



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 102:

Reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries (*continued*) . . . . .

1

*President:* Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

**AGENDA ITEM 102**

**Reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries (*continued*)\***

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Mexico, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/L.715.

2. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have asked for the floor merely to introduce formally the Mexican draft resolution in document A/L.715.

3. I think the text of that draft is sufficiently clear and it is unnecessary to repeat what I said at the 2179th plenary meeting on 26 November. I shall therefore confine myself to explaining that the reasons which prompted us to introduce the draft resolution and the purposes we are trying to achieve through it are all outlined in my statement of that date. It is in the light of what we said then that representatives should seek to ascertain the meaning and scope of the provisions of our draft resolution.

4. I should like to add that, stemming from that statement, my delegation initiated an exchange of views with the Soviet delegation as a result of which both delegations reached the conclusion that their respective proposals were not necessarily mutually exclusive and that, consequently, both could be put to the vote in the General Assembly in the order in which they have been introduced and could both be adopted.

5. Moreover, I should like to state that the essential provision in our draft resolution is operative paragraph 1, and we would venture to hope that it will meet with unanimous acceptance because it seems axiomatic to us that the report we are asking the Secretary-General to prepare in that paragraph would be a very valuable document for a better understanding of the item.

6. However, some delegations have expressed certain doubts or reservations to us on the content of one of the preambular paragraphs and, therefore, I should now like to repeat in public what I have already said in private conversations, namely that my delegation would have no difficulty in agreeing that we should have a separate vote on any paragraph of the draft resolution if this would help to facilitate the general acceptance which we hope the Mexican text will receive.

7. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

8. Mr. SCHAUFLE (United States of America): Draft resolution A/L.715 has only recently been circulated. The administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution are contained in document A/9404, which has only been circulated today. We believe that in the interest of careful consideration of both the draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.715 and A/L.701/Rev.1 and of their financial implications we should defer taking any decision on these proposals until Monday, 10 December.

9. We consequently move, under rule 76 of the rules of procedure, that the debate on this item should be adjourned until Monday, 10 December.

10. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have before us a motion under rule 76 of the rules of procedure. Under that rule, I shall call on two representatives to speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, and we shall then proceed to vote on it.

11. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The delegation of the Soviet Union sees no grounds for postponing consideration of this matter. However, it reserves the right to speak on the substance of the views expressed and proposals made by the United States representative when it participates in the discussion of the basic problem as a whole, that is on item 102.

12. The trouble is that the discussion has not ended and the Soviet delegation appears last on the list of speakers. I therefore have the following suggestion. I should like to ask the President to give the Soviet delegation an opportunity to speak in the debate and then we can proceed straight to the vote. I should add that I do not know the views of the head of the Mexican delegation regarding the Mexican draft resolution, although there are also no major reasons for postponing the vote on it, since he circulated the draft resolution to delegations yesterday and representatives had the opportunity to study it yesterday and to receive instructions—especially the United States delegation, which is in New

\* Resumed from the 2180th meeting.

York. It has only to pick up a telephone receiver and within 20 minutes it can agree on its position with the State Department. So if that pretext is being put forward by the United States delegation it can hardly be serious. But let us not anticipate matters.

13. As to the soviet delegation, as all representatives know, we introduced our draft resolution a long time ago. At the very beginning of the General Assembly session, Comrade A. A. Gromyko, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, introduced this text in his statement during the general debate. Delegations have had more than two months to study this draft. There is therefore no need to postpone the vote. Our draft resolution does not have any financial implications. The only financial implications, which are in any case positive ones, are the \$1,000 million or more which the developing countries will receive in the form of supplementary assistance. Therefore, as far as the Soviet draft resolution is concerned, there is no reason to postpone the vote on it. But this is only a preliminary comment, and I now ask you to allow me to speak in order to conclude the debate on the substance of the item under discussion.

14. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to sum up the procedural position. Rule 73 states:

“During the discussion of any matter, a representative may rise to a point of order, and the point of order shall be immediately decided by the President in accordance with the rules of procedure.”

15. A point of order was raised, rule 76 has been invoked, and I am therefore compelled to apply it. This rule refers to the adjournment of the debate and permits me to call on two representatives to speak in favour of the motion and two representatives to speak against it.

16. Until we settle this point, I cannot call on anyone to speak in the debate.

17. Mr. MENEGATTI (Italy) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, I should like to point out that I asked for the floor immediately after the United States delegation and it was in the same spirit, namely, that I wish to support the motion which appears to us to be entirely reasonable and constructive. That would offer many delegations—but I wish to speak merely on behalf of the Italian delegation—an opportunity to have a breathing spell to reflect upon this important and serious matter.

18. The head of the Mexican delegation has reminded us of the importance of our obtaining a consensus or unanimity on his draft resolution. I would recall that we have always linked the two drafts and that is why I, too, am requesting that a vote not be taken before Monday.

19. Mr. FACK (Netherlands): I have asked to speak in order to support the motion to adjourn the debate under rule 76.

20. I am in agreement with the remarks made by the representative of Italy, although I am perhaps in a slightly more advantageous position than some representatives. At exactly 3.30 p.m. I received my instructions on how the

Netherlands vote is to be cast but I should not be at all surprised if a number of delegations are not as fortunate as I am. If I, therefore, support the motion to adjourn the debate until Monday, I do so for reasons of principle.

21. I think that if there are delegations which find themselves in an awkward position because they have not yet received their instructions from their Governments on how to vote on an extremely important matter such as the one before this General Assembly at the present time, it would be appropriate to give them a breathing spell so that they have time to receive their instructions.

22. We were under the impression that we were here this afternoon in the General Assembly in order to cast votes on all draft resolutions before the Assembly at the present time. I suppose that it was with this in mind that the United States delegation moved the adjournment of the debate.

23. Be that as it may, for reasons of principle I think that it is appropriate for delegations which are not yet in possession of instructions from their Governments on how to vote on an extremely important matter to agree to an adjournment of the debate under rule 76 of the rules of procedure. I therefore support the motion.

24. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia, who wishes to speak against the adjournment, I should like to clarify one point raised in the statement of the representative of the Netherlands. This afternoon we were not really going to proceed to a vote, but rather to hear the last speaker in the general debate and subsequently to proceed to the vote. It was precisely because the general debate had not been concluded that we were able to accept the motion under rule 76. Therefore, the general debate has not been concluded and there is a motion to adjourn it until Monday.

25. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I am against adjournment for many reasons. I need not enumerate all of them. However, there are two cogent reasons why we should proceed with the debate and when the debate is over to vote forthwith on the draft resolution of the Soviet Union, the gist of which, as Mr. Malik has just reminded us, was presented a long time ago in the statement of the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union [2126th meeting].

26. I must also remind my colleague from the Netherlands that the revised document which embodies this draft resolution is already 10 days old. He could already have written to his Government by airmail and received a reply—unless his Government is preoccupied by other issues, such as energy.

27. Secondly, I should like you, Mr. President, to remind us that 10 December, which happens to be Monday next, is the day for celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and the reason we are meeting here is that the Assembly Hall is being prepared for certain ceremonies, including ceremonies to honour those to whom we are awarding medals or certificates or citations for having served the cause of human rights throughout the years. Now, for us to have a debate on this question, at that time, might get very involved, since we cannot divide ourselves between here and the Assembly Hall; it would not be proper. I think my colleague from the

United States should have taken into account that 10 December is a special occasion that should be observed.

28. But there is another reason why the debate should not be adjourned: as I have specifically mentioned, not only this morning but in many other General Assembly meetings, we are acting here in solidarity. Yet, no sooner had our colleague from the United States proposed adjournment, than two other NATO Powers popped up and mentioned, "as a matter of principle". And they are always using that formula: "as a matter of principle, we would like to debate it, but...". We know that formula; all the trouble is in that word "but".

29. Now, my Government is not a member of either the "NATO club" or the "Warsaw club", and I believe it is only reasonable that we should proceed. Why do you want to have an aspirin over the weekend and delay the headache? Some of you mentioned the draft resolution of our colleague from Mexico [A/L.715], which is germane in certain points to the one which has probably become the bone of contention for adjournment. But this is a new draft resolution; it has nothing to do with, though it does not exclude, the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.701/Rev.I]. But I know what you want to do, those of you who want to postpone this; you want to mix the issues and you want to lobby over the weekend. That is not fair. Every one of us has made up his mind, one way or the other. And, my good colleague and friend from the Netherlands, why should you stand up for those that you think have not yet received a reply? You received a reply at 3.30 p.m., so why should you be worried about those who may have received replies at 3.45 p.m., or those who will receive replies perhaps at 5 o'clock, when we will still be meeting on this issue?

30. Come on, now; let us be frank. I like your smile, and I am laughing with you, my dear friend from the Netherlands. Come on; out with it: you want to vote with solidarity. But we all know beforehand how we shall be voting; we know who is in favour, who is against, and who will not participate in the debate; and we know your explanations of vote. You could make them now, if you want, and we could stay here till 7 or 8 o'clock. There are four receptions; are you afraid that you will miss one of them? We could stay here even until 9 o'clock to finish this item.

31. But in a serious vein, in a matter like this, I do not think it fair to try to put the axe to something that is under consideration. There should be a little fair play. Every one of us knows how he wants to vote, and if he has not yet received instructions from his Government there is always that yellow light: he can abstain and then he can probably correct his vote later. I think there is no valid reason why we should adjourn this debate.

32. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with rule 76 we have heard two representatives in favour of the motion and two against. Before we proceed to the vote to determine whether we should in fact adjourn the debate until Monday morning, I should like to explain to the representative of Saudi Arabia that on Monday morning we shall be very pleased to hear him as one of the authors of the Declaration on Human Rights. We are not meeting on Monday afternoon.

*The motion was rejected by 52 votes to 36, with 30 abstentions.*

33. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): As the motion has been rejected, we shall continue with the debate on agenda item 102.

34. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Today the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly is concluding its consideration of one of the most important items on its agenda—"Reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries." The delegation of the USSR, as the country which initiated this proposal, would like to make some comments on the outcome of the discussion held on this item.

35. This proposal of the Soviet Union was motivated by a sincere and serious desire to consolidate the successes which have been achieved in improving the international situation, to supplement political détente by military détente, and to ensure that the benefits of the easing of international tension are enjoyed by the peoples of a wide range of countries. The reduction of the military budgets of the five States permanent members of the Security Council would have great significance both for the cause of disarmament and for the economic progress of the developing countries. It would, of course, be desirable for other States possessing major economic and military potential to reduce their military budgets too.

36. The funds saved from the reduction of military budgets would be switched from military to peaceful purposes and would be used for the welfare of the peoples and for the provision of technical and economic assistance to the developing countries, as a supplement to the assistance which is already being provided to them through existing channels. In this case, the assistance would be free of charge and would not be accompanied by any conditions, particularly by any requirements of a constraining nature.

37. This proposal by the USSR fully corresponds to the position of the developing countries as set forth in the official United Nations document entitled "Review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade" [A/C.2/L.1329]. This document was adopted unanimously today by the Second Committee of the General Assembly.

38. In this important document, on behalf of all the developing countries in the United Nations, the following is especially emphasized as one of the basic principles:

"... all countries should actively promote the achievement of general and complete disarmament through effective measures. The resources that may be released as a result of effective measures of actual disarmament should be used for the promotion of economic and social development of all nations. The release of resources resulting from those measures should increase the capacity of developed countries to provide support to developing countries in their efforts towards accelerating their economic and social progress."



39. In our proposal, this general principle is embodied in specific and realistic figures for the provision of assistance to the developing countries through an actual reduction of military expenditure. The fact that the USSR position coincides with the positions of the third world countries on this question, which is vitally important to them, makes us confident that the delegations of those countries, which constitute a majority in the United Nations, support our proposal and will vote for the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.701/Rev. I].

