



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2027
22 November 1974

ENGLISH

Twenty-ninth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 22 November 1974, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina)
Rapporteur: Mr. COSTA LOBO (Portugal)

- Organization of work.
- 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 /24/ (continued)
 - (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Distribution of the Funds Released as a Result of the Reduction of Military Budgets;
 - (b) Report of the Secretary-General
- Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use: report of the Secretary-General /27/ (continued)
- Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /28/ (continued)

/...

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room LX-2332, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 25 NOVEMBER 1974, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 29 NOVEMBER 1974.

The co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

- Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /29/ (continued)
- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3079 (XXVIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General /30/ (continued)
- Implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean /31/ (continued)
- World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference /34/ (continued)
- General and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /35/ (continued)
- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2286 (XXII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) /100/ (continued)
- Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East /101/ (continued)
- Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health /103/ (continued)
- Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia /107/ (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): At our meeting yesterday afternoon I announced to the Committee the proposal made by the Permanent Representative of Algeria, Ambassador Rahal, with regard to the postponement of the debate on the question of Korea. The representative of Algeria has now asked to speak on that subject and I have pleasure in calling upon him.

Mr. RAHAL (interpretation from French): I should like first of all, Mr. Chairman, to say to you personally and to all the members of the First Committee how much I regret not having, so far, had the opportunity and the pleasure of taking part in the work of the Committee, work whose importance I am the first to recognize and appreciate. Coming as I do for the first time into the Committee, I believe it to be my duty to convey to you my personal happiness at the fact that the destinies of the Committee have been entrusted to you, a man whose tried and tested competence we are all aware of and for whom we all have feelings of genuine friendship, a representative of a country of the non-aligned group for which we always have a great deal of affection and to which we attribute a great deal of importance.

(Mr. Rahal, Algeria)

Mr. Chairman, through you I informed the First Committee of our request for postponement of the debate on the question of Korea until after the end of the debate on the question of Cambodia, which is to be held in the plenary Assembly. I believe that I should offer some explanation on this to the members of the Committee.

Everyone here knows that originally the debate on the question of Cambodia was to begin in the plenary Assembly on 18 November, and that would have made it possible and easy -- for us, at least -- to have the First Committee continue in the normal manner with our order of business, in keeping with our time-table, and begin the discussion on the question of Korea on 25 November. Now the debate on Palestine has occasioned some delay, as representatives are aware, and the discussion on disarmament questions has lasted until today. The debate on Palestine will end only this evening, Friday, 22 November, and may even continue on Saturday morning.

As a result, the debate on the question of Cambodia in the plenary Assembly will begin on Monday, 25 November, that is, at the same time as the debate on the question of Korea. I should like to state that delegations which, generally speaking, do not have many members, would find it very difficult to follow simultaneously, in two different places, both the debate on Cambodia in the General Assembly and the debate on the question of Korea in the First Committee.

Our request is therefore based on the spirit of courtesy and fair play which always animates the members of this Committee and which does not affect the political stance of Governments. This spirit of courtesy has nothing to do with differences of opinion which may exist among our Governments because it affects only the personal relations among us in our work in this assembly. I really did not think that this issue would give rise to any difficulties whatsoever because, in the final analysis, whatever opinions we may have, we are still subject to the same constraints and bear the same burdens.

Having sensed a certain hesitation, I had conversations with the representatives of the group of sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676. Since we have reached agreement, I should like first of all to say that I withdraw my request, but I now submit to the Committee -- in the hope that it will give rise to no difficulties -- the compromise at which our two groups of sponsors arrived.

First of all, if the Committee approves, the debate on the question of Korea would begin, as scheduled, on Monday, 25 November, when the Committee will hear only the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. On Tuesday, 26 November, the Committee could hear only the representative of the Republic of Korea. We propose that the debate should then be suspended, to be resumed only after the end of the debate on Cambodia in the plenary Assembly. Finally, I should like to point out that we would be asking for suspension of the debate in the First Committee for only one or two days, because the debate on Cambodia will not, we think, last beyond Thursday, 28 November.

I therefore appeal for the First Committee's courtesy and understanding of our difficulties, and ask that no difficulty be placed in the way of accepting the compromise that I have just proposed.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Algeria for the clarifications he has just given.

I am particularly grateful to him for the warm words of praise that he was so good as to address to my country and me, which I appreciate and value highly.

As representatives have heard, the representative of Algeria has withdrawn the proposal he had made in a note addressed to the Chairman of the First Committee and which I read out yesterday afternoon. Under rule 122 of the rules of procedure,

"A motion may be withdrawn by its proposer at any time before voting on it has commenced, provided that the motion has not been amended."

The proposal of the representative of Algeria has not been put to a vote nor has it been the subject of any amendment. His withdrawal of the proposal is therefore in order.

(The Chairman)

The representative of Algeria has also submitted, for the Committee's consideration, the agreement reached by the sponsors of the two draft resolution concerning the question of Korea. I shall briefly restate its terms.

On Monday, 25 November, in accordance with the time-table that was unanimously adopted by the Committee, we shall start consideration of the question of Korea; but on that day we shall hear only the statement to be made by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, who, as the Committee will recall, was invited to participate in the debate on the item to which I am referring.

(The Chairman)

On the second day, that is to say, on Tuesday, 26 November, the Committee would only hear the representative of the Republic of Korea, who was also invited by the Committee to participate in the debate on this item.

Having heard those two statements, the Committee would hold no further meetings on the question of Korea -- I repeat, on the question of Korea -- until the plenary Assembly completes consideration of agenda item 25, entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations".

I believe that the matter has been placed before the Committee in very clear-cut terms by the representative of Algeria, and I hope that I have clearly understood what he said when I recapitulated his statement to the Committee.

Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands): The sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676 were quite ready to start the discussion of the Korean item here on Monday. We did not have the same difficulties, apparently, as the sponsors of the other draft resolution. But in a spirit of compromise we can agree to the proposal just outlined by the Ambassador of Algeria and just repeated by you, Sir. So on Monday morning we will have the opening of the debate and listen to the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea only, and on Tuesday morning we will have a second meeting and listen to the representative of the Republic of Korea. After that the debate will be suspended until the end of the debate on the Khmer question.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of the Netherlands. I only wish to comment, in connexion with the remarks he has just made, that the First Committee had decided to have no meeting on Tuesday morning, in which case the statement of the representative of the Republic of Korea would be made on Tuesday afternoon. The Committee now has these proposals before it.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): There are countries which are not sponsors of either draft resolution and which perhaps have their own opinions. I should like to make the following suggestion: the debate on the Khmer question will start on Monday and we ought to be able to be present at the beginning of the debate to hear the introduction and the initial statements on the subject. That is why, in our opinion, -- and I am now speaking on behalf of my delegation -- on Monday we should not have a meeting to consider the Korean question in the First Committee. My proposal would be that the two statements be made on Tuesday, in the morning and in the afternoon; on Tuesday morning the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and in the afternoon the Republic of Korea. Thus we would be able to hear the introduction of the item on the question of Cambodia on Monday and hear the introduction of the item on Korea on Tuesday, and then we would be able to pursue our work normally after a decision has been reached on the Khmer question.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Before calling on the representative of Algeria to express his reaction to this suggestion -- I consider it to be a suggestion -- I should like to say to the representative of Tunisia that, in principle, the Committee had unanimously adopted the decision to start its work on the question of Korea on 25 November, so that any suggestion or even a formal proposal such as the one made and then withdrawn by the representative of Algeria would have to be adopted by the Committee. And the Committee had agreed to hold no meeting on Tuesday morning, in accordance with the availability of conference services.

