pursuant to that resolution would be unverified, with the result that the international community could not feel complete confidence in its efficacy. And, finally, we feel some doubt whether the approach embodied in the draft resolution, namely, that of seeking partial remedies to important questions of arms control and disarmament by way of resolutions of the General Assembly, is best calculated to produce effective results. As we see it, if action of this kind comes to be regarded as an alternative to, or a substitute for, the provisions of international treaties, the outcome in the long run could be unhelpful from the point of view of international security.

164. Mr. BAVAND (Iran): We welcome the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1 of which we are one of the sponsors. We believe that the draft convention is a significant step forward in that it constitutes a real disarmament measure. It usefully anticipates and forestalls a possible breakthrough in technology which might render biological weapons susceptible to control and hence make them militarily attractive, and in itself maintains the momentum which has been arduously achieved on arms control.

165. As one of the sponsors we shall not comment on the draft; however, our sponsorship should not be understood as implying that our delegation views it as the best possible draft, or even the best one achievable. No doubt its weakness reflects political problems as well as technical ones. In our opinion, however, the draft has been improved since it was originally presented in Geneva.

166. Our delegation has maintained, in common with many others, that it is important that the link between chemical and biological weapons be maintained. The question whether this convention has or will prove to have *de facto* separated biological from chemical weapons, despite the disclaimers in the draft convention, cannot be discounted. By the time of the review conference it will be clear whether or not this has been the case.

167. Whether or not the ubiquitous, good-faith formula expresses adequately the sense of urgency felt by many in this Committee is debatable. But it may also be debatable whether harsher or more specific alternative clauses will facilitate or help in surmounting the real problem of distrust and mistrust which lies behind the problem of verification as it relates to chemical weapons.

168. We have noted the suggestion of the representative of Mexico, originally made in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and summarized in the working paper contained in document A/C.1/L.578, now incorporated in draft resolution A/C.1/L.596. We look on it as a useful interim measure which, as it were, links our support of the present draft convention on biological weapons with our sponsorship of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.581, now A/C.1/L.596. We are therefore ready to support it as a separate draft resolution dealing with chemical weapons.

169. While we cannot emphasize too strongly the value of a rapid but sound agreement on chemical weapons, we are hopeful that every step forward in arms control, however small it may appear at the time, will help increase trust, break down fear and hence contribute a little bit towards a further and perhaps larger measure of arms control.

170. Mr. YANGO (Philippines): Briefly, my delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1 on the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction. Let me say at the outset that my delegation will vote in favour of that draft resolution.

171. Earlier in this meeting, the delegations of Yugoslavia, the United States and Brazil referred to a previous amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.582 but now withdrawn, on the subject of savings derived from disarmament and its connexion to development. I wish to recall that my delegation was a sponsor of that amendment, which called for inserting in draft resolution A/C.1/L.579 a new tenth preambular paragraph to read:

*"Affirming the principle that a substantial portion of the savings derived from measures in the field of disarmament should be devoted to promoting economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries"*.

172. As a result of negotiations, however, between the sponsors of documents A/C.1/L.582 and 579, the new preambular paragraph, referred to by previous speakers and now incorporated in draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1, reads:

*"Convinced that the implementation of measures in the field of disarmament should release substantial additional resources, which should promote economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries"*.

173. In a spirit of co-operation, my delegation will go along with this new wording of the preambular paragraph. However, my delegation desires to place on record that it still maintains and continues to support very firmly the principle that a substantial portion of the savings derived from measures in the field of disarmament should be devoted to promoting economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries. I wish to recall also that in our statement at the 1837th meeting on the question of general and complete disarmament we gave our full support to the comprehensive programme of disarmament submitted at the twenty-fifth session, which has to be taken into account in the further work and negotiations of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. This comprehensive programme of disarmament, in paragraph 8 under its subheading "Principles", provides that "A substantial portion of the savings derived from measures in the field of disarmament should be devoted to promoting economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries", which is practically the amendment proposed in document A/C.1/L.582, word for word. I wish to recall further that the initiative taken by my delegation in the Second Committee, during the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, on the item on the economic and

social consequences of disarmament was grounded on this principle, in connexion with our desire to establish the link between the Disarmament Decade and the United Nations Second Development Decade. We will, therefore, continue our efforts to support this principle in our sincere belief that there is an integral link that should exist between disarmament and development. It is the hope of my delegation that this principle or link will eventually gain acceptance and recognition.