40. Some representatives have tried to spread the idea that such assistance supposedly amounts to an insignificant sum. This does not correspond to the facts. Surely additional assistance to developing countries amounting to over \$1,000 million is not unimportant? With this sum it would be possible in the developing countries to build not mirages—as one of the opponents of this proposal expatiated with false cynicism—but genuine industrial projects and other useful projects. Only one thing is necessary: a genuine willingness on the part of those who must reduce their military spending and transfer additionally and without charge part of the funds thus saved to developing countries.

41. The reduction of military budgets by 10 per cent will not jeopardize the principle of the equal security of States, because it is being proposed that all five States should reduce their military budgets by an equal percentage, in the same proportion. It is absolutely clear that a proportional reduction of the level of the military budgets of the five Powers would not prejudice the security interests of a single one of them.

42. A proportional reduction is also fully in accordance with the principle contained in the Soviet-British communiqué issued on 5 December 1973 in Moscow during the stay in the Soviet Union of Sir Alec Douglas-Home, the British Foreign Secretary. That communiqué states that, during discussion of the question of talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and of armaments, the parties emphasized the great significance of the principle of not jeopardizing the security of either of the parties.

43. In drawing attention to this understanding between the Soviet and British parties, I am expressing the hope that the United Kingdom delegation in the General Assembly will not object to a proportional reduction of the military budgets of the five States permanent members of the Security Council, since this would be fully in accordance with the principle of not jeopardizing the security of any of the parties.

44. Any attempts to demonstrate the opposite are merely an open manifestation of unwillingness to reduce military budgets and to make a further real advance on the road to disarmament. We are deeply convinced that the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations fully understand both the constructive nature of this proposal and the essentially negative position of its opponents.

45. The delegation of the USSR cannot but express its satisfaction that this Soviet proposal has been supported by those who are genuinely interested in strengthening peace, implementing measures for disarmament and providing assistance to developing countries. In noting with satisfac-

tion that this proposal has been supported by many non-aligned countries, we express our gratitude to their delegations in the Assembly.

46. What is being said by the opponents of the proposal for the reduction of the military budgets and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries? Most of them, it would seem, do not reject this proposal in principle. It is difficult to reject it openly. However, they are seeking devious ways to divert the attention of the Assembly and of delegations from this practical and easily realizable proposal. Some of them allege that it is difficult to establish the size of the military budgets of each of the five permanent members of the Security Council. Yet—and we wish to emphasize this particularly—the amounts of these military budgets have been approved by the Parliaments of each of these five countries and their amounts in the relevant national currencies known from official documents not only to the delegations of those countries in the General Assembly but also to the whole world.

47. Let us begin with the size of the military budget of the United Kingdom. From the official documents of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, it is well known that the defence allocations for the financial year 1973/1974 amounted to £3,100 million. This sum for the military budget was approved by Parliament on 6 March 1973. Where is this information found? In an official British document. I shall give the title in English and indicate the page: *Financial Statement and Budget Report 1973-74* (London, her Majesty's Stationery Office) p. 18.

48. We also know very well the size of the military budget of France for 1973. It also amounts to the substantial sum of 34,800 million francs. It was approved by the National Assembly of France on 20 December 1972. How do we know this? From French official documents, namely: *Journal officiel de la République française (Lois et Décrets)*, Tuesday, 21 December 1972, Paris, p. 1322.

49. Let us turn to the Soviet Union. Its defence budget amounts to 17,900 million roubles for 1973. That sum is also perfectly well known to everybody from the law on the State budget of the USSR for 1973, published in the newspaper *Izvestia*, the organ of the Soviet Parliament and Soviet Government, on 20 December 1972. This figure is also known to Sir Donald Maitland. He quoted it in his statement: It is true that he complained that only one line had been published about the military budget of the USSR. However, the military budgets of all countries can fit into one line—those of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France.

50. The military budget of the United States is also known from official presidential documents. In the financial year 1973, actual expenditure on defence in the United States was estimated at about \$76,400 million. How do we know this? From an official United States document, entitled: *The Budget of the United States Government. Fiscal year 1974, Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget* (Washington, 1973), p. 364.

51. Only with regard to the military budget of China are there no official data. According to the world press and

experts, China's military budget amounts to a sum between \$9,000 million and \$16,000 million. Let us hope that, after the adoption by the General Assembly of the resolution on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council, the Chinese Government will officially make known the amount of China's military budget.

52. The proposal to reduce military budgets by 10 per cent, as has already been explained on a number of occasions, provides for a one-time reduction of those same official budgets for 1973 of the permanent members of the Security Council and the allocation of a fixed proportion of 10 per cent of the funds thus saved for the purposes of development.

53. All this can easily be calculated on the basis of existing official data, so that an exact fixed sum can be made available for supplementary gratuitous assistance to the developing countries.

54. What is required? Not much. Only the willingness of the United Kingdom, France, China and the United States. The willingness and agreement of the Soviet Union already exist. All those States will reduce their military budgets by 10 per cent, that is, proportionately. Not one of them will suffer any loss from the point of view of defence and security interests. Therefore any allegations to the effect that the United Kingdom or China or France, if they were to reduce their military budgets by 10 per cent, would be in a less favourable position than the Soviet Union, are groundless and therefore untenable.

55. Certain opponents are deliberately trying to dismember the question of the reduction of military budgets by dividing it into two parts—that is to say, by separating disarmament from development. On the one hand, attempts are being made to demonstrate that it is supposedly impossible to implement practical measures for the reduction of budgets and for disarmament and, on the other hand, the story is being spread that the Western capitalist countries are supposedly already providing so much assistance to the developing countries that it would be unwarranted to provide any additional assistance to them, even gratuitously, through the reduction of military budgets. Both these so-called arguments cannot withstand serious criticism. The Soviet Union firmly advocates that one further practical step be both with regard to disarmament—through the reduction of the military budgets of the five permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent—and with regard to providing additional assistance to developing countries.

56. Some opponents of the Soviet proposal maintain that it is impossible to reduce the military budgets of the five permanent members of the Security Council by an equal proportion, because the levels of military preparedness vary and because these Powers have various types of weapons in their possession: some have more, and others less. Therefore it is said that those who have fewer weapons should be allowed to continue the arms race and should be given a discount and granted privileges in this matter. From this more than strange reasoning it follows that all talks on disarmament and on the reduction of military budgets

should stop and that the discussion of these questions in the United Nations and in international forums should be postponed until all the great Powers have achieved an equally high level of military preparedness and have stockpiled an equal number of weapons. Only then would it be possible, allegedly, to speak of the reduction of military budgets and disarmament. The groundlessness of this reasoning is obvious and there is no need to prove it. The slogan of such a philosophy is "Long live the arms race, down with development."

57. Some people allege that it is impossible to do anything anyway because, they say, not all the great Powers wish to reduce their military budgets. To state that amounts to not believing in the influence of world public opinion and in the effect of the opinions and decisions of the United Nations where the great Powers too are concerned.

58. Certain representatives of Western capitalist countries have been boasting about the considerable amounts of assistance which their countries are providing to the developing States. But in this connexion they, and particularly the representative of the United Kingdom, have modestly remained silent about the amounts of dividends which, during the colonialist imperialist domination of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the United Kingdom, for example, derived from its former colonies which are now sovereign developing States. These dividends amount to billions of dollars. In order to return only part of the "revenue" acquired from colonial domination, the former colonial Powers, and particularly the United Kingdom, should provide much more substantial assistance to the developing countries than they are now providing, and should offer it gratuitously. The true nature of the "assistance" provided by certain Western Powers was very well described by the President of Zaire, Mr. Mobutu, in his statement at the 2140th plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 4 October 1973. He stated that his country transferred annually a sum amounting to the colossal figure of some \$350 million for services rendered to it by foreign companies. "That is why", he declared, "I am wondering who is helping whom."

59. Let us turn to the facts. The profits of British companies, for example, from direct investments alone in the developing countries—that is, without taking into account the profits from oil companies, banks, insurance companies, portfolio investments and other such—in 1971 amounted to £209 million, and the profits of the British oil companies which have investments in the developing countries in the same year amounted to about £200 million.

60. If the United Kingdom were to reduce its military budget by 10 per cent, this would amount to a sum of about £300 million, and if from this sum saved on military expenditure it were to provide 10 per cent in assistance to developing countries—additionally and gratuitously—this would amount to about £30 million.

61. This sum represents only about 8 per cent of the £409 million which the United Kingdom obtains annually from the exploitation of the developing countries by only the two types of companies which I have mentioned.

62. In the light of these facts, it would not be too burdensome for the United Kingdom to provide that amount of additional assistance to the developing countries.

63. Sir Donald Maitland tried to make up for the absence of arguments against our proposal on the reduction of military budgets, by depicting Soviet assistance to the developing countries in an inaccurate light.

64. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation would like to point out that the Soviet Union has agreements on assistance and co-operation with 45 developing countries, and their number is growing. Under those agreements the USSR is providing assistance in building and expanding about 860 different projects in developing countries, of which more than 400 are already in operation. The amount of credits on easy terms offered by the Soviet Union for the purposes of economic, scientific and technical development to the developing countries for the period from 1963 to 1971 has almost doubled and at the present time exceeds 5,600 million roubles. About 90 per cent of these funds are channelled into the development of production, and three quarters of that is directed into industry and power. The economic self-sufficiency of the developing countries is growing and strengthening in the course of economic co-operation with the Soviet Union, because the Soviet Union is building its relations with these countries on the basis of respect for sovereignty, equality of rights and non-interference in internal affairs. At a time when the monopolistic capital of the capitalist countries is being used to pursue the aim of securing the natural resources of the developing countries and guaranteeing the continuation of neo-colonialist exploitation of their human resources, the co-operation of the Soviet Union with the developing countries is helping them in the struggle for political independence, economic self-sufficiency and social progress for the welfare of the broad masses of the population of these countries. The projects of economic co-operation between the Soviet Union and the developing countries have become a real school for training the engineers, technicians and highly skilled manpower needed in the developing countries. The economic co-operation of the USSR with the developing countries is based on the fact that our assistance is an expression of the solidarity of the Soviet working people with the national liberation struggle of the developing countries against imperialist domination; this support is given by the Soviet Union to the developing countries that are defending their economic and political independence.

65. I should like to say a few words about the Mexican draft resolution. The delegation of the USSR has carefully studied the draft resolution introduced to the Assembly by Mr. García Robles, the head of the Mexican delegation.

66. We note with gratitude that Mr. García Robles, like many other representatives of developing countries, not only reacted favourably to the main idea contained in our proposal of embarking on a course of reducing the military budgets of the five permanent members of the Security Council, but is also making efforts for the practical realization of this idea. He supplements this idea by stressing the need for other States with a major economic and military potential to follow the example of these five States. This is reflected in his draft resolution, which requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of consultant experts,

to study this aspect of the idea of reducing military budgets in more detail and to transmit a report to the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

67. For our part, we have no objection to this draft resolution. We consider, in accordance with our understanding with Mr. García Robles, that his draft resolution supplements our draft resolution and does not compete with it.

68. In conclusion, we should like to state that the proposal to reduce the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and to utilize part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries, introduced by the Soviet Union for consideration at the present session of the General Assembly, is a practical and constructive proposal by one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. We call on all the permanent members of the Security Council without exception, to whom our proposal is addressed, to display the same willingness and practical readiness to implement it. This is required in the interest of consolidating the successes which have been achieved in improving the international situation, and of supplementing political détente by military détente in order to strengthen this détente and make it irreversible. It is required in the interest of implementing practical disarmament measures and of the peaceful development of States.

69. On instructions from the Soviet Government, the delegation of the USSR is authorized to state that the Soviet Union is prepared to implement this proposal.

70. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker on the general debate. I shall now call on those representatives who desire to explain their vote before the vote.

71. Mr. Mamoun Ibrahim HASSAN (Sudan): The Sudan delegation, adhering to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, has through the years called for general and complete disarmament. Being consistent with this initial stand, our delegation has supported all measures which enhance the process of disarmament.