Now I should like to consult the representative of Algeria on the suggestion we have just heard from the representative of Tunisia.

Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (interpretation from French): I should like to thank our colleague, the representative of Tunisia, for his proposal which, in fact, would fully satisfy my own delegation and also, I am sure, all the delegations in the same group of sponsors as the Algerian delegation, because we would be free to hear the opening of a debate which is of the greatest interest to us.

(Mr. Rahal, Algeria)

But I do not think I should dwell on this proposal, and I should not like my friend from Tunisia to dwell on it either, because the compromise which my colleague from the Netherlands and I myself have put forward resulted from a discussion in the course of which we finally, as it were, divided the apple of discord into two. So perhaps, after the sacrifice which the First Committee is no doubt going to accept, we could also ask the General Assembly to open its discussion on Cambodia only in the afternoon, if the beginning of the discussion on Korea in the First Committee is to be held on Monday morning, so that we would not only be asking for sacrifices from the First Committee but also from the plenary Assembly.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): The proposal which has just been clarified by my friend, the Ambassador of Algeria, is so reasonable that I agree. I agree with this formula, but there is another possibility: that we hear the two representatives of Korea on Tuesday afternoon; we could hear both of them then. But I do agree with the proposal of Algeria. It is acceptable to me, but what matters is that we should be able to hear the beginning of the debate in the plenary Assembly and also here, because we cannot divide ourselves into two, and the two questions are rather similar. They are two phases of a problem which is intrinsically one and the same.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Speaking of sacrifices, perhaps the Chairman of the First Committee will have to ask the First Committee to make sacrifices. Given that the respective groups are interested in one item in the plenary Assembly, and another in the First Committee, both of which, it is felt, belong to the same sphere of interest, I suggest that, so as not to delay our work, we devote our attention to other items on the agenda that bear no relation to the Cambodian question. But that is a question that we shall examine later.

(The Chairman)

The Committee has now heard the proposal of the representative of Algeria, which I myself have repeated and I should like to consult the Committee on whether there is any objection on the part of any delegation to our proceeding as proposed. I hear no objection.

(The Chairman)

In order to avoid any kind of misunderstanding, I shall repeat: On Monday, 25 November, the Committee will meet in the morning exclusively to hear the statement to be made by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and no other statement. On Tuesday afternoon, the Committee will meet only to hear the representative of the Republic of Korea make his statement, and for nothing else. Thereafter the Committee will postpone consideration of the question of Korea until the plenary Assembly has completed its consideration of agenda item 25, concerning Cambodia.

As I hear no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

I am grateful to the members of the Committee for their co-operation in dealing with this suggestion.

Mr. de SOTO (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): Now that we have taken a decision with regard to our programme of work, I should like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether you have had an opportunity to consider what we shall be doing next week after Tuesday afternoon, that is to say, after we have heard the two representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea. Specifically, I should like to know whether we shall then go on to the next agenda item, item 36; because I believe it would be useful for delegations to be able to start getting ready for the debate on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, if that is what we are going to be considering.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The point raised by the representative of Peru is very relevant indeed. In fact, I believe that the First Committee should try to make the maximum use of its time.

Today, Friday, in accordance with our established programme, we shall conclude the items relating to disarmament. On days when there are no meetings to consider the question of Korea, we could move ahead with our work by turning our attention to the last item on the agenda for the Committee, that is to say, item 36, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". I think this would be the best way to get ahead with our work. But if the representative of Peru has no objection, before making any formal proposal in this respect to the Committee, I should like to hold some consultations with delegations and with members of the Secretariat.

(The Chairman)

I shall come back to this item later on in our work.

AGENDA ITEMS 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 100, 101, 103, 107 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Continuing now with the items on disarmament, I call on the representative of the Philippines.

Mr. YANGO (Philippines): I wish only to say that my delegation was unavoidably absent last night when the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691 was put to the vote, relating to item 27, "Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use". If we had been present, Mr. Chairman, we would have voted affirmatively on the said draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The explanation made by the representative of the Philippines regarding his vote will appear in the verbatim record of the Committee.

I now call on the representative of Syria to introduce the draft resolution appearing in document A/C.1/L.698.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): I shall try, in a few words, to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698.

We are all aware in this Committee of the dangers represented by napalm and other incendiary weapons. We are all aware of their harmful effects on man and on the human environment. The discussions that have taken place in this Committee, in the Diplomatic Conference on humanitarian law, and in other bodies dealing with humanitarian matters, together with the report of the Secretary-General on the same subject, have left no doubt that the banning of the use of such weapons is an urgent necessity dictated by humanitarian considerations. The international community is now clearly determined to put an end to the use of such weapons by laying down international rules.

I must remind you on this occasion that the result of the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691, submitted by the delegation of Sweden and other delegations, confirmed that determination and a fact that was obvious to all, namely that the peoples of the world are unanimous as to the need for co-operation and for concerted efforts to provide the international instruments needed to safeguard humanity from such dangers.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

What gives new momentum to these efforts is the prohibition of the use of these weapons and the condemnation of their use. The banning of the use of napalm bombs and other weapons which cause unnecessary suffering or have indiscriminate effects presents humanitarian aspects which we cannot ignore. Any attempt to change the nature of this question under any pretext, by using any kind of argument, would be contrary to the will of the international community and thus also to the objectives we all seek to achieve, namely, protecting man, his environment and all his achievements.

On the basis of these humanitarian considerations, the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic has supported all resolutions on disarmament compatible with the aspirations of the peoples of the world for a better life. On this basis, we have taken the initiative by submitting to this Committee the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.698, in the conviction that the condemnation of the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in armed conflicts does faithfully reflect the need for immediate measures to protect mankind and for strengthened and concerted efforts to draw up international regulations prohibiting the use of these weapons in armed conflicts.

I should like to assure representatives that this draft resolution, the purpose of which is to protect every man everywhere in the world without discrimination, represents the political will of the international community, a will which must be strengthened if we are to measure up to our responsibilities in seeking to prohibit the use of these weapons. This draft resolution testifies to our faith in the principles which we approved yesterday when we voted on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691. If the international community were not to condemn the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons which cause unnecessary suffering or have indiscriminate effects, this would expose mankind to many dangers and encourage the use of such weapons, a result that would be contrary to the desire we have expressed with regard to the use of these weapons and contrary also to the responsibilities which we have assumed.