174. Mr. de SOTO (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1 which commends the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction, and which appears to command a considerable degree of support.

175. I wish to state that inasmuch as the draft convention is still under consideration by the pertinent authorities in my country, the affirmative vote of my delegation does not commit our position in respect of the signature of or accession to that convention.

176. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): If no other delegation wishes to speak, we shall proceed to vote on the draft resolutions; but before so doing I should like to inform the Committee that by reason of the distribution of draft resolution A/C.1/592/Rev.1, which was officially introduced by the representative of Mexico, it seems logical to say that the Committee has no decision to take on the working paper submitted by Mexico in document A/C.1/L.578.

177. The voting will begin with draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1. Since there were no objections nor opposition to this document, may I take it that the Committee adopts it by acclamation?

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*

178. In this connexion, I should like to inform you that a proposal was made by the representative of Morocco whereby the United States, the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be the depositaries of the convention. Since this proposal was supported by several delegations, and there has been no objection to it, it will be decided, as we have done on past occasions, that the Committee endorses it.

179. Mr. CARACCILO (Italy): I have no objection, but I think that the suggestion made by the representative of Morocco followed an opinion that I expressed before on the same subject. Of course, I realize the difficulty of going further with that problem at this late stage of our deliberations. Therefore, while I maintain what I have said, and wish to put it on record, I shall not press the point I have raised.

180. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): If there are no objections the proposal will be regarded as accepted.

*It was so decided.*

181. We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.596. If I understood rightly, none of the representatives in the Committee who spoke expressed any objections, although we heard reservations. If there are no objections, may I take it that this draft resolution is adopted by acclamation?

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*

182. I call on the representative of France for an explanation of vote.

183. Mr. SCALABRE (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation did not wish to cause any loss of time by opposing the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1. However, we should like to make it clear that if it had been voted on we would have abstained. As our representative announced in the course of the general debate on disarmament, and for the reasons he explained [*1838th meeting*], France will not accede to the draft convention on the prohibition of biological weapons recommended in the draft resolution. We therefore would have abstained in the vote on this draft resolution. In this regard my delegation recalls that the French Government has recently adopted legislation by which France would unilaterally undertake the total prohibition of the manufacture and stockpiling of biological weapons, thus demonstrating its willingness to participate in the application of a measure which is at last a measure of real disarmament, although objections of principle prevent us from acceding to the convention which endorses it.

184. Moreover, because of the reservations we have repeatedly expressed concerning the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, we could not but have abstained also on draft resolution A/C.1/L.596, which entrusts to that organ the question of a total ban on chemical weapons.

185. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.592/Rev.1.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Lesotho, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indo-

nesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Malawi, Netherlands, Romania, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, Canada, France, Greece, Italy.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 96 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.*

186. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As a rule, my delegation explains its vote at the end of the voting rather than immediately after the adoption of a draft resolution. It is for this reason that my statement does not, of course, apply to the draft we have just adopted, since, as you have so rightly said, Mr. Chairman, a sponsor cannot explain its vote on its own draft resolution.

187. I merely wish to say that my delegation agreed to the adoption by acclamation of draft resolution A/C.1/L.579/Rev.1 and had it been put to the vote, we would have voted in favour, in view of the fact that the States on

which the success of negotiations for the total elimination of chemical weapons will largely depend have also sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/L.596, which requests that those negotiations continue as a matter of high priority. We are convinced that the fate of the first draft resolution will be closely linked with that of the second.

188. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Besides the delegation of Canada, a number of delegations have asked to explain their vote after the vote. Since it is getting late now, I suggest that we leave these explanations of vote until the next meeting. There appears to be no objection to that procedure.

189. I should like to thank the members of the Committee for working so hard and enabling us to adopt draft resolutions on the two first agenda items concerning disarmament. But that still leaves five items on which there are draft resolutions. The representative of Ceylon, in the light of certain recent developments and various suggestions made here, proposes that the draft resolution on item 98 not be put to the vote until a little later, that is, following the votes that will take place at our next meeting.

*The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.*