72. At each session of the Assembly we have expressed our concern at the ever-increasing arms race, and hence military expenditures. There is a consensus among different delegations that the arms race exacerbates international tension, thus undermining the lofty ideals of our Charter. The majority of the human race laments the fact that great financial resources of our world are exploited and utilized in unproductive and destructive purposes. In the early 1960s, the countries of the world used to spend annually \$120,000 million on armaments. By the advent of the present decade annual expenditure rose to \$200,000 million and it is expected to reach between \$300,000 million and \$350,000 million annually.

73. It is a sad fact that the military expenditure of our world is two and a half times its expenditure on health and one and a half times its expenditure on education. It is 30 times the official aid granted by developed to developing countries. In one way or another some 50 million people of the human race are engaged directly or indirectly in military purposes. What a waste of the earth's limited resources and what a waste of the creativeness of the human being!



74. It is alarming that even such unproductive expenditure is mounting with the rapid increase in science and technology, thus rendering our world insecure and hampering peaceful contacts and co-operation between different peoples and nations.

75. The first review of the Second United Nations Development Decade has indicated that progress towards the attainment of the International Development Strategy's key targets for the transfer of financial resources to the developing countries has been disappointing. While some developed countries have enlarged their financial contributions, the over-all effort remained unsatisfactory and the availability of external financial resources remained far from commensurate with the needs of the developing countries.

76. It is certain that unless current trends are reversed, neither of the targets of our Decade is likely to be reached on the date envisaged in the Strategy [*resolution 2626 (XXV)*]. That is where we hope that resources which might be released by disarmament could play a vital role.

77. In any genuine move to adopt disarmament measures, be they partial, collateral, or complete, enormous resources could be liberated, and unless a portion of them is transferred to development in developing countries, the gap between the rich and the poor will widen.

78. Moreover, donor countries, whenever urged to increase the official flow of aid to developing countries, have given the excuse of their inability to do so is because of increasing internal demand for their public resources. Hence it goes without saying that disarmament by the major donors will liberate official resources and that might enable them to increase their transfer to developing countries.

79. For a long time the developing countries in the Assembly have tried to pass measures seeking to establish a correlation between disarmament and development. We need not recite our efforts in the Assembly to establish such an integrated approach to development and disarmament. Only an integrated approach can contribute significantly to the solution of the two pressing problems of our age, that is, to overcome the disparity between the developed and the developing countries, and to reduce the armaments race. Only this approach can establish a lasting peace and security built on justice and progress.

80. Although the initiative contained in the draft resolution before us [*A/L.701/Rev.1*] is an old one, it goes in the same direction as our ideas *vis-à-vis* multilateral economic co-operation and issues relating to peace and security. The Soviet initiative, commendable as it may be, has its shortcomings and loop-holes. It needs more precise definition as to its details and points. During the debate we have heard a critical analysis which encompassed *inter alia* the need to define a military budget; whether the specified rate in the Soviet initiative is really sufficient to reduce disarmament and tension; whether it is advisable to apply a flat scale of contribution to those who are expected to donate; and whether there is a need to apply certain criteria for the terms of aid. Some of these ideas merit careful consideration.

81. Indeed, we are aware of the limitations of the initiative, of its shortcomings and the difficulties of its implementa-

tion; we are also aware of the present realities of the international strategies of the super-Powers and the big Powers. It might even prove to be a certainty that the initiative will not get off the ground, bearing in mind that the majority of those who are called upon in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the present draft resolution showed an unfavourable response to the whole idea. But despite all these considerations, we cannot but support a principle we have long advocated, hoping that a better climate will prevail in the international arena which makes feasible the implementation of the idea.

82. Our support for the initial idea and for the principle it entails, that is, to reduce the military expenditure of the permanent members of the Security Council and the allocation of some of the funds thus liberated to development in developing countries does not mean an acceptance of the item proposed in its totality and with all its provisions. Many delegations during the debate on the issue have put forward constructive suggestions which merit careful consideration.

83. Bearing in mind the abovementioned factors, my delegation will cast a favourable vote when draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1 is put to a vote.

84. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados): The Barbados delegation will cast a positive vote for the propositions contained in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union in document A/L.701/Rev.1. The proposal of the Soviet Union is commendable and praiseworthy on two grounds. In the first place, it exhorts the permanent members of the Security Council—the big Powers—to reduce their military budgets and arms build-up by at least 10 per cent of the 1973 levels. In the second place, the Soviet proposal recommends that 10 per cent of the funds so released by such a reduction in armaments should be allocated to the developing countries to assist them in the more peaceful and productive pursuits of nation-building. The Soviet proposal argues at one and the same time for disarmament and development.

85. As such, no delegation can be heard to be in opposition to a proposal which encourages the five States in the world which are armed the most to reduce their armaments. Nor can any delegation oppose a proposal which seeks to assist developing countries in accelerating their economic growth by any quantity, however small. The Soviet proposal is a contribution to the efforts and aspirations of the Second United Nations Development Decade.

86. The Soviet Union includes itself in the exhortation to the major producers and users of armaments. The proposal is, therefore, not one-sided but even-handed and objective. In any case, the developing countries have nothing to lose but quite a lot to gain from the Soviet proposal. We shall be the net beneficiaries of the exercise, in any case. Whether the release from any such armaments shows a reduction of \$30,000 million or \$1,300 million, or \$1 million, it will be more than we in the developing countries have at the moment. We will be the recipients of something. Put in such philistine but realistic terms, the Barbados delegation will have no choice but to support the draft resolution of the Soviet Union. We cannot oppose a proposal which seeks to give us actual development aid.

87. We have heard arguments in the general debate—and encountered them informally—which seek to impugn the good faith and the motives of the Soviet Union. My delegation does not share any such reservations concerning the motives of the Soviet Union. We esteem such calumnies to be both unworthy and ungenerous, quite apart from the historical record of the specific performance of the Soviet Union in matters which assist the developing countries and those which strengthen the role of international peace and security. Can we in the developing countries forget, for instance, that it was the Soviet Union under its then Chairman of the Council of Ministers, the late Tovarich Nikita Khrushchev who, in the commemorative session of the General Assembly of 1960, submitted the proposition to the General Assembly on the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples which subsequently became part of our standing legislation, now known as resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960.

88. That proposal by the Soviet Union in 1960 was considered by certain Powers at that time—and the records indicate this—as mischievous, insincere and unrealistic. But we know that that same Declaration has been instrumental in tying the hands of the imperialists and bringing millions of people forward into freedom and independence. The Committee of 24 members on decolonization<sup>1</sup> was created pursuant to that self-same resolution.

89. Nor can we forget the invaluable assistance rendered the developing countries by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in 1964 when we struggled valiantly with the industrialized Powers to create a new régime in international trade and development which would bring about some rationalization and equity in the international system. The Soviet Union fought shoulder to shoulder with the developing countries for three months in Geneva, at the first historic United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. This is a matter of public record and so my delegation is revealing no secret on this issue.

90. Once again, Foreign Minister Gromyko of the Soviet Union introduced a proposal in the Assembly about four years ago setting forth measures in which international peace and security ought to be strengthened.

91. At this session of the General Assembly yet once again, the Soviet Union, faithful to its espousal of the cause of peace and its efforts to reduce international tension, has submitted yet another praiseworthy proposal to reduce armaments further by 10 per cent of current levels and to give part of the resources released thereby to the developing countries.

92. That is not the record, we submit, of a State whose motives are to be questioned, either in the area of disarmament or in the domain of measures aimed at assisting developing countries. A country which lost more than 13 million of its nationals in the last world war cannot be a country, we submit, which can light-heartedly present a proposal on disarmament; nor is it likely to make such a proposal merely to win some doubtful political advantage. No; my delegation, as at present constituted, has no reason to doubt the

motives of the Soviet Union on this matter. We salute the Soviet Union in its efforts.

93. My delegation is convinced that the Soviet Union proposal is genuine and praiseworthy; but we are even more convinced that, if adopted and executed, it will bring actual concrete benefits to all developing countries and raise the level of magnanimity and international responsibility of the five permanent members of the Security Council.

94. My delegation has encountered the argument, in the corridors of conversation, that the item as put does engender political dispute and controversy amongst the five permanent members. We say, so let it be. The Barbados delegation will take diplomatic notice of this circumstance. In any case, we intend to take a position on this question based solely on the enlightened self-interest of developing countries. We are not interested in the political disputes of the five permanent members of the Security Council. We, for our part, will not seek to become part of any such dispute; we are friendly with all the States concerned. But we are quite willing and happy to be the happy recipients of the whole 10 per cent cut in the armament budget; being small, we are content with small mercies, and so our purse runneth over with joy as the glad beneficiaries of 10 per cent. Let no one say that we are unthankful.

95. Consequently, based upon these foundations, the Barbados delegation will vote for the Soviet draft resolution in document A/L.701/Rev.1 in all its provisions, and we make bold to exhort all developing countries to do likewise.

96. Since we are likely to vote on the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Mexico [A/L.715], my delegation is pleased to announce that we will support that draft resolution as well.

97. Mr. SCHAUFLE (United States of America): I should like to say a few words concerning my delegation's decision to abstain in the vote on the USSR proposal calling for a 10 per cent reduction in the military budgets of the five permanent members of the Security Council and the use of part of the funds thus saved to increase development assistance.

98. After careful consideration we have concluded that a resolution that would tie additional development aid to reductions in defence budgets is neither a practical, equitable nor promising way to proceed towards the development goals to which we all subscribe. First, we do not believe that the proposal is a practical one. Its application would require some common standard for measuring the military budgets of the various States concerned. No such standard exists. Countries differ significantly in their concepts of what constitutes a military budget. Those countries whose military budget covers only a part of their defence-associated expenditures would, under this proposal, have the advantage of undertaking a relatively smaller reduction in their military strength. By the same token, their development assistance contribution would be relatively less than if common, objective standards for definition of a military budget existed. Even assuming that we could all agree on such standards, there is no assurance that all the States concerned would be willing to submit their military budgets to the sort

<sup>1</sup> Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.



of international scrutiny necessary to see that the standards were applied fairly.

99. Moreover, the Soviet proposal suggests no system for verification of the proposed budget cuts. In the absence of such verification there could be no assurance that a military budget was in fact reduced, or, if it was, that actual military expenditures were decreased or the funds not subsequently restored. Without some standard accounting concepts and a verification system it would be practically impossible to ensure that a measure for equal relative reductions in official budgets would be equitable in its effects on national military forces.

100. Quite beyond the impracticability of the Soviet proposal, we do not believe that it is useful to try to link defence budgetary levels to capacity or duty to provide development assistance. There is no direct relationship between the size of a country's defence budget and the funds it may make available for development purposes abroad; nor do comparisons among countries show any consistent ratio between the two. Therefore, in our view, to propose such a purported link cannot effectively ensure that those countries able to do so would devote an appropriate share of their available resources to aid for developing countries.

101. To reach the goals of the Development Decade each of the more developed countries should use its own budgetary procedures to determine how the maximum amount of money could be made available for aid purposes. We do not believe that countries with widely different budgetary systems should be called upon to allocate development aid funds out of a particular part of their budgets. It is up to each of them to decide on what financial mechanism it finds most suitable.

102. I should like to conclude my remarks on the proposal before us by making it clear that, while the United States is unable to support the proposal, we do remain committed both to the search for means to curtail and limit armaments and to the principle that the developed countries have a responsibility to help other, developing, countries to improve their economic situation. We have upheld that principle. The development assistance provided by the United States Government to other nations since the Second World War amounts to over \$75,000 million. The United States will continue to furnish such assistance and we welcome the efforts of any and all other States to help meet the needs of developing countries.

103. With regard to draft resolution A/L.715, I wish to point out that the United States has consistently maintained that the most promising path to genuine progress in the disarmament field and the one most likely to protect and enhance the security of all States is that of the careful and thorough examination of the complex issues involved in possible control measures. That is why my delegation welcomes the general approach of the representative of Mexico, Mr. García Robles. However, we regret that we shall have to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. Specifically, my delegation believes that the second preambular paragraph needlessly adds an element of contention and an exaggerated sense of urgency to what is otherwise a non-controversial procedural draft resolution. While we agree that the question of the reduction of military budgets is

timely and important, we cannot accept language describing the matter as one of "urgent necessity".