We are aware of the danger of napalm and other incendiary weapons. Many of us have in our own countries had the experience of being victims of such weapons.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

Many of us are more aware than others of the need to prevent the use of such weapons and to strengthen international efforts to prohibit the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons.

I do not think that there will be any disagreement at all about the humanitarian aspects. The draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698 is self-explanatory in the light of what I have just said. The text of this draft resolution is entirely in keeping with the objectives mentioned in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691 approved by our Committee yesterday.

Examining rapidly the various paragraphs of this draft resolution, we see that we have recalled two General Assembly resolutions: resolution 2932 A (XXVII), whereby the General Assembly condemns the use of napalm in armed conflicts, and resolution 3076 (XXVIII), in which the General Assembly referred this matter to the Diplomatic Conference for study, and the Diplomatic Conference is drafting international regulations prohibiting these weapons.

In the preamble we have pointed out that the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons which cause unnecessary suffering and have indiscriminate effects on man and the environment is a violation of human rights in armed conflicts. Thereafter the General Assembly would, according to the draft express its deep concern at the continuing use of napalm and other incendiary weapons.

In the operative part, the General Assembly condemns the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in armed conflicts and urges all States to refrain from the production, stockpiling, proliferation and use of such weapons, pending conclusion of a general agreement on the prohibition of these weapons. This appeal is addressed to all Governments and is a humanitarian appeal, based upon humanitarian considerations, an appeal to protect mankind against these weapons, pending conclusion of a general agreement or the drafting of general rules prohibiting the use of these weapons, so that the international community would react if such weapons were to be used. Otherwise we should be running counter to the

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

humanitarian objectives we all have in mind. In operative paragraph 3 the General Assembly invites all Governments, the International Committee of the Red Cross, the specialized agencies and other international organizations concerned to transmit to the Secretary-General all information about the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in armed conflicts, so that there can be international control over the use of these weapons and so as to prevent the use of these weapons against man. We hope that the Committee will support our draft resolution. We request a roll call vote on it.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The main reason why I have asked to speak is to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1. However, for reasons beyond my control, I was unfortunately unable to be present in the Committee when the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1 was introduced and since, as I understand it, the Chairman intends to put that draft to the vote this morning, I would venture to ask its sponsors whether they could make some slight changes that would be appropriate, in the opinion of my delegation, before that draft is put to the vote. In our statements both here and in Geneva we have referred to the CCD in various ways -- as the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, the Disarmament Committee or CCD. However, in the documents so far we have used the complete title that was given it in 1969, that is to say, Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Unless there is some reason to alter this practice, perhaps the sponsors of the draft resolution could make the relevant changes, particularly in operative paragraph 3, which "Requests the Committee on Disarmament ...". That should read "Requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament ...". Operative paragraph 4 "Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the Committee on Disarmament ...", and that should also be changed, as well as the other places where those words are used.

I shall now proceed to the main purpose of my statement, namely, to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1, sponsored by the delegations of Ethiopia, Mexico, Nigeria and Sweden. This draft resolution is closely related to General Assembly resolution 3093 B (XXVIII) of 7 December 1973. In that resolution the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare, with the assistance of qualified consultant experts appointed by him, a report on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council, which should also cover other States with a major economic and military potential and on the utilization of a part of the funds thus saved to provide international assistance to the developing countries.

• (Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The Secretary-General, in due course, appointed the Group of Consultants on the Reduction of Military Budgets. As explained in the report of that Group in document A/9770, it held several meetings and, as a result, the Secretary-General submitted the report I have just mentioned to the General Assembly.

I am sure that all representatives have studied that report very carefully. The report, in addition to its actual text, contains a series of annexes. I am also sure that precisely on the basis of their study of the report and the annexes, they will agree with the statement made by the sponsors of this draft in the third paragraph of the preamble that "Governments have not had the time necessary to study that report with the attention and care which the important and complex questions covered in it merit".

In the light of this, the sponsors of the draft state in the fourth paragraph of the preamble "that it would be advisable to postpone any assessment by the General Assembly regarding the substance of those questions".

The draft therefore recommends that the following be done with regard to this item. First, that the General Assembly should express its appreciation to the Secretary-General and to the consultants as well as to the Governments and international organizations which rendered assistance in the preparation of the report requested in resolution 3093 B (XXVIII).

Next, as is customary in these cases -- and the only purpose of operative paragraph 2 is to facilitate the decision to be taken by the Fifth Committee on what we call the administrative and budgetary implications of this draft resolution -- the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for the report to be issued as a United Nations publication and widely distributed.

Operative paragraph 3 is the fundamental paragraph of this draft resolution. In it the General Assembly would invite all States to communicate to the Secretary-General before 30 June 1975 their views and suggestions on all those points they deem pertinent with regard to the matters covered in the report.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

May I draw attention to the fact that in the request of the Assembly to Governments there is no limitation whatsoever. Governments may express their views and make comments on all those matters which they consider to be pertinent in connexion with this subject. We mention some examples because the sponsors, as the result of a careful reading of the report, believe that the seven points mentioned are the ones on which it would be most desirable for the General Assembly to know the opinions of Governments.

The first point is: (a) meaning and scope of a definition of military budgets which Governments believe should be arrived at; not an abstract definition of military budgets but a definition which has "the greatest probability of receiving general acceptance", as the paragraph goes on to say.

The next point in regard to which we draw the attention of Governments on the need for them to communicate their views is that the text include feasible and adequate procedures so that the United Nations may establish a system of standardized military budgets of the States envisaged in resolution 3093 B (XXVIII). Undoubtedly, to arrive at a system of standardized military budgets will not be an easy task. But neither do we believe it to be an impossible task, if all States co-operate.

In the report of the consultant experts there is a paragraph which should be borne in mind in connexion with this matter and that is paragraph 36, page 17, of the report, where we read the following:

"In the interwar years, a standardized accounting system was developed under the auspices of the League of Nations, and a large number of countries did in fact submit their military budgets to the League of Nations in standardized form." (A/9770, p. 17, para. 36)

In the annexes to the report -- among them particularly in the valuable data provided by Sweden -- we also find, in our opinion, weighty reasons for us not to despair of arriving at and achieving a similar procedure for the United Nations.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The next point refers to the "per cent reduction advisable for the States permanent members of the Security Council, bearing in mind that a 10 per cent reduction has been proposed". Subparagraph (c) was read out as worded in the text. As will be recalled, the resolution adopted last year did not stipulate any percentage reduction. On the other hand, it is a fact that in resolution 3093 A (XXVIII), as well as in the debates of the General Assembly and in the report of the consultant experts, it has been proposed and considered that this reduction should be 10 per cent. But this, of course, does not imply necessarily that all Governments would agree on that figure. It would be useful to have as many Governments as possible give their views on this question -- namely, the per cent reduction they consider to be advisable for the States permanent members of the Security Council.

The next point, (d), requests that Governments pronounce themselves, too, on a definition of what should be understood by, and I quote from the resolution of last year, resolution B, "the other States with a major economic and military potential".

In point (e) Governments are asked to suggest the per cent reduction advisable for these States.

Point (f) is intended to ascertain the views of Governments on the part of the resources released through the reduction of military budgets which should be allotted to international assistance for developing countries.

Finally, the last point is intended to have Governments give their views on the international system or mechanism, within the framework of the United Nations, which "should be employed in order to achieve the best distribution and utilization of the additional assistance allotted to the developing countries, taking into account the goals set for the Second United Nations Development Decade".

Operative paragraph 4 is intended to make appropriate use of the information. When I say "appropriate use" I mean so that delegations will by next year have the views and suggestions of their Governments on the basis of a prior study of all the data which will then be available, and this data will be in addition to the report in document A/9770, which we hope by then will have been

thoroughly studied by Governments -- apart from that, a compilation, by countries, of the views and suggestions received in compliance with this resolution. And that is why, in operative paragraph 4, we request of the Secretary-General that the compilation of these opinions which, as requested in operative paragraph 3, will have been transmitted before 30 June 1975, be distributed as a document of the thirtieth session of the General Assembly not later than 1 August 1975, and that the compilation contain, as the paragraph states, "a compilation, by countries, of the views and suggestions requested in this resolution ...". In the first place, a compilation by countries, and, secondly, "a tabulation of the same" -- that is to say, the views and suggestions "according to the matters covered therein, particularly regarding the seven points specified in the preceding paragraph".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The last paragraph limits itself to requesting inclusion in the provisional agenda of the thirtieth session of the General Assembly of an item entitled "Implementation of resolution ... (XXIX)" -- here we would insert the appropriate number, when the Assembly has adopted this draft resolution -- "report of the Secretary-General".

I believe that these brief explanations will assist in clearly understanding the significance and scope of this draft resolution which the four sponsoring delegations are convinced will constitute -- if, as we hope, it is adopted by the General Assembly -- a constructive contribution for the future study of so important a subject.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank Mr. Garcia Robles of Mexico for his introduction of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1. In his statement, the representative of Mexico made some remarks on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1 to the effect that in operative paragraphs 3 and 4 wherever the words "Committee on Disarmament" are used, the official title "Conference of the Committee on Disarmament" should be substituted. In order to avoid the issuance of yet another corrected text could I ask the sponsors -- although I think that a consultation is not even necessary; I believe that this is a formal, not a substantive, change that is in accordance with the facts -- whether they agree with this, so that we would lose no time with this in our procedure?

I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who will speak on behalf of the sponsors.

Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The remarks made by the representative of Mexico concern the text in English only, so that we have no objection to this text being corrected so as to include the official title of this organ, and we therefore accept the suggestion of the representative of Mexico to include the words "Conference of the".

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): When we proceed to vote on that draft resolution it will be understood that the English version is thus corrected.

Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden): I am going to address my very few remarks to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1, just introduced by the representative of Mexico.

The Swedish delegation has on several occasions already expressed its great interest in the reduction of military budgets. In order to contribute the necessary conditions to this end we have also, in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, put forward proposals on a greater openness in regard to defense expenditure with the aim of creating confidence among States. It had therefore been natural for my delegation to sponsor the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1 regarding the reduction of military budgets.

In the draft resolution, certain points are set out in operative paragraph 3 a being worth the particular attention of Governments. This enumeration does not imply, of course, any assessment of the substance to be covered by the views and suggestions requested from Governments in that paragraph. The list, in our view, only reflects considerations raised in earlier United Nations resolutions in this field and in the Secretary-General's expert report.

To take just one example. In paragraph 3 (f), the question referred to is what part of the resources released through the reduction of military budgets should be allotted to international assistance for developing countries. In this context I should like to underline that the Swedish efforts in the disarmament negotiations always have focused primarily on bringing the arms race to a halt. At the same time, of course, we have continuously emphasized, with a certain amount of vigour the fact that the arms race entails the diversion of enormous human and material resources from peaceful economic and social pursuits to unproductive military purposes. But it is important for us to stress that development must never be made dependent on reduction in military expenditure. The two objectives, disarmament and development, must therefore be sought vigorously, each one in its own right.

We regard the report of the experts as a valuable contribution to the efforts to reduce military budgets, and we hope that Governments will study the report and comment on it in order to enable the General Assembly to take appropriate action at its next session.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to point out to the Committee and to the sponsors particularly that in document

(The Chairman)

A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1 it is not only in the English text that the words "Committee on Disarmament" appear rather than "Conference of the Committee on Disarmament" but also in the Spanish and French texts. I do not know Arabic, so that I do not know whether it occurs in the Arabic text too, but in any case I should like to bring to the notice of the Committee that in operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of this draft resolution corrections of the text will be made in all languages so that it will read "Conference of the Committee on Disarmament" instead of "Committee on Disarmament".

Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal): On 18 October this year, when this Committee began the general debate on disarmament items, the representative of the United States, Senator Stuart Symington, gave us a precise and chilling estimate of the current total stockpile of the United States nuclear arsenal. The Senator stated on that day that the United States has a nuclear capability equivalent to more than 615,000 times that of the Hiroshima bomb, which took about 100,000 lives. That would put the total nuclear destructive potential of only one super-Power at the annihilation of upwards of 61 billion people. To put it in another way, this means that there is in storage in the arsenals of only one of the two super-Powers more than 15 tons of TNT for every inhabitant on this earth. If we add to this figure the nuclear stockpiles of the other super-Power as well as the remaining nuclear Powers, the total figure could very well be more than 30 tons of TNT for each human being on this earth.

An individual can hardly be killed physically more than once, and everyone in this hall knows very well that a mere fraction of 30 tons of TNT is sufficient to kill one person. Yet this "overkill" capacity is maintained and is being constantly improved at a staggering cost both in terms of money and talent. While the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute's estimates put world military expenditure for 1973 at \$US 207,000 million, the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's preliminary figures indicate an even greater expenditure, amounting to \$US 234,6000 million. Actual expenses, however, are bound to be even higher, since both the above estimates are based on constant prices of 1970. Some estimates put the expenditures as high as \$240,000 million to \$275,000 million annually. This figure is higher than the combined total estimated product of the countries of South Asia, the Far East and Africa, and far exceeds that of Latin America.