104. In addition to its somewhat precipitate tone, the paragraph makes a distinction between two different categories of States —the permanent members of the Security Council and other States with a major economic and military potential, and suggests that for the first category the importance of reducing budgets is significantly greater than it is for the second. We cannot concur in making such a distinction.

105. I should like also to say a few words about the third preambular paragraph. The United States has stated on several occasions, most recently in connexion with the Soviet proposal on this subject, that regardless of the high priority and importance we attach to the goals of disarmament and development, we do not believe any useful purpose is served by linking in a precise manner the possible reduction of national military budgets to an obligation to increase national contributions to development assistance. The third preambular paragraph seems to imply such a linkage.

106. It is our understanding that the expert study called for in operative paragraph 1 would cover the entire range of issues related to the question of possible agreed reductions of military budgets and would not be confined to the study of any single measure. In his statement to the Assembly on 26 November, Mr. García Robles indicated that the report of the experts should cover a variety of concrete issues relevant to the question of possible budget reduction measures. At that time he said:

"Among the various points that the report should endeavour to elucidate it would be desirable to give prominence to the criteria that should be applied in order to arrive at a generally accepted definition of what is to be understood by military budgets." [2179th meeting, para. 151.]

We agree with Mr. García Robles. We would even say that the following things are indispensable.

107. First, the group of experts should examine the problem of arriving at a common definition of the elements and scope of military expenditures.

108. Secondly, given the diverse budgetary systems of States, the group should explore the question of devising standard accounting procedures for measuring military budgets and expenditures.

109. Thirdly, in view of the varying national rates of inflation, the group should study appropriate methods for evaluating the effects of price and wage changes on national military spending.

110. Fourthly, the expert group should investigate the feasibility of comparing in a meaningful way budget figures expressed in one currency with figures expressed in another, especially when the comparison is between market and non-market economies, with very different domestic price structures.

111. Fifthly, the group should examine the feasibility of various techniques for monitoring military spending levels and changes in those levels. Of course, that set of questions is not meant to be exhaustive; it is only illustrative of the types of issues that we regard as essential for the group of consultative experts to address itself to.

112. My delegation would also like to concur with the view expressed by Mr. García Robles on 26 November [2179th meeting], that the group of experts should have available to it the replies which Member States would provide in response to a questionnaire from the Secretary-General. Such a procedure was followed in 1971 in connexion with the expert study on the *Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures*.<sup>2</sup> We would therefore fully expect that, in accordance with operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, the Secretary-General would request, either in the form of a questionnaire or by some other appropriate means, Member States to provide the detailed and meaningful data necessary to make the study a responsible and successful one.

113. On those assumptions—that the group of experts would examine carefully the various issues involved in the possible reduction of military budgets and that the Secretary-General would request Member States to provide the data necessary to make the examination meaningful—the United States would welcome the opportunity to co-operate with the study and would nominate a qualified American expert to participate in it. We would also be prepared to provide the expert group with relevant data. My delegation believes that an expert study organized and prepared along those lines would be a constructive enterprise which would contribute to a better understanding of the issues involved. Only by utilizing such an approach can we hope to make possible the serious and thorough consideration of this important aspect of our work in the disarmament field.

114. I think it will be clear from what I have said that my delegation found some elements of genuine merit in the Mexican draft resolution, and if it had had more time to study all its aspects it might have been able to arrive at a voting solution other than that of a pure and simple abstention. That was the purpose of the procedural motion we made earlier.

115. I wish to point out in this connexion that we also wish to respect the Mexican commitment to have the vote take place on both draft resolutions on the same day; hence we did not request a postponement of voting on the Mexican draft resolution alone.

116. Mr. CHOUNRAMANY (Laos) (*interpretation from French*): As we have not had the opportunity to speak in the course of the debate on agenda item 102, my delegation wishes to avail itself of this opportunity to explain briefly the affirmative vote we propose to cast.

117. My delegation is gratified at the very important initiative taken by the Soviet Union in proposing the reduction of military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and use of part of the funds thus

saved to provide assistance to developing countries. At a time when we are witnessing a cooling off in the original enthusiasm over development, we firmly believe that such a reduction of military expenditure, to be carried out for the benefit of the less fortunate countries, would constitute, above all, an element of vitality and of peace. Apart from the fact that it would reinforce the sustained efforts of the international community to promote the economic development of the developing countries, such a measure, taken as a result of a decision of the General Assembly, would serve to strengthen détente and pave the way for lasting peace and international security.

118. We hear a lot of talk about détente, but that détente is primarily political and concerns only the North, leaving a number of factors of tension in the South, such as mass poverty, unemployment, ignorance and disease. We would be very relieved indeed if this détente were to have an impact for the benefit of the masses, in the sense that it would improve the lot of millions of persons who are suffering in poverty and degradation.

119. The Soviet proposal to reduce military expenditure is a clear illustration of the view that the gap between the rich countries and the poor countries should be filled. It is specific and precise because it clearly provides that part of the funds thus saved should be set aside to provide assistance to countries which need these funds for their economic development.

120. In paragraph 19 of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly [resolution 2734 (XXV)], the Assembly expressly stated that "there is a close connexion between the strengthening of international security, disarmament and the economic development of countries". It goes without saying that we whole-heartedly subscribe to this idea, which deserves very special attention by all countries. Indeed, there are close ties of mutual interdependence between détente, disarmament and development. One cannot talk about effective international security without speaking of collective economic security, which should be realized through the consecration of the economic rights and duties of States.

121. We very much hope that the draft resolution on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent will mark the beginning of a series of measures towards disarmament which will open up prospects for a gradual reduction in the future and will be a sign of real and lasting peace. Such measures could thus accelerate the process of détente and increase the climate of trust which has begun to emerge among nations.

122. Laos, which is a developing country belonging to the hard-core of the 25 most under-developed countries, very much hopes that the developed countries without exception—whether or not they are permanent members of the Security Council—will make additional sacrifices along these lines to assist the economically weaker countries. I am confident of the understanding and the good will of all the countries concerned in implementing the specific measures recommended in the Soviet proposal, which sounds a note

<sup>2</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.72.IX.16.

of optimism on a practical and freely accepted reduction in the arms race.

123. May I say, in passing, that it is encouraging to note that several important treaties, agreements and conventions have been concluded by the great Powers concerning disarmament, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, bacteriological and toxic weapons and so on. I am inclined to think that such an important initiative as the one concerning a reduction of military expenditure which we are now considering should not be taken lightly. In any event, it has had the full attention of my Government. My delegation is pleased in the interest of peace, to support the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union in document A/L.701/Rev.1.

124. Mr. CHUANG Yen (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Before voting on the Soviet draft resolution on the so-called reduction of military budgets by 10 per cent, we deem it necessary to make a further explanation of our position.

125. In his speeches Mr. Malik uttered a whole series of falsities and put up a pretense of sincerity in order to cover up the Soviet fraud on disarmament. Furthermore, he viciously and slanderously attacked China. Yet, no matter what amount of pleasant words and sophistry you may use, a sham is a sham and a fraud is a fraud after all. You have been crying for disarmament for more than a decade, but how much have you reduced your military expenditures and what armament have you reduced? Now your rivalry with the other super-Power has extended to every corner of the globe and your arms race has become increasingly fierce in your contention for world hegemony. You know full well that your military expenditures cannot possibly be reduced and disarmament cannot possibly be realized; yet you have kept on making disarmament proposals of one kind or another year in and year out. To put it bluntly, such stuff of yours is precisely designed to cover up your own arms expansion and war preparations and shift the responsibility for opposing disarmament on to other countries. However, you have the effrontery to "be proud of" this. You are indeed devoid of all sense of shame.

126. In his speech Mr. Malik talked at great length about the figures of military expenditures of the Soviet Union and other countries. We deem it necessary also to deal with this question. According to the greatly reduced figures published by the Soviet Union itself, Soviet military expenditure in 1960 was 9,300 million roubles and has gone up to 17,900 million roubles in 1973. As is known to all, the military expenditures published by the Soviet Union are false and they are many times less than the actual military expenditures. This was publicly admitted by Khrushchev. The actual Soviet military expenditures are reportedly three to four times more than those officially admitted, which have made it possible for the Soviet Union to maintain armaments comparable to those of the other super-Power. The Soviet Union is not honest even about its own military expenditures, and this is a further proof of its hypocrisy in proposing the reduction of military budgets.

127. The Soviet Union often makes itself appear as being concerned about the maintenance of international security and world peace. If this were true, why should you obsti-

nately refuse to sign Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America in disregard of the Latin American people's just demand for opposing nuclear threat and nuclear blackmail? Why should you obstinately refuse to support the establishment of an Indian Ocean peace zone in disregard of the legitimate desire of the numerous small and medium-sized countries in the Indian Ocean region to defend their national independence and State sovereignty, and why should you instead unwarrantedly attack this proposal? And why should you refuse to accept China's proposal for all nuclear countries, particularly the Soviet Union and the United States, to undertake the obligations not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and to withdraw all their troops from abroad and dismantle military bases on foreign soil? In our opinion, given a sincere desire on the part of the Soviet Union, it will not be difficult for it to do all this. Mr. Malik, do you dare to stand up to declare that the Soviet Government agrees to sign Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, support the establishment of the Indian Ocean peace zone and undertake to fulfill the above two obligations as proposed by China long ago? Probably you will not dare to do so.

128. Mr. Malik said that the proportionate reduction of the military budgets of the five States permanent members of the Security Council was a fair approach and that China had no "privilege" not to do so. In this connexion, we already stated our position and exposed your scheme in our last speech [2175th meeting], and there is no need for repetition here. However, it must be pointed out that Mr. Malik's accusation about China having any "privilege" on the question of disarmament is a pure invention and sheer demagoguery. It stands to reason that the aggressors should be disarmed and that those subjected to aggression and threat have the right to self-defence. In the face of serious military threats by the Soviet Union, it is only natural and irreproachable for China to strengthen its national defence, heighten its vigilance and make all preparations against surprise attacks from Soviet revisionist social-imperialism. The question of so-called "privilege" simply does not arise. While stationing large numbers of armed forces on the Sino-Soviet border and in the People's Republic of Mongolia in an aggressive and sabre-rattling posture, the Soviet Union is asking China to reduce its military budget and carry out disarmament. We would like to ask, What are you really up to?

129. Mr. Malik alleged that this Soviet proposal took into account the "mood, opinion, feeling" of the third world countries, unabashedly posing himself as a living Buddha ready to bestow alms and charity on them and styling himself the guardian and spokesman of their interests. Then, let us look at what you have done to the third world countries these years. What you term "assistance" is in fact exploitation and plunder. A commentator of *Pravda* by the name of Zukov openly said on the Moscow television network on 7 October 1972:

"Those who regard assistance to foreign countries as a kind of alms or a waste of money are extremely wrong . . . Such assistance is not gratis, as certain comrades imagine."

Semen Skachkov, Chairman of the Soviet Committee for External Economic Relations, said in an article in *Pravda* on



29 March 1973 that the Soviet assistance to developing countries "helps to boost our foreign trade and increase our export of equipment. It can adequately meet the needs of the national economy of the Soviet Union." He admitted that through "assistance", the Soviet Union had grabbed a large amount of: "... important material, foodstuff and manufactured products beneficial to the Soviet economy". He also admitted that:

"... the foreign exchange obtained from the debt-repayment by the developing countries are increasing yearly, constituting an important contribution to the balance of payments of the Soviet Union".

These are not things said by me. They were all said by gentlemen from the Soviet Union.