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

Moreover, it has been estimated that nearly 400,000 scientists and engineers are engaged in research into and development of military technology at an annual cost of \$20,000 million. Rare and valuable talents continue to be deployed for such unproductive and destructive purposes, talents which could otherwise have been fruitfully employed for research in the field of increased food production and other major areas of medical, scientific and technical research that could have contributed to the welfare of humanity in general. A recent new item in the press concerning the development of a new supersonic bomber testifies to the enormous expense which results from the process of research into and development of military technology. According to press reports, three prototypes of a new supersonic bomber are to be manufactured and tested, the first one in December of this year. Each of those three prototypes, being developed at a staggering cost of \$500 million, is said to have a range of 6,000 miles at a speed of 1,500 miles per hour with a load capacity of 115,000 lbs of rockets and bombs. The cost of this bomber, even when mass produced, will reportedly be a whopping \$76 million. By contrast, the type of conventional bombers that dropped the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs would cost only \$10 million to manufacture today.

The wanton recklessness with which such huge expenditure is being incurred for military purposes comes into sharp focus when viewed against the dismal picture of world poverty and hunger. Annual figures for multilateral and bilateral development assistance, including loans, technical assistance and outright grants, are estimated to be less than 4 per cent of total world military expenditure.

It is not very heartening to know that world military expenditure is 25 times more than the amount allocated for development assistance, in a period which is designated on the one hand as a Second Development Decade and on the other as a Disarmament Decade.

The Second Development Decade envisages an annual rate of growth of 6 per cent for the developing countries. However, that goal seems to be as distant as ever. Present world economic problems have caused a further stagnation in the development efforts of the developing countries. The much

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

talked of goal of 1 per cent of the gross national product for development assistance remains as far from realization as it was when announced. On the other hand, colossal amounts of money continue to be spent on armaments, with a total disregard of the lofty ideals that inspired the General Assembly in declaring the seventies a Disarmament Decade.

It was against this background that my delegation last year whole-heartedly supported General Assembly resolution 3093 (XXVIII), which sought to reduce the military budgets of the States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and to utilize the part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries. The resolution further expressed the desirability of other States, particularly those with a major economic and military potential, also reducing their military budgets and allotting part of the funds thus released for assistance to developing countries. Though the resolution also rightly expressed the desirability of a reduction in the military budgets of the major economic and military Powers, the main object was the reduction of military budgets by all the permanent member States of the Security Council, which account for no less than 70 per cent of total military expenditure.

The report of the Group of Consultants on the Reduction of Military Budgets (A/9770), besides containing much useful information, presents a well-balanced study of the possible methods of arriving at an acceptable formula for the reduction of military budgets. My delegation would like to put on record the expression of its deep appreciation to the Group of Consultants for bringing out a comprehensive and well-balanced report. However, my delegation regrets to note from the Secretary-General's note (A/9800) that four permanent members of the Security Council declined to serve in the Special Committee established in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2093 A (XXVIII) and that the Committee has had no meeting. This attitude of indifference and non-co-operation on the part of those States, which were the ones called upon to reduce their military budgets, would have virtually resulted in the proposal's being put into cold storage; but thanks to the initiative of the sponsors of the draft resolution A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1 the proposal will now be the subject of greater study and

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

scrutiny by all States. The draft resolution invites all States to communicate to the Secretary-General their views on various aspects of the reduction of military budgets. My delegation hopes that a positive response will come from all States, particularly the States permanent members of the Security Council and other States with substantial military budgets.

When speaking in support of the resolution on the reduction of the military budgets of the States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent in the plenary assembly last year during the debate on the subject I said:

"My delegation is inclined to go even further and to suggest that there should be a freeze on the level of spending for military purposes at the 1973 level. The goal of disarmament will remain as remote as ever if reduction of the military budget for a particular year by 10 per cent is followed by an increase of 20 per cent in the subsequent year". (A/PV.2178, p. 12)

My delegation firmly believes in the validity of that suggestion and would like to urge that all military expenditure should be frozen without any delay. However laudable the proposal for the reduction of military budgets may be, the immense complexity of the question of determining what constitutes and what does not constitute military expenses and various other technicalities involved in this issue may continue to pose a problem for years before a generally agreeable solution can be achieved. In the meantime, military expenses will undoubtedly continue to increase. When the resolution on the reduction of military budgets was introduced last year, we were talking about world military expenditure of about \$200,000 million. This year we are mentioning figures ranging between \$230,000 million and \$275,000 million, and next year it will be no surprise if those figures reach \$300,000 million. Therefore, even as we continue to argue about the technicalities concerning the reduction of military budgets, those military budgets keep shooting higher and higher, consequently making it more and more difficult to bring them down. It will be like trying to overtake a 100-mile-per-hour car with a car with a maximum speed of 80 miles per hour. The longer the chase, the greater the distance between the speeding car and the following car.

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

My delegation therefore firmly believes that a first step towards the reduction of military budgets should be a freeze in the level of military spending. Once an agreement is reached to freeze military budgets we can continue our efforts for their reduction and the allocation of the funds saved for aid to developing countries.

Before concluding, my delegation would like once again to emphasize the need for an immediate freeze on military spending and to mention that it will continue its efforts in pursuit of that objective.

Mr. GICHERU (Kenya): I should like to apologize for not being able to communicate this information earlier, but I should like to assure the Committee that it was due to unavoidable circumstances.

The delegation of Kenya wishes to refer to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.699, which was introduced by the representative of Mauritius, concerning enlarging the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean by no more than three States and which the First Committee yesterday adopted by consensus.

In accordance with the operative paragraph of the draft resolution, I should like to communicate that Kenya is interested in becoming a member of the Ad Hoc Committee. An official communication to this effect will be made in writing through the normal channels.

I should also like to take this opportunity to thank the delegation of Mauritius and others for the foresight in proposing this idea because, in the final analysis, all the people in any region must be equally involved in matters affecting the welfare and security of the region.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee has taken due note of the interest of Kenya in participating in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee as a member.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): I propose to address myself briefly to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1.

It is a great pleasure for my delegation to be a sponsor of that draft resolution, which was introduced this morning with characteristic clarity and conviction by the representative of Mexico.

Since the Soviet representative introduced the item on 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 -- which led to the adoption of resolution 3093 B (XXVIII) of 7 December 1973, referred to in the first preambular paragraph, among others -- my country, Nigeria, has been following this subject with keen interest. We see in it a flicker

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

of hope or a measure, symbolic or otherwise, of disarmament and the possibility of transferring resources from armament to development. We sincerely hope that the draft resolution will serve to continue the discussion on the subject.

Nigeria was glad to serve on the panel of experts referred to in the second preambular paragraph. Even though our appreciation of the services of the experts has not been explicitly expressed in the draft resolution before the Committee, my delegation wishes to place on record our full appreciation and gratitude for their services and their report in document A/9770 of 14 October. Naturally, we include the staff of the United Nations Secretariat in our expression of gratitude.

Mr. HYVARINEN (Finland): I merely want to present a minor correction to the language used in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.701, which my delegation has submitted to the Committee. It is a linguistic change, if I may put it that way.

In keeping with the established language of respective international instruments, as well as the language of previous resolutions, we should use the word "proliferation" rather than "further spread" in the second preambular paragraph. We should therefore like to replace "further spread" -- as now appears in the text -- by "proliferation".

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee has taken note of the correction and when we proceed to the vote we shall take it into account.

Mr. MBATCHI (Gabon) (interpretation from French): I wish only to point out that Gabon is a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.701.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee has taken due note of the statement by the representative of Gabon.

With the Committee's agreement, and if there is no objection, I shall now call on the representative of the Office of the Observer of the Holy See, who wishes to make a statement.

Reverend IUCAL (Holy See): Mr. Chairman, while it may be rather late to congratulate you on your election, it is all the more opportune at this time to thank you for your excellent leadership during the past six weeks -- a period during which the Committee has indeed taken important steps towards its ultimate goal.

Realizing the unprecedented nature of this statement before the Political and Security Committee, the observer delegation of the Holy See also wishes to thank you, Mr. Chairman, as well as the officers and all members of the Committee, for the privilege of speaking on the supremely important question of disarmament.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the resolution of most other global problems depends upon a rapid end to the terror and crushing burdens of the present arms race and the reallocation of planetary resources to the achievement of world social justice, the prerequisite to genuine and lasting peace. And so, during this session of the General Assembly, the Holy See, which is a founding member of the International Atomic Energy Agency and has followed with great interest the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva, has been represented at meetings of the First Committee -- an additional indication of the importance it places on the role of the entire United Nations system in the field of disarmament.

When the Holy See has functioned as an observer at international meetings, it has not ordinarily put forward concrete proposals or injected itself into the debate on specific resolutions, and that is certainly not its intention here. Furthermore, the Holy See is concerned with the moral aspects of international relations and so its statements remain, for the most part, at the level of principle. However, the principles that it proposes are not entirely abstract.

For over three quarters of a century the Holy See has publicly advocated disarmament: in 1889 Pope Leo XIII condemned large standing armies and later

promoted The Hague Conference of 1899; during the First World War Pope Benedict XV advocated the general and proportional reduction of armaments, together with the compulsory arbitration of disputes and economic sanctions against any State which refused to accept this judgement of reason. In 1956 Pope Pius XII declared his support of general disarmament and added:

(Fev. Lucal, Holy See)

"In fact only in the ambit of an institution like the United Nations can the promise of individual nations to reduce armament, especially to abandon production and use of certain arms, be mutually exchanged under the strict obligation of international law. Likewise only the United Nations is at present in a position to exact the observance of this obligation by assuming effective control of the armaments of all nations without exception."

It is interesting to note that in 1946 this same Pope had referred to nuclear weapons as "infernal creations", stating that this new factor had:

"... brought the problem of disarmament into the centre of international discussions under completely new aspects" and that it provided "an incentive that was never felt before".

Pope John XXIII, in his encyclical Pacem in Terris, which was hailed by men of all religions and ideologies, wrote as follows:

"Justice, right reason and humanity, therefore, urgently demand that the arms race should cease; that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned; and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control."

He added that there was no hope of accomplishing this unless the process were complete and proceeded from inner conviction, that is, unless the fundamental principle of fear on which the present peace depends was replaced by mutual trust.

The present Pontiff, Pope Paul VI, has in the past decade uttered so many pleas for disarmament that it is perhaps unnecessary to quote him here. One may recall only his linking of an end to the arms race with funds for development, at Bombay in 1964; his reference to nuclear arms as "fatal and dishonouring weapons", made on the twentieth anniversary of Hiroshima in 1965; his stirring plea before the United Nations later the same year; and his lament in 1967, when establishing the first day of January as a World Day of Peace that the world "seems to have become a factory and market-place of weapons, and what weapons!"

(Rev. Lucal, Holy See)

Just last year, the President of the Pontifical Commission on Justice and Peace, Cardinal Maurice Roy of Quebec, declared that the present arms race is a permanent temptation to intimidate or even blackmail; it is an injustice and a theft of funds from the poor. It is madness, because it does not insure security, but creates extra risks by causing instabilities capable of upsetting the balance of terror. It is a sign and cause of a hegemony, in intention or in fact, because to arm oneself, even for the purpose of not using these arms, is to maintain an imperialistic concept of the world by substituting the primacy of force for the primacy of right. Lastly, the arms race is a danger, because it has become a cumulative process with its own momentum and is beyond the control of States; it is a machine gone mad. This assessment of the situation by the Cardinal was made over a year ago. Since then, there has been a glimmer of hope that vertical proliferation can be brought under control, a hope which the Holy See prays will brighten and be shared by all.

In speaking out so bluntly, the Holy See has responded to a responsibility which is, in the words of Pope Paul:

"... the imperative of also becoming interested in civil society, not in order to interfere unduly in a domain outside its scope, but to foster respect for the basic principles of civil and international life, justice toward all, mutual concord and collaboration among peoples -- in a word, to co-operate in the peaceful search for this common good, of which the temporal authority should be the guarantor, in order to serve and defend peace."

The Holy See speaks not for power, but for people -- as the spiritual spokesman at the world level for many millions of Catholics and unofficially for countless others who acknowledge its moral role in world affairs. And in a spirit of humble service, the Holy See would speak for all mankind, especially the poor. As the Second Vatican Council declared:

"Therefore, it must be said again: the arms race is an utterly treacherous trap for humanity, and one which injures the poor to an intolerable degree."

For the Holy See, therefore, disarmament has always been fundamentally a moral question, and it is heartwarming to note that its moral foundation has not been neglected in the deliberations of this Committee, thanks to the many

(Rev. Lucal, Holy See)

many representatives who have stressed the awesome power of modern weapons and the consequent moral responsibility of statesmen to hasten the world's progress toward general and complete disarmament. The future of man on this planet is literally at stake. As a representative said so well at the recent Conference on Population in Bucharest:

"... of all things in the world, people are the most precious".

And it is people who are paying with poverty and inflation for the insane expenditure of the arms race, who are killed by bullets and burned by napalm, and who live in the constant and underlying dread that it could all come to an end -- the whole of human history -- in one apocalyptic moment of supreme folly.

The purpose of this intervention is not to blame any particular people or State. Security is a primordial need, and in their search for it good men can become infected with a psychological disease which diminishes their responsibility and threatens entirely to escape their control. Nor does the Holy See here intend merely to reiterate a prophetic denunciation of the present course of world events, although this would be altogether fitting, given the gravity of the situation. No, the aim of this statement is rather an effort to help tear down walls and build bridges between States, to increase the solidarity of peoples by pointing to the common danger and appealing for a collective, unified response. Men must agree on the way they should go and then travel the road together.