130. The Soviet Union does not easily loosen its grip even on its partners in its so-called socialist community. The figures in the *Yearbook on Soviet Foreign Trade* show that from 1960 to 1967, Soviet export of crude oil to four Eastern European countries amounted to over 98.77 million tons which cost 1,705.62 million roubles, and that in the same period Soviet export of crude oil to six Western European countries totalled 99.11 million tons which only cost 852.99 million roubles. Four members of the Council on Mutual Economic Assistance bought less crude oil than the six capitalist countries, but had to pay more than double the sum. It is known to all that the Soviet Union is engaged in huge munition deals also under the signboard of "military assistance". Even in the war against Israeli aggression waged by Egypt and Syria, the Soviet Union brazenly took advantage of their difficulties to compel the Arab countries to pay in cash for the weapons it had supplied them at a high price. The above facts fully show that the so-called "feelings" and so forth for the third world countries as bragged about by the Soviet Union are nothing but synonyms for profit-seeking and plunder. The Soviet representative described our exposure of that double hoax of sham disarmament and sham assistance as opposition to the third world and non-aligned countries. Who will believe these venomous calumnies and words aimed at sowing dissension?

131. In his speech the Soviet representative never forgets to pin the anti-Soviet label on China, as though in this way he could scare people into submission. As a matter of fact, it is you, renegades to Leninism, who are anti-Soviet, anti-communist and against the people. The Brezhnev doctrine which you are now practising has nothing in common with Leninism. You are practising socialism in words and imperialism in deeds, social-imperialism in its full sense. Since you have done so many evil and scandalous things, we certainly have to expose and oppose you openly. This is our bounden internationalist duty as well as our duty as a State Member of the United Nations. If we were to allow you to practise deception at will without raising any objection, we would be doing a disservice to Lenin, to the Soviet people and the world people. The United Nations is an Organization composed of 135 Member States and not a realm ruled by the voice of the Soviet Union alone. Mr. Malik, you should open your eyes to see what era we are now living in. Your peremptory and truculent ways can intimidate no one but will only reveal evermore completely your ugly features of a social-imperialist super-Power.

132. Basing itself on the position as stated in our speeches of 21 November [2175th meeting] and today, the Chinese delegation will vote against the Soviet draft resolution on the reduction of military budgets.

133. We fully understand the well-intentioned desire of some small and medium-sized countries to defend peace. However, at present it is the two super-Powers' frenzied arms expansion and war preparations that are seriously menacing international peace and security. The Mexican draft resolution makes an indiscriminate and sweeping demand for all the five States permanent members of the Security Council to reduce their military budgets. This is inappropriate and will be used by the Soviet Union to serve its fraud of sham disarmament. Therefore, the Chinese delegation cannot agree to this draft resolution, and will vote against it.

134. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would wish to explain very briefly the vote it will cast on draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1, submitted by the Soviet Union.

135. My Government has always supported the idea that the struggle against under-development is a struggle for peace. It is indeed true that the disparity between the standards of living of the developed and the developing countries is a source of tension and, indeed, of confrontation. Accordingly, any action aimed at reducing this disparity is an action that would promote peace. This applies to any disarmament measure designed to benefit development. As a matter of fact, this was emphasized by the General Assembly when it stated in paragraph (5) of its resolution 2626 (XXV):

"The success of . . . development activities will depend . . . particularly on concrete progress towards general and complete disarmament. . .".

In addition, nearly 80 per cent of the \$225,000 million spent on armaments represent the annual expenditures of the great Powers to increase their destructive capacity. Thus it is quite evident that a reduction of the military budgets of the great Powers will liberate resources that in turn can be used for development.

136. In this connexion, the Soviet proposal is a laudable undertaking, which is why my delegation has welcomed it with interest. We consider, however, that the proposal suffers from a number of insufficiencies, both in terms of its formulation and in its practical scope. To be clear, the Soviet proposal should have placed this participation of 1 per cent within the general programme of aid to development. In other words, aid to development resulting from earlier or future commitments on the part of the great Powers should not remain at its normal level, and even less be diminished by the present proposal. Otherwise, if accepted, this proposal would not result in an increase in aid to development. Moreover, this proposal does not indicate how to determine the amounts of the military budgets of the great Powers on which the 10 per cent savings is to be effected. The determination of these budgets will certainly be one of the obstacles to an agreement among the five Powers concerned and, therefore, an obstacle to implementation of the proposal itself.

137. Lastly, we consider that this proposal should have taken into account the real situation of the Powers concerned. Indeed, while the great Powers are asked to allocate 1 per cent of their military budgets in aid to development, a much higher percentage should be asked of some of those Powers, which can now very well do without military budgets—at least in the case of the financial year covered by the proposal.

138. For all these reasons my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1.

139. In the case of the proposal in draft resolution A/L.715, my delegation would have wished to examine and possibly support it. But in view of the decision of the General Assembly to consider it immediately and vote upon it, my delegation will likewise be obliged to abstain on it.

140. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran): My delegation will cast a favourable vote on draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1 in affirmation of our support for the general purport of the Soviet proposal. In the course of my statement on this item on 26 November [2178th meeting], I stressed the position of my Government on all aspects of this proposal. I stressed that the link between disarmament and development, while not a matter of course, is a cherished ideal which the bulk of the membership of this Organization has espoused.

141. At the same time, I pointed to some ambiguities resulting from the structures of military budgets that tend to complicate the implementation of the proposal.

142. But more especially, I have expressed some doubts about the practical effectiveness of setting up an *ad hoc* committee as envisaged in operative paragraph 4 while the basic requisites of its mandate are not fulfilled.

143. In spite of such misgivings, my delegation will cast a favourable vote on this draft resolution, in the hope that by its adoption a first step towards an admittedly far-fetched yet noble goal will have been taken.

144. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil): As was clear from my statement of 19 November last [2171st meeting], the delegation of Brazil is of the opinion that a satisfactory decision by the General Assembly on item 102 would depend on a suitable compromise according to which the item would be dealt with within the broad framework of international peace and security, disarmament and economic development. To that end, we should permanently keep in mind as an appropriate background resolution 2734 (XXV), the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which stressed the close connexion between the strengthening of international security, disarmament and economic development so that any progress made towards any of these objectives will constitute progress towards all of them.

145. In the same context, resolution 2626 (XXV), the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade, should have been taken into account, since it emphasizes that the success of international development activities will depend, in large measure, on improvements in the general international situation and, in the first instance, on concrete progress towards general and complete disarmament under effective international con-

trol. That resolution, together with resolution 2685 (XXV), established a close link between the Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade.

146. These parameters would in our view have allowed the General Assembly to take a politically adequate decision on the present item. It would have permitted us, first, to reaffirm once again the accepted 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, and secondly, to appeal to Member States, in particular the nuclear-weapon States as well as the developed countries responsible for the largest military expenditures, to make their best efforts to render that fundamental principle effective and operative.

147. Draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1 appears to be narrow and unsatisfactory in scope, since it excludes such a fundamental principle from the consideration of the General Assembly and fails to express concern over the persistence of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and over the subsistence of a large segment of mankind in unacceptable conditions of destitution and economic underdevelopment. In that draft the language concerning détente should have reflected the belief that détente must set in motion a process aiming at the establishment of a more equitable international order in conditions of collective political and economic security.

148. Draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1 seems ineffectual from the standpoint of its own professed ends and, given statements heard during the debate on this item, it seems doubtful that practical results will be forthcoming. It should be noted in particular that the mode of constitution of the Special Committee as foreseen in operative paragraph 4 departs significantly from the normal practice of the General Assembly, not only because it singles out the permanent members of the Security Council, thus attempting to create among Member States a distinction not established by the United Nations Charter, but also because it provides for an arbitrary distribution of seats in the proposed Special Committee. The mandate of the proposed Committee could have been broader and more attuned to the needs felt by the United Nations membership.

149. As many, if not all, members are aware, my delegation has attempted to establish a dialogue on the decision that the General Assembly should take on the present item. Those efforts were not fruitful, because of the impossibility of introducing meaningful alterations in the content of draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1. My delegation has taken note of this fact and will abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

150. We shall also abstain on draft resolution A/L.715. Although it is of a procedural and supplementary nature, that draft endorses the substance of draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1 and deals in its phraseology with other questions of principle which are difficult for us to accept. We recognize in any case the very good intentions which prompted the representative of Mexico to submit this draft.

151. Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): There is no need for me to explain why my delegation will abstain in the

vote on draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1. My Permanent Representative has already done so in his statement on 27 November [2180th meeting]. I would only add that I was delighted to hear this afternoon that the Soviet Mission, or perhaps the Soviet Embassy in London, has spent some convertible roubles on the purchase of a publication of Her Majesty's Stationery Office—or perhaps we gave it to them free. The fact remains that from that publication and other publications anyone can obtain a thorough and detailed picture of what constitutes British military expenditure. That is unfortunately not true of the Soviet budget. So much, for the moment, for A/L.701/Rev.1.

152. Draft resolution A/L.715 is an animal of a very different colour. It has the great merit that it would have the effect, by calling for a report, of exposing the basic defect of the Soviet proposal, namely that, particularly in the absence of any valid basis for the comparison of military budgets, it does not offer a serious way forward to disarmament or, therefore, to any additional funds becoming available for development or for any other purpose.

153. The Mexican draft recognizes explicitly that the question has not been adequately studied and recognizes implicitly that adoption of the Soviet draft would have no effect other than to raise groundless expectations. Nevertheless, my delegation will, with some reluctance, have to abstain on this draft also. That is because the draft does not adequately reflect what we believe to be the case, namely, that what is needed is, in the first place, not cuts in military budgets, but rather agreed disarmament measures which will result in a reduction in military budgets and hence in additional funds becoming available for development and other purposes.

154. It is this serious approach to disarmament which my delegation feels is the one which is really in accordance with paragraph 8 of the joint communiqué issued by my Foreign Secretary and the Foreign Minister of the USSR earlier this week, to which the representative of the Soviet Union has referred. As the saying is, "the devil can cite Scripture for his purpose". Without wanting to take that too literally, and without suggesting that either the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union or I myself am a devil, I would like to read that paragraph of the communiqué in full:

"In discussing the negotiations on mutual reduction of forces and armaments and associated measures in Central Europe, they"—that is, the two Ministers—"emphasized the importance of the principle of undiminished security for each party, and their joint determination that the negotiations should contribute to a more stable international relationship and to the strengthening of peace and security in Europe."

Well, it is fantastic to suggest that proportionate but unverified reductions from unbalanced but also unknown and unverifiable starting points uphold the principle of undiminished security and contribute to a more stable international relationship. Something more concrete than that is required. I am sorry to have to say this, because the visit of my Foreign Secretary to Moscow was an important one. As paragraph 17 of this communiqué said:

"They"—that is, the two Ministers—"affirmed their desire to develop and strengthen relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain on a basis of mutual respect",

a sentiment perhaps not entirely borne out by Ambassador Malik's attack on my country's record in the development field, a record which I am sure the recipient countries will recognize stands rather favourably in comparison with the Soviet record, an effort for which the Soviet effort could hardly be regarded as a substitute.

155. These comments, reflecting the view that the Mexican draft resolution in document A/L.715 does not entirely describe the proper way forward, apply particularly to the second and third preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/L.715.

156. As regards the third preambular paragraph, there is one further point I feel I should make. In his statement, my Permanent Representative referred to and quoted from the study presented to the Secretary-General last year by a group working under the chairmanship of Mrs. Myrdal. One of the sentences in that report was as follows:

"The United Nations has agreed to seek each one"—that is to say, disarmament and development—"vigorously in its own right regardless of the pace of progress in approaching the other."<sup>3</sup>

That is what my Government is doing. Economic circumstances permitting, as my Permanent Representative said, my Government plans to increase its aid efforts, regardless, that is, of whether or not there are reductions in military budgets. Conversely, however, we cannot accept a casual link, in the sense of an obligatory or moral link in the other direction.