In reading the signs of the times in the area of disarmament negotiations, especially in this Committee, one discerns a rather general agreement that priority should be given to the problem of nuclear weapons, since this is most urgent, although other questions should not be neglected. It should be noted that the Holy See, together with many States, is deeply concerned about the increase in non-nuclear weapons, especially the accelerating world traffic in conventional weapons, which has been condemned by Church leaders but does not appear on the agenda of this Committee. And as a party to the Geneva Protocol of 1925, the Holy See also strongly advocates the elimination of chemical and bacteriological weapons. It is, in addition, very concerned over the development of newer

weapons, including those capable of use in environmental warfare, which are far from conventional. In addition, in certain areas of the world there is a complex interrelationship between nuclear and non-nuclear weapons which must be resolved if denuclearization is to proceed. But in general the nuclear problem has quite correctly been given priority by this Committee.

As to particular approaches to the nuclear problem, the Holy See rejects none that are valid and helpful. But as a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to which it acceded on 25 February 1971, the Holy See attaches special importance to that convention as a very constructive approach to the problem of nuclear proliferation and the one capable of receiving the most widespread support, despite its limitations at the present time and its performance to date. The Holy See looks forward to the review conference next May and earnestly hopes that the Treaty can be improved and objections to it overcome. And therefore the Holy See hopes that States will support what has been called the "NPT approach" to the problem, even though some of them may continue to point out its weaknesses or simultaneously urge the taking of other steps, such as the renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons, which would undoubtedly improve the general situation.

Our delegation understands the term "NPT approach" as including, first of all, the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones. One of the positive trends of the debate in this Committee has been increasing support for this idea, a trend which would seem to reflect a new and welcome point of view among many States, namely, that nuclear weapons are no longer a source of prestige and honour. Nor are they a source of true security; for what State today can really guarantee the security of its citizens? No, nuclear arms are rather comparable to a dangerous disease in need of cure and quarantine as it threatens to reach epidemic proportions in spreading through the world community.

The term "NPT approach" must also include the indivisibility of efforts to end both horizontal and vertical proliferation. The Holy See attaches the highest importance to the rapid reduction of nuclear arsenals, making détente more than just an elegant French word but rather a universal word for an extremely elegant reality. This would undoubtedly further the non-proliferation Treaty approach and the implementation of article VI of the Treaty on non-proliferation, which states:

(Rev. Local, Holy See)

"Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." (General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII))

On the question of nuclear disarmament, a unique degree of consensus among members of this Committee is essential, because the problem is so serious. The approach favoured by the majority in the Committee is not accepted by all, but our delegation joins in the hope expressed here that a greater unity of view can be achieved among the delegations before the disarmament resolutions reach the plenary Assembly. During this time, perhaps certain reservations and objections can be overcome through honest discussion and a willingness to enter into consultations. The primary concern of the Holy See is that maximum consensus be obtained, so that the world may benefit from a unified and co-ordinated strategy on disarmament and then move forward with a determined political will to achieve it.

There is much more that the delegation of the Holy See would like to say on disarmament, especially on the crucial question of the formulation of more ultimate goals than those dealt with here. If general and complete disarmament is to be achieved, we shall all have to learn to think about world order in a new way, to think of man in a new way, and of his life in common and of the paths of history and the destiny of the world, as Pope Paul said in his address to the United Nations nine years ago. We shall certainly have to think in terms of the classification of nuclear substances of whatever kind as subject to an international régime, and of a strengthened United Nations system capable of preserving the peace and providing mechanisms for peaceful change and liberation from unjust social structures, as a substitute for war and violence. But these questions cannot be taken up here.

To conclude, the Holy See is under no illusions as to the difficulties involved in these first steps towards disarmament. It is mindful of the Gospel injunction that we must be as simple as doves, but also as wise as serpents.

(Rev. Lucal, Holy See)

But true wisdom indicates that man's efforts, including the work of this Committee, must be conceived in more collective terms than ever before, and that this is possible with sufficient political will. As Pope Paul said in his message for the World Day of Peace on 1 January 1973: "Peace is possible if it is truly wanted. If peace is possible, it is a duty".

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of the Holy See for his statement and also for the cordial words of friendship he was so kind as to address to me.

I believe that we should bring to an end our debate on the proposals and, in order to meet our deadline, try from now on to deal with the voting on the various draft resolutions, with opportunity, of course, being given for delegations to explain their votes both before and after each vote.

In order to make use of our remaining time, 15 minutes, I shall put to the vote the draft resolution appearing in document A/C.1/L.701, sponsored by the delegations of Finland and Gabon, on item 35 of the agenda, "General and complete disarmament", and entitled "A comprehensive study of the question of the nuclear-weapon-free zones in all of its aspects".

The representative of Mexico, it seems, wishes to speak. If it is for the purpose of explaining his vote, I must first call upon those delegations that have listed their names for that purpose.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): There is something I should like to say which, strictly speaking -- I repeat, strictly speaking -- might not be an explanation of vote. So that, with the reservation that I may wish to explain my vote after the vote, I should like to make a brief comment at this time.

I find that the last paragraph of the preamble, in the Spanish version, is not worded in the best possible way. It says:

"Considerando que un amplio estudio de la cuestión en todos sus aspectos realzaria todo esfuerzo adicional en relación con las zonas libres de armas nucleares,".

I do not know whether that is the best translation of the original text, which it seems to me is in English; but my delegation considers that it would be better to have the Spanish wording correspond to that of the French text; in other words, to have it read as follows:

"Considerando que nuevos esfuerzos que se refieran a las zonas libres de armas nucleares se verían reforzados" -- or "fortalecidos" -- "por un estudio completo de la cuestión en todos sus aspectos,".

Therefore, if there is no objection, my delegation would prefer the Spanish text to correspond to the French text.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): If there is no objection the part of the Spanish-speaking delegations, that change will be made in the Spanish text. As I see there is no objection, the Spanish text will be amended accordingly.

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

Mr. MIHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): Speaking in the general debate on disarmament on 7 November, the permanent representative of Yugoslavia expressed the Yugoslav Government's support for Finland's idea concerning a comprehensive study on the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects. We have listened with interest to the remarks made yesterday by the representative of Finland, when he introduced the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.701, which we share fully. We are particularly pleased to note the role that the General Assembly is assuming in operative paragraph 1, namely, to undertake a comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones, the result of which no doubt could be very useful at this time, when the General Assembly is considering several initiatives in respect of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world.

We also fully agree with and support the idea that the study be carried out by an ad hoc group of qualified governmental experts under the auspices of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, in which any State other than those which are members of the Committee on Disarmament can take an active part. In this way we feel the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament would be taking a positive step towards broadening and improving its activities and its methods of work.

My delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I only wish to say that my delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution. We consider that the comprehensive study requested therein may be a very valuable contribution on this subject. I only wish to add that my delegation understands that, in the light of the statements which I am informed were made yesterday in the Committee by the representative of Finland and in the light of the broad-ranging talks which I have had occasion to have with the representative of that country, what is stated in the last preambular paragraph means that this comprehensive study, which it is recognized here would enhance -- or strengthen -- further efforts concerning nuclear-weapon-free zones,

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

can in no way be interpreted as something which might either delay or adversely affect the efforts which States individually or in groups are carrying out in connexion with the establishment or broadening of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We should like to state here that the Soviet delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Finland in document A/C.1/L.701, but at the same time we should like to point out that voting in favour of this draft resolution does not mean that my delegation is changing its attitude towards questions concerning the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, that is, the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The statements made by the Soviet delegation in the discussion of the question of Protocols I and II are still valid in this particular case and are applicable also to the vote on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): There being no further explanations of vote, I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee to speak on the administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution.

Mr. FANEJEJE (Secretary of the Committee): Under the terms of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.701, the Secretary-General would be requested to provide services and to give such assistance as may be necessary for a comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones to be carried out by an ad hoc group of governmental experts under the auspices of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The study would be the subject of a special report to be transmitted by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session.

(Mr. Banerjee, Secretary of the
Committee)

As has been the practice in similar circumstances, it is assumed that Governments will provide the services of experts needed for the preparation of the report at no cost to the United Nations. If, as in similar cases in the past, the services of one consultant should be needed, it is proposed that the related expenses would be met from the existing resources allotted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. In view of the proposal to submit the report to the thirtieth session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General proposes that the costs of translation, editing and reproduction of the report should be met to the extent possible from the existing appropriation for General Assembly documentation. However, as the report was not foreseen in the work programme of the related Secretariat services, it may become necessary to subcontract all or part of the work involved, in which case the Secretary-General might have to request additional resources in his supplementary estimates for the biennium 1974-1975.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.701. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Cuba, France

The draft resolution was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. KEVIN (Australia): In explaining our vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.701, which has just been adopted, I would recall that Australia has voted in favour of all the regional nuclear-weapon-free zone resolutions presented at this session. We regard the initiative of Finland for a study of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all their aspects as very useful and were pleased to be able to support it.

In general my Government assesses nuclear-weapon-free zone proposals in terms of the extent to which they are compatible with the objectives of the non-proliferation Treaty. We regard that Treaty as the cornerstone of international efforts to prevent nuclear weapon proliferation. Our first aim is to strengthen that Treaty and work for its acceptance everywhere. In this context my Government particularly appreciates the expression of support for the non-proliferation Treaty contained in operative paragraph 3 of document A/C.1/L.700, the Middle East nuclear-free-zone draft submitted by Egypt and Iran. Australia also particularly welcomed the very favourable vote earlier this week on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690, as amended by document A/C.1/L.693/Rev.1, which we regarded as one of the most important resolutions in the area of nuclear disarmament this year.

Without seeking to prejudge in any way the scope or the outcome of the experts' study on nuclear-weapon-free zones which will now be carried out under the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.701), we hope that the study will focus its attention on the question which we regard as fundamental, namely, how best regional nuclear-free zones can contribute to the global objective of preventing a proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Kevin, Australia)

I have two final specific comments on the Finnish initiative. First, Australia noted with appreciation the explanation given yesterday by the representative of Finland concerning the organizational arrangements for the ad hoc group of qualified governmental experts. We consider that it is entirely appropriate that the study should not be undertaken by CCD as such, but by a special group of experts set up by it for that purpose and comprising the necessary expertise not only from among its own members, but also from other interested parties non-members of the Committee. My Government considers that it would be desirable to take into account the views of all interested countries on the composition of the Ad Hoc Group of Experts.

Secondly, in regard to the experts' report, it would be very valuable if CCD could have the opportunity to study and comment on it. At the same time, we think it would be appropriate for the report to have a certain independence from the over-all CCD report, to which it might be attached as a separate self-contained document.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation considers that a comprehensive study of nuclear-weapon-free zones would be interesting. Although we would have preferred some of the conditions of the study to be more specific in the text in document A/C.1/L.701, we would not have opposed it had a consensus been proposed. However, since a formal recorded vote was requested, my delegation had to abstain because of the essential role which that resolution confers on CCD in operative paragraphs 2 and 5.

Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.701, just adopted by the Committee. In so doing we were motivated above all by the belief that at this stage the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world offers the most effective way of containing the nuclear arms race and preventing its spread to those regions which today are still free of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Naik, Pakistan)

We do not consider by any means that nuclear-weapon-free zones are a substitute for or need inhibit other measures designed to achieve the same end. That this view is widely shared is evident from the fact that this Committee adopted this week resolutions relating to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in South Asia and has before it a similar proposal with regard to the Middle East and Africa.

I should like to say with regard to the resolution that has just been adopted that we welcome that initiative and appreciate the spirit in which it was made. The proposed study will serve to throw light on the elements which are common to nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world and on which, therefore, standard procedures can be adopted.

It is necessary, we believe, that the study should be conducted by experts of the highest competence available and with the impartiality which an essentially political issue of this nature demands. It should not be seen as impeding action on specific proposals already under way or under consideration. In this regard, we fully share the observations made by the representative of Mexico, when he explained his vote before the vote.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): My delegation voted in favour of the Finnish initiative. I should merely like to express the view that when CCD invites qualified governmental experts to participate in the Ad Hoc Group, it should keep in mind the fact that such a group should be sufficiently small to carry out the requested study effectively.

Mr. BLANCO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation abstained from voting on the draft resolution because of the well-known position of the Revolutionary Government of Cuba on this item in general. We would not have opposed a consensus if the draft resolution had been adopted by that procedure.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As there are no further speakers to explain their vote after the vote, I consider that we have now concluded consideration of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.701.

I should like to inform the Committee that at this afternoon's meeting I intend to put the draft resolutions to the vote in the following order: A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.702, A/C.1/L.698, A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1, and A/C.1/L.700..

With respect to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1, the representative of Brazil asked whether there were any other draft resolutions on that item. I should like to state that so far no other draft resolutions have been submitted on that item.

Mr. THOMPSON FLORES (Brazil) (interpretation from Spanish):

Mr. Chairman, when you read out the draft resolutions on which the Committee will vote this afternoon, you mentioned the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698. If I am not mistaken, I should like to inform you that that draft was introduced and circulated only this morning. While my delegation understands the desirability of adopting that draft, on the one hand, and of having the Committee conclude its work on disarmament today, we are not able to take a decision on it today. We should therefore like to request you to hold that decision in abeyance at least until this afternoon, at which time we shall be able to decide whether we will be in a position to consider it today.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall consult the Committee again about the desirability of considering that draft today.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK (continued)

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Earlier today, the representative of Peru raised a point of order with respect to the working procedure that would be followed by the Committee as a result of the decision it took with regard to the question of Korea and whether we would meet next week at the time when in principle meetings had been set aside for consideration

(The Chairman)

of the question of Korea. I should like to point out that 18 meetings were assigned to consideration of the question of Korea and that those meetings which are not held will be cancelled. Consequently, consideration of the last item, namely, Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Collective Security, will not suffer.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.