157. I also have a brief comment on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/L.715. It seems to my delegation that the thought behind the Mexican draft would have been better expressed if this paragraph had made it clear that what is required is a study of the possibility of establishing an agreed basis for the reduction of military budgets—which, in our view, as I have said, would be through serious disarmament measures. The operative paragraph, however, and indeed the preamble taken as a whole could be held to imply that there already exists such an agreed basis and that all that is needed is a report on this which could immediately be put into effect, with a consequent release of additional funds for international assistance to developing countries—and that we believe not to be the case.

158. My delegation discussed with the sponsor of the draft resolution the possibility of certain amendments which would have made it possible for us to vote in favour of his draft. It was not possible to reach agreement. In the light of what I have said, therefore, my delegation will abstain in the vote. But we welcome the possibility of a serious and expert report and expect that this report will in fact reinforce the views which we have expressed.

159. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): Before proceeding to explain my delegation's position on the two draft resolutions on which the Assembly is about to vote, I would seek permission to state in general terms, very briefly, our position on the item we are discussing.

160. Pakistan has from the beginning supported wholeheartedly and without reservation the goal of complete and

<sup>3</sup> See document ST/ECA/174, p. iii.



general disarmament. We recognize, at the same time, that a step-by-step approach is the most practicable way to the achievement of this goal. We have consequently supported various collateral measures of partial disarmament put forward and discussed in Geneva in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and elsewhere, provided these are feasible and likely to further the ultimate purpose.

161. As a developing country, Pakistan naturally attaches the greatest importance to international, national and regional efforts to remove the great disparities in living standards and economic development which exist between various parts of the world and which are becoming more acute with every passing year. The modest goals set under the International Development Strategy for the current decade constitute only small initial steps towards the establishment of a just, fair and viable economic order based on the concept of international economic security. We view with concern the very limited progress made so far towards achieving even these modest goals and we are particularly concerned at the apparent faltering of will in the developed countries to treat the economic problems of the planet in an integrated manner. Such an approach calls for adjustments—and not only in the developing countries, as we are very often reminded—but also structural changes and a reordering of priorities in the developed countries. The process will undoubtedly involve temporary sacrifices and hardships on the part of the latter.

162. These sacrifices and the diversion of resources are, however, as nothing in comparison with the vast amounts which annually are devoted to military expenditures all over the world and in particular in the militarily most powerful States. The figures are too familiar to need repetition and run into hundreds of billions of dollars. It has been evident for a long time that military expenditures have reached a point of diminishing returns or worse in terms of international or national security. The first and second rounds of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks are an indication, that, among other things, the two principal Powers concerned are becoming increasingly cognizant of this situation. Even so, one cannot yet say with confidence that the trend towards ever-increasing expenditures on military budgets is likely to be reversed. At any rate there is no evidence of such a reversal taking place in the foreseeable future.

163. My delegation is more convinced than ever that concrete and practical steps must be taken to stop the arms race, to reduce substantially the current military expenditures and to devote the human and material resources thereby released to the welfare of mankind and in particular to the development of the economically retarded parts of the world.

164. We agree with the idea that political détente in the world should be supplemented by military détente. In this respect we agree also with the view expressed by the sponsor of draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1 that the primary responsibility in the field of disarmament for reduction of expenditures lies with those countries which possess the largest and most powerful arsenals and which spend, in absolute terms, the greatest amounts of money upon armaments and armed forces. In a spirit of realism, however, it must be recognized that even among the militarily most powerful States there are gradations of strength and of military sophistication. A

blanket and more or less arbitrary reduction of military budgets, even if the percentage reduction is the same for all, will affect their respective military establishments in differing degrees.

165. It seems to us evident, then, that in a matter of this nature, where the security interests *inter se* of a group of Powers are at issue, progress can be achieved only through mutual agreement. It is a matter of gratification that debates on this subject in this and other forums—and they have a long history—have resulted in a general recognition of the need to reduce military expenditures and to divert them to peaceful ends. In the view of my delegation, the United Nations would best serve this end by encouraging the Powers concerned to agree on practical measures towards this goal. While we are appreciative of the Soviet initiative in this field, my delegation is not convinced that the proposed recommendation of a 10 per cent cut addressed to a limited group of Powers can be put into effect at this stage and in the present circumstances. In the absence of a general consensus on the matter it seems to us premature to establish a special committee for the purpose of distributing funds which are yet to become available. Last year's experience with the Special Committee on the World Disarmament Conference makes us chary of treading the same path again.

166. We remain convinced, nevertheless, as I have already stated, of the need to reduce military expenditures and to use the funds saved for the economic and social development of the developing countries. We believe that the current debate has made it possible to have a useful exchange of views on the subject and we hope that it will eventually lead to serious thinking on this matter and to concrete steps towards giving practical shape to the general desire on this matter. The report called for in draft resolution A/L.715 will, we hope, serve to further this purpose. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.715.

167. It seems logical to my delegation that further action in the matter ought to wait until we have received the Secretary-General's report and Governments of Member States have had time to study it.

168. On grounds of logic, as well as for the reasons of substance I have already set forth, my delegation will not be able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1. We had hoped indeed—and perhaps I should stress the hope again—that the sponsor of the draft resolution would see fit, in the interest of the goal that we have in mind, not to press the draft resolution to the vote at the present time.

169. Mr. FACK (Netherlands): I have asked for the floor in order to explain the vote to be cast by the Netherlands delegation on the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union on the reduction of military budgets. I shall also say a few words, in explanation of vote, on the Mexican draft resolution.

170. The fact that my delegation can explain its vote on the basis of written instructions received from the Netherlands Government within 24 hours after the draft resolution became available to us may serve to assure the representative of Saudi Arabia, who showed some solicitude in this regard, that the governmental machinery of the Netherlands is, so to speak, well oiled.

171. At the outset, I wish to recall the brief comment made on this proposal of the Soviet Union by the Netherlands Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the First Committee on 6 November. On that occasion Professor Kooijmans said:

"My Government deems it necessary to give high priority to the supply of financial means for development aid, in accordance with the International Development Strategy approved by the General Assembly in 1970 [*resolution 2626 (XXV)*] and irrespective of military expenditures. In the meantime, we should continue all our efforts to bring about negotiated disarmament and arms control agreements, in order to enhance international stability and security. Those agreements might in turn set free new, additional resources to help reduce the gap between rich and poor."<sup>4</sup>

172. The Netherlands attitude, therefore, is clear: we expect all Members to live up to the provisions and targets contained in the Strategy of 1970; we are second to none in favouring negotiated disarmament and arms control agreements, and we hope that such agreements will, in due course, result in making additional funds available for development, over and above the targets set in the Strategy. We cannot help noting with regret that none of these essential points are contained in the operative part of the draft resolution now before the Assembly.

173. The Soviet proposal addresses itself first of all to cuts in the military budgets of some Members, instead of disarmament agreements. One might argue that, by cutting military budgets, States would be forced to reduce their forces and their armaments. While acknowledging the logic of this argument, we are nevertheless of the opinion that this would be a rather primitive way to achieve disarmament. Because the budgetary systems of States differ as greatly as do their forces and armaments, there would be no guarantee that disarmament would be balanced and that international security would really be enhanced.

174. Secondly, the Soviet Union proposes that a small proportion of the savings should be added to the assistance that is already provided to developing countries through the existing channels, without mentioning the provisions and targets of our Strategy at all. As various speakers in the debate have pointed out, this new conception might well result in less assistance than is required under the Strategy now.

175. Finally, draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1 contains some organizational provisions which fail to commend themselves to my delegation. For all those reasons, the Netherlands delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1.

176. I should now like to add a few observations, in explanation of our vote, on the second draft resolution before the General Assembly which was submitted by the delegation of Mexico [A/L.715].

177. It will be clear from my previous comment that my delegation experiences considerable difficulty with the

wording of that draft resolution. We have doubts about two of the preambular paragraphs and we are not happy about the terms of operative paragraph 1. We doubt the usefulness of a study by the Secretary-General on the subject, as provided for in the draft resolution at the present time.

178. In view of these doubts and difficulties, the Netherlands delegation will, much to its regret, have to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

179. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): My Government has consistently supported the principle of general and complete disarmament. Any reduction in arms expenditure should alleviate the sense of despair which the arms race generates in the mind of humanity. If the funds released from the arms race or activities can be made available for economic and social development, this cannot but be a very welcome step in the world.

180. The draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union, in document A/L.701/Rev.1, does contain these ideals. However, the debate that has taken place on it so far has raised a number of practical questions which call for our more serious consideration. First, the very atmosphere in which this delicate issue has been discussed raises serious doubts on whether the principle is at all capable of implementation at this stage. Questions have also been raised which remain unanswered, and ambiguities pointed out which need clarification. I need not dwell at length on it at this stage since Members of the Assembly are fully aware of it.

181. We feel that more consultations would have been appropriate before a decision was taken. This has always been the practice in the United Nations, especially on questions concerning such crucial matters as disarmament. To do otherwise is more likely to defeat than to facilitate the aim of our efforts.

182. However, if we have to proceed to the vote, and this seems to be the case, the Tanzania delegation finds itself compelled to abstain in the vote on the Soviet draft resolution.

183. At the same time, we find that the draft resolution proposed by the delegation of Mexico [A/L.715], so eloquently introduced by our good friend Ambassador García Robles, is motivated by a genuine effort to try to find an acceptable solution to the implementation of the otherwise commendable proposal of the Soviet Union. Though we have some reservations on some of its provisions and believe that it does need some improvement, we shall none the less cast a positive vote on the draft resolution. In doing so, we wish to pay a particular tribute to the Mexican delegation, and to Ambassador García Robles, in particular, for their well-meaning effort.

184. Mr. RAE (Canada): Members of this Assembly are aware of Canada's long-standing concern with the economic and social consequences of the arms race and of our sponsorship this year of a draft resolution supporting further scientific research in this area. Canada has also consistently sought increases in the amount of resources allotted to development assistance. The record of the Canadian Government speaks for itself, both in restraining mil-

<sup>4</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, First Committee, 1948th meeting, para. 85.*

itary spending and in consistently providing substantial amounts of multilateral and bilateral development assistance. My delegation, therefore, sympathizes with the objectives of draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1, but finds that it has two major drawbacks which, we regret, will not allow us to support it.

185. The first problem lies in the failure of the draft resolution to set out either a system of assessment or a formula by which reductions in military spending could be measured and compared among different kinds of budgets and which would allow States to be assured that the announced reductions had actually taken place.

186. Our second concern is with the proposed system of distributing to the developing countries the funds that might be made available. The draft resolution as it stands, implies that they would be distributed on a cash-grant basis through a new special committee. We would not favour such an approach to multilateral development assistance. In our view, development assistance through the United Nations should be distributed by existing agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], in accordance with procedures which have been very carefully worked out through consultations among donor and recipient nations.

187. While, in view of its general objectives, the Canadian delegation will not oppose draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1, its inadequate explanations of both assessment and distribution procedures will not allow us to support it; thus we must abstain.

188. We look with understanding on the objectives of draft resolution A/L.715 introduced by the representative of Mexico. We would think it useful if a considered, detailed and serious study could be made of the possible means of comparing military budgets and of assessing their reduction so that Governments would be in a better position to judge the feasibility of military budget reductions as an effective approach to disarmament.

189. However, in the second and third preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/L.715, there are certain assumptions made which could in our view prejudice the results of a study. In addition, such a study, to be useful, would have to address itself to the practical problems of measurement and confirmation of reductions in military budgets, which I have touched upon and which have been touched upon by a number of other speakers. My delegation doubts that the request made in very general terms to the Secretary-General in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/L.715 would in fact lead to the accomplishment of this task, and accordingly we shall abstain on this draft resolution as well.

190. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): With regard to our vote, I shall refer first to the Mexican draft resolution [A/L.715] because this proposal and indeed the statement made by the representative of Mexico in the General Assembly, came after we had spoken and, therefore, there was no occasion for us to comment on it. My delegation will fully support this draft resolution because it follows more or less—and I think more rather than less—the lines that we had outlined in our statement in the General Assembly [2179th meeting].

191. The draft resolution is irreproachable because it provides for all the considerations that have to be taken into account in regard to the reduction of budgets. It deals with the subject of a study so that we shall have a balanced, properly measured and assessed reduction of budgets. It provides that Governments will extend their full co-operation to the Secretary-General to ensure that the study is carried out in the most effective way, which means that Governments will necessarily and inevitably provide data and there will be means of ascertaining how far that data is correct. There will therefore be no problem regarding a balanced and accurate ascertainment of budgets.

192. The central idea of reducing budgets is most important having regard to the many and long years—I should say decades—of fruitless negotiations on reduction of armaments, without any result or any reduction of arms. The reduction of military budgets offers an opportunity for a new approach and a new avenue towards the reduction of armaments. Indeed, during the many years of efforts towards the reduction of armaments, military spending has gone up to unprecedented and almost fantastic heights. Therefore, how could we object to a measure for reducing those expenditures, particularly, as provided in the Mexican draft resolution, in an accurate, balanced and equitable way?

193. My delegation is happy to note that the United States delegation has taken a very constructive and positive view on this draft resolution and has offered to participate in the ascertainment requested of the experts and to provide full information and assistance towards an appropriate assessment and ascertainment. Therefore, we consider that to be a very great move forward. As far as we understood—we may be wrong—the only real objection of the United States delegation to the Mexican draft resolution was the reference in the second preambular paragraph to the “urgent necessity”. That there is a necessity is obvious. One cannot eliminate the word “necessity” because if there was no necessity there would be no need for this draft resolution or for any effort. The whole objection, then, is with regard to the word “urgent”. If the elimination of the word “urgent” would make the United States delegation take a more favourable view and to vote in favour of this draft resolution, I feel perfectly certain that my colleague from the Mexican delegation would agree to revise his draft by deleting the word “urgent”. But, of course, that will depend, since some of us feel that the necessity is urgent, on the willingness of the United States delegation to go along with the Mexican draft resolution if the word “urgent” is deleted. Of course, there may be other points, but the constructive view with regard to draft resolutions of such importance is not to vote against them or to abstain, but if there are amendments to propose the amendments and therefore to help towards a better draft resolution being drafted and accepted. Therefore, my delegation will vote in favour of the Mexican draft resolution as it stands, unless it is revised and, if so, we shall consider it again.

194. With regard to the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.701/Rev.1], we already expressed our views in our main statement in the General Assembly. We believe that the main purpose and objective of that draft resolution is good. As a matter of fact it was the first initiative in bringing up this matter with which we agree as a means of reducing



military budgets and therefore reducing armaments, whereas we have had no other avenue in any other sense. I will not take more time but will just say that we shall also support the Soviet draft resolution.

195. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): In explaining how my delegation proposes to vote on these two draft resolutions—A/L.701/Rev.1 and A/L.715—let me say immediately that my Government certainly agrees in principle—as, no doubt, would most of us here—with the general desirability of a phased and agreed reduction in the military budgets everywhere in the world, and not least among the major Powers. Translating principle into practice, the Australian Government has in fact reduced its defence spending in real-value terms during the past years. It is, of course, not always easy, as has been pointed out by other speakers, to draw the line between strictly military expenditures and civilian expenditures for military purposes, which in turn may make it difficult to verify reductions in military budgeting with anything like complete accuracy.

196. Australia, which has increased its official aid to developing countries year by year to a point where this is expected next year to stand at 0.65 per cent of the gross national product, is also bound to be interested in any proposals for increasing development aid, including emergency aid, to countries that have suffered natural disasters, in respect of which my Government has already contributed substantially. But we are not prepared to accept as a principle that there should be a direct correlation between reduced military expenditures and increased development aid, and we enter this point as a strong reservation in respect of both draft resolutions. The allocation of budgetary expenditure among competing claims and obligations is a matter for individual national Governments to determine.

197. Nor do we see the necessity, let alone the practicability, of establishing a new special committee to distribute any savings made by Governments from reductions in their military expenditures. For one thing, as the representative of Canada has just pointed out, there already exists within the United Nations system a perfectly good agency for distributing aid funds in the form of UNDP, operating perhaps, if feasible and necessary, with the assistance of the Disaster Relief Co-ordinator; and my delegation sees no need in this case to add to the growing proliferation of special committees.

198. It is for that reason in particular that my delegation, while by no means opposed to the ostensible purpose and spirit of draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1, finds itself unable to support it.

199. On the other hand, we find less objection to the proposal in draft resolution A/L.715 that the Secretary-General should be asked to prepare, with expert assistance, a report on the reduction of the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council, to cover also other States with a high economic and military potential, and on the utilization of part of any such savings for assistance to developing countries, and, consequently, find ourselves able to vote in favour of it.

200. Mr. MENEGATTI (Italy) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Italy wishes at this stage to

confine its brief remarks to draft resolution A/L.715. In this connexion, it will be recalled that at the beginning of the meeting this afternoon the delegation of Italy supported the procedural proposal to postpone the vote until next Monday. In fact, the appeal of the head of the Mexican delegation, who requested unanimous approval of the draft resolution submitted by his delegation, found a ready response because of the many merits of his delegation's draft resolution which we are the first to recognize. It was in order to be able to consider more thoroughly certain aspects of the draft resolution which create difficulties for us and thus to be able to give a favourable response that the delegation of Italy had pressed for a postponement of the vote. It was therefore in a constructive spirit and in accordance with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly that we had raised that possibility. Since our request was not granted and our difficulties remain, the delegation of Italy finds itself under obligation to abstain, most regretfully, in the vote on draft resolution A/L.715.

201. Mr. PUNTSAGNOROV (Mongolia) (*translation from Russian*): Our delegation considers that in itself the idea of reducing the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council deserves full approval. The fact that the reduction of military budgets is linked with the provision of substantial assistance to developing countries gives it even greater international significance. The implementation of the Soviet proposal would greatly influence the improvement of the international situation as a whole. The idea of the proposals is clear and specific. Therefore it is naturally difficult to object to it. That is precisely why its opponents are resorting to every possible device to find arguments of some kind, and do not even stop at distortion of the actual state of affairs.

202. I have in mind the assertions made here concerning the alleged threat to China from the Mongolian People's Republic. This invention is precisely calculated to mislead some representatives and to justify the military preparations in the People's Republic of China. Mongolia's border with China stretches over more than 4,500 kilometres. Under the Kuomintang régime, it was for a long time a hot-bed of imperialist aggression and constant tension. We had hoped that with the formation of the People's Republic of China in 1949 an era of genuine good-neighbourly relations between the Mongolian People's Republic and China would begin. The Mongolian People's Republic, in view of the rout of the militarist forces in the Far East and the liquidation of the Kuomintang régime on mainland China, in the early 1950s, made considerable reductions in its army and disbanded border units on the frontier with China. However, towards the beginning of the 1960s, and especially during the cultural revolution in China, the situation changed radically.

203. The foreign policy of the People's Republic of China is becoming increasingly hostile towards my country. The leaders of China have repeatedly made statements to the Mongolian People's Republic concerning annexation. Troops were amassed on our border, military and strategic installations began to be built, and military exercises are being carried out. The national borders of the Mongolian People's Republic were and are being systematically violated. There were instances when Chinese soldiers and officers penetrated 15 or 20 kilometres into Mongolian territory, taking reconnaissance photographs and carrying out other

provocative actions. China's radio and press have tried to discredit my country in every way and have unleashed a bitter anti-Mongolian campaign, openly calling for the overthrow of the Mongolian People's Government. All this has been taking place against the background of the feverish preparations of the population of the People's Republic of China for a major war.

204. Here it should also be pointed out that the testing of nuclear weapons in China relatively near the Mongolian frontier is having a detrimental effect on the environment and is threatening the lives of the people. For instance, as a result of the atomic tests conducted in China towards the end of June this year, the radioactivity of the atmosphere in the Ulan Bator region and in certain southern towns in the Mongolian People's Republic has increased on average between 12 and 48 times. In certain areas of Gobi, the radioactivity of rainwater has reached limits which make it unusable as drinking water.

205. In these circumstances, the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic has been compelled to take measures to strengthen the defence capabilities of the country, including the strengthening of military co-operation with the Soviet Union, with which we have an agreement on friendship and mutual aid. It is precisely these measures which infuriate those who do not find the present favourable changes in the world to their taste. They are trying in every way to poison the international atmosphere, to sow the seeds of enmity and mistrust between States and to increase tension, resorting to the irritating concept of the super-Powers and of the imagined threat to China from the north.

206. All this emphasizes once again the special relevance of the Soviet proposal on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council. That proposal, in our opinion, is a very important contribution to the cause of consolidating détente and strengthening mutual understanding and trust between peoples.

207. On the basis of all that I have said, I should like to emphasize that the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic will support the Soviet proposal.

208. Our delegation also has a favourable opinion of the Mexican delegation's proposal.

209. In conclusion, I should like once again to emphasize that the Mongolian People's Republic will continue to do everything in its power to make a positive contribution to the strengthening of peace in the Far East.

210. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia): The Zambian delegation wishes to explain its vote before the vote on the item under consideration. My Government has always supported any measures taken by the General Assembly aimed at general and complete disarmament. In this regard, therefore, my delegation finds the Soviet proposal indeed commendable and worthy of serious consideration, since it associates the question of disarmament with that of development. Coming from a developing country, my delegation considers this item a very important one, in that it seeks the reduction of the senseless spending by the big Powers on armaments and the allocation of some of the resources thus saved for devel-

opment, a course which we from the developing countries have been calling for in this Assembly.

211. However, after listening to the various arguments advanced during the debate on this item, my delegation is of the opinion that there are a number of imponderables which certainly need to be carefully studied. This naturally will require more time, and my delegation is of the view that perhaps it is premature to take a definitive position on this subject right away. My delegation will therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1, submitted by the Soviet Union, but will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.715, submitted by the delegation of Mexico.

212. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/L.715. We shall abstain with great reluctance and much regret, both because we highly respect the wisdom and genuine motivation of the sponsor of that draft resolution, the representative of Mexico, Mr. García Robles, and because we have consistently supported the idea of a comprehensive study on the reduction of military budgets. The text before us does, however, give rise to considerable doubts on our part.

213. First, we question the advisability of limiting the scope of the report requested to the reduction of the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council and other States with a major economic and military potential. We, for our part, would have preferred such a study to be global in scope and thus to cover all States, regardless of their economic and military potential.

214. Secondly, we would have preferred the request to the Secretary-General to be couched in language that more clearly stressed our expectation of receiving a clear and objective analysis of what expenses should be included in military budgets, in order that the process towards a solution of the manifold problems relating to reduction might proceed on an agreed and comparable basis from country to country. In the event of agreed reductions we would, moreover, hope that consideration would be given also to the type of measures that might be appropriate for the verification that reductions were actually taking place.

215. Thirdly, my delegation does not fully agree with the implicit link between disarmament and development in the third preambular paragraph. The attempt to create such a link would appear neither advisable nor conducive to the promotion of the causes of disarmament and development, since it implies that progress in one field is a precondition for progress in the other.

216. Finally, I should like to say that my delegation voted for the motion to adjourn the debate until Monday. We regret that the motion was rejected, especially if the time could have been put to good use in obtaining a text that might have gained broader support. I must admit that I for one find it difficult to see what is gained by bringing a draft resolution to a vote before all possibilities for reaching a compromise have been exhausted; and the character of the reservations that have been expressed during the debate this afternoon do not seem to have made the reaching of a compromise impossible.

217. We would hope, however, that members, irrespective of their vote, may find it possible fully to co-operate with the Secretary-General in the task with which he has now been entrusted.

218. Mr. PÉREZ de CUÉLLAR (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1.

219. My delegation feels that we ought to support this draft resolution because it establishes a link between disarmament and development assistance, even though, in our opinion, this is not expressed as clearly as it might be. Like other delegations, we believe that the draft resolution could have been retouched until it was technically more viable and therefore more likely to be operative. Some of the statements made in this forum lead us to think that it might be inoperative.

220. In conclusion, we shall vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1, taking particularly into account the fact that it confirms the link I have mentioned between disarmament and development. On the other hand, my delegation will unhesitatingly support draft resolution A/L.715, all the more so since we trust that the report requested of the Secretary-General therein will help solve some of the technical problems which, in our opinion, are raised in draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1.

221. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): In all the discussions on disarmament items in the First Committee, the delegation of Thailand has always advocated any measures or decisions which, in our view, would lead to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The record in the United Nations in the disarmament field has, however, been a disappointing one, and yet we would be remiss in our duty if we were not to persevere in our collective efforts to pursue the elusive but commendable goal.

222. My delegation is appreciative of the Soviet initiative in its attempt to tackle the question of disarmament from a different angle, that is, to reduce the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and to utilize part of the funds thus saved to provide additional assistance to developing countries. We agree with the general motives of such a move, and yet we have some reservations about the practicability of the procedure as laid down in draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1.

223. My delegation's reservations are based partly on the statements made by the other permanent members of the Security Council. Without going into the merits or demerits of those statements to which I referred, the fact remains that on a draft resolution of such importance which directly concerns the permanent members and which requires their agreement or at least their co-operation there is no consensus among the five permanent members. In view of this lack of consensus, my delegation believes that the Soviet draft resolution, even if adopted, would have a very small chance of practical results. In addition, my delegation has always adhered to the principle that the General Assembly, in setting up any Committee, should not impose membership

of that Committee on any Member State against its own will. A recent experience on another United Nations agenda item relating to disarmament has already brought about unnecessary difficulties which resulted in the non-progress of the implementation of a United Nations resolution on the matter.

224. Had there been a request for a separate vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1, the Thai delegation would not have been able to support it.

225. My delegation is convinced that the general objectives of the Soviet draft resolution are laudable, but because of the reservations I mentioned we shall therefore abstain in the vote on it.

226. As for draft resolution A/L.715, which was eloquently introduced by the representative of Mexico, my delegation regards it as a real attempt to find a procedural compromise acceptable to all concerned. We regret that the attempt was not wholly successful but we are indebted to him for the initiative he has taken. The Thai delegation has no hesitation in supporting draft resolution A/L.715.

227. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now proceed to the vote. In accordance with rule 93 of the rules of procedure, we shall vote first on draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/9358. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

*Against:* Albania, China.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Congo, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mauritania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Zambia.



*The draft resolution was adopted by 83 votes to 2, with 38 abstentions (resolution 3093 A (XXVIII)).<sup>5</sup>*

228. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Indonesia to explain his vote.

229. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): My delegation voted for draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1, albeit with some hesitation. We hesitated because while, on the one hand, we are in agreement with the principle underlying the resolution, it is not clear to us, on the other hand, how its operative paragraphs are going to be implemented. If implementation will have to wait until all five permanent members agree to commit themselves, then the practical effect of the resolution in terms of available funds will be nil, as it can already be concluded from the debates that no such unanimous agreement can be hoped for.

230. My delegation would prefer that those among the five permanent members of the Security Council and, in the words of operative paragraph 3, other States "with a major economic and military potential" which agree and would implement the resolution without waiting for each other. We would hope that especially the sponsor of the resolution will be in a position to set a good example.

231. We are also wondering how to interpret operative paragraph 1,

*"Recommends that all States permanent members of the Security Council should reduce their military budgets by 10 per cent from the 1973 level during the next financial year"*.

What will happen if the next financial year passes without anyone of the five permanent members or the other States paying up?

232. With regard to operative paragraph 4, we would have preferred that the funds released would be contributed directly to UNDP rather than create a special committee for its distribution, especially if the operation is going to take place only once during the next financial year. The Assembly could, of course, indicate its preference as to how it expects UNDP to use those funds.

233. My delegation is also not very happy with operative paragraph 4 in which the members of the Special Committee are named without apparently being sure that they have agreed to participate. In the event that they have not, we may again have created a non-committee, like the Special Committee on the World Disarmament Conference.

234. Some speakers have made constructive remarks, others have submitted concrete proposals during the general debate. It is a matter of regret that the latter have not been incorporated in the draft resolution, for my delegation would have liked to support some of them as they seem to us realistic and constructive.

235. Meanwhile, another draft resolution on the item has been introduced by Mexico. It was said that it is not contradictory to the Soviet draft resolution, but complementary to

it. My delegation is not sure how to interpret operative paragraph 3 of the Mexican draft resolution in relation to operative paragraph 1 of the Soviet draft resolution. What will happen if the next financial year passes without any funds being made available? In the meantime we will have spent \$120,000 for the report of the Secretary-General. How can the report of the Secretary-General help at the end of the financial year when no funds have been forthcoming?

236. My delegation appreciates, however, the basic idea underlying the initiative of the Soviet Union, linking the reduction of the huge military spending with development. Reduction in the huge military budget, in the view of my delegation, should be seen as what it really is, a reduction in the increase of armament. By reducing the budget by 10 per cent, 90 per cent still remains of the huge amount which can be used to produce quite an impressive array of new arms. We are still very far from real steps towards effective disarmament. In voting for the draft resolution my delegation is in fact reaffirming our support for the basic idea of linking the reduction of the huge military budget with development assistance. We should like to express our appreciation to the delegation of the Soviet Union for having taken the initiative of translating the idea into a resolution. But my delegation regrets to be rather sceptical as to the present practical value of the resolution, but we hope fervently that further developments will prove us entirely wrong.

237. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now proceed to a vote on the draft resolution in document A/L.715. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution appears in document A/9404. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* Albania, China.

*Abstaining:* Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Congo, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Netherlands, Portugal,

<sup>5</sup> The delegations of Mauritius and Zaire subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

South Africa, Spain, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 93 votes to 2, with 26 abstentions (resolution 3093 B (XXVIII)).*

238. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

239. Mr. KARHILO (Finland): The position of my delegation in the two votes which the Assembly has just taken was determined mainly by one consideration, that is, our support for the general objectives of draft resolutions A/L.701/Rev.1 and A/L.715. My delegation considers that reducing the military budgets and utilizing part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries could be one important means of pursuing our common efforts towards disarmament and, as a result, increasing resources available for international development co-operation.

240. My delegation would point out, however, that it seems to us at this early stage premature to establish the machinery mentioned in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1. We feel that we can usefully proceed to concrete action in this field only after all relevant questions concerning the reduction of military budgets have been carefully studied.

241. Mr. YANGO (Philippines): My delegation voted in favour of both draft resolutions in the belief that they somehow balanced and compensated each other in the desired attainment of the objective of reducing military budgets and setting aside a portion of the savings thus realized for international assistance to developing countries.

242. The position of the Philippines on disarmament linked to development is well known, and it would have been difficult for us not to support any draft resolution tending to promote such linkage. At the same time we would not wish to have been carried along by undue enthusiasm that could eventually lead to unfounded expectations.

243. Draft resolution A/L.715 somehow provided that element of caution and reserve which compensated for any feeling of hesitation we entertained with respect to draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1. We would be in a much better position to consider and act on this matter at the next session of the General Assembly with the reports called for under the two draft resolutions. Thus, we voted in support of both draft resolutions.

244. Mr. SCALABRE (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has already explained at length what it approved in the Soviet draft resolution in document A/L.701 and its reservations because of certain provisions of or certain omissions from that draft. These reservations were not removed with the revision of the text of 26 November. They led my delegation regretfully to abstain in the vote on the revised text. On the other hand, we are in favour of the idea which prompted the Mexican text [A/L.715], that is to say, the preparation by the Secretary-General of a report on the reduction of military budgets as a whole. However, my delegation could not agree with the wording of certain

parts of that draft resolution, in particular the second paragraph of the preamble. We were therefore, regretfully compelled to abstain and we regret that it was not possible, because of the very short time allowed for consideration, to improve the text of the draft resolution and to make it acceptable to all.

245. The delegation of France will nevertheless follow with great interest the work of the group of experts. Its position on measures for the reduction of military budgets which may be proposed in the future as a result of that work will no doubt depend largely on the results of the study to be undertaken by the Secretary-General—in particular, as regards verification of military budgets which may be established and the effectiveness of which is, in our opinion, the *sine qua non* condition for the true effectiveness of a reduction of military budgets so as to achieve genuine disarmament, an objective to which the Government of my country remains attached.

246. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Under operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/L.701/Rev.1 which has been adopted, the General Assembly has decided to establish a Special Committee on the Reduction of Military Budgets, consisting of countries which will be appointed by the President of the General Assembly after consultations with the regional groups. I shall initiate consultations on this matter as soon as possible and shall report to the Assembly at a later date.

247. Before adjourning the meeting I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. May I recall that the General Assembly, at its 2123rd plenary meeting, decided that statements made in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes.

248. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Thank you for inviting me to speak and for the reminder.

249. First of all, on behalf of the delegation of the Soviet Union, I should like to express gratitude to all those delegations which supported the Soviet draft resolution aimed at the further easing of international tension, at the adoption of practical measures for disarmament and at the provision of real additional assistance to developing countries.

250. In exercise of its right of reply, the delegation of the Soviet Union would like to say the following in connexion with the routine anti-Soviet statement by the Chinese delegation. The statement by the Chinese representative, as was clear to all, did not contain a single new argument in relation to the USSR proposal on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent.

251. Earlier during the discussions in the General Assembly, we already replied to the first anti-Soviet statement by the Chinese delegation. There is no need for me to repeat myself and to refute groundless arguments. The history of China's presence in the United Nations shows that the Chinese representatives are trying as hard as they can to block any genuine measures in the United Nations—and not only in the United Nations—for the limitation and reduction of the arms race and for disarmament. They are thereby

challenging the United Nations as a whole and all those who are striving for détente, the strengthening of trust between States and the limitation of the arms race and disarmament.

252. Speaking again today in the Assembly and uttering slander against the Soviet Union and objections to the Soviet proposal, and having voted against that proposal, the Chinese delegation once again confirmed that China is against the positions and views of the majority of States Members of the United Nations, and first and foremost against the third world countries and against the decisions on disarmament which the non-aligned States adopted at the Algiers conference.

253. The results of the vote on the Soviet draft resolution clearly and convincingly showed and confirmed that the position of the Chinese leadership and that of the majority of States Members of the United Nations, above all the developing countries—the third world countries—are poles apart.

254. Such is the truth and the reality; and no anti-Soviet fabrications and slander of the Soviet Union in the Chinese representatives' statements from the rostrum of this Assembly or from any other rostrum can conceal this real situation of today. In speaking against the proposal on the reduction of the military budgets of the five permanent members of the Security Council and, consequently, against the provision of additional assistance to developing countries for the purposes of development, China thus again demonstrated its opposition to international détente and to any measures aimed at strengthening international peace and security, including disarmament.

255. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation would like to state once again that such a policy on the part of China, far from contributing to the strengthening of peace and security, introduces an element of dangerous instability in inter-

national life. The possibility of changing that policy depends wholly and entirely on the leaders of China themselves.

256. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stated recently at the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow: "We should welcome a constructive contribution by China to the improvement of the international atmosphere and to the development of loyal, peaceful co-operation between States based on equality."

257. The Soviet delegation would like to take this opportunity to express once again its sincere gratitude to all those delegations in the General Assembly which voted with us for the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union on the question of the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries.

258. The Assembly's adoption of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union is the best and most convincing answer to China with regard to its slander against the Soviet Union. It constitutes a condemnation of China's position. If the Chinese delegation does not understand this and does not report it to its leadership, one can only pity it.

259. By the adoption of this decision, the United Nations has made a new and important contribution to the limitation of the arms race and at the same time to the provision of substantial additional assistance to developing countries. The opposition—both the vociferous and the restrained opponents—has been overcome by the adoption of these noble and peace-loving decisions. A substantial contribution has thereby been made to the cause of normalization and international détente.

*The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.*