



---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 50TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland)

CONTENTS

Incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons: report of the Secretary-General [35]

World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference [40]

Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa [42]

Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [45]

General and complete disarmament [49]

- (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency;
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General

Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [116]

---

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room LX-2332.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 35, 40, 42, 45, 49 and 116 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue its consideration of the remaining agenda items relating to disarmament.

In accordance with the decision taken this morning, we shall first deal with draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2 relating to item 49 under the general title, "General and complete disarmament", and dealing specifically with the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The financial implications of these resolutions are given in document A/C.1/31/L.40 which has just been distributed in provisional form. I should like to draw to the attention of the Committee that those implications are indeed considerable. A wish has been expressed that the decision on this draft resolution be taken by consensus.

May I take it that the Committee agreed with this suggestion?

I would like to point out that the draft resolution is sponsored by 72 delegations and that that wish has been expressed on behalf of those sponsors.

I hear no objections, and we shall proceed accordingly.

Before we take a decision, however, I should like to call on delegations that wish to explain their positions before we take a decision on this draft resolution.

Mr. HSU (China) (interpretation from Chinese): In his speech during the general debate in this Committee, Vice-Chairman Huang Hua of the Chinese delegation already made a comprehensive statement regarding our position on the question of disarmament. Here, I wish to state briefly again our views on the proposed special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament.

At present, the Soviet Union and the United States are frantically engaged in rivalry for hegemony all over the globe. Accordingly, the arms race between them is becoming ever more intensified. Their rivalry has greatly aggravated the international tension, seriously threatening world peace and security. At the same time, the super-Powers, particularly the Soviet Union which is the main source of a new world war today, are vigorously trumpeting "détente" and "general and complete disarmament", describing the arms race as the root cause of war and holding all countries responsible for that arms race. Its sinister aim is to cover up the basic fact that imperialism is the root cause of war, camouflage the Soviet aggression, expansion, arms build up and war preparations, lull world opinion and weaken the determination of the peoples of the world in strengthening their armed forces of self-defence. While refusing to undertake the minimum obligation, it is propagating the convening of a world disarmament conference and advocating that the proposed special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament should be made "an intermediate stage in preparation of a world disarmament conference". This is precisely an integral part of its fraud of sham détente and sham disarmament.

We fully understand the honest desires and legitimate demands of the third world and other peace-loving countries, which are opposed to the arms race, aggression and expansion by the super-Powers and support the realization of genuine disarmament. Since the Second World War, disarmament talks in various forms have been going on within and outside the United Nations for many years. However, these disarmament talks under multifarious names have not led, and cannot possibly lead to genuine disarmament. As the talks go on, the nuclear and conventional arms of the super-Powers have been increasing instead of decreasing. The facts show that the lack of progress in disarmament is not due to the lack of appropriate international forums but to the lack of the will for genuine disarmament on the part of the super-Powers.

(Mr. Hsu, China)

It is evident that at present when the two super-Powers are engaged in frenzied arms expansion and war preparations and in fierce contention for world hegemony, particularly when the Soviet Union is carrying out aggression and expansion everywhere, the danger of war is visibly increasing. In the meantime, the Soviet Union is energetically peddling the fraud of sham détente and sham disarmament. Under these circumstances, the convening of a session in whatever form devoted exclusively to the question of disarmament could not possibly achieve any progress in genuine disarmament. On the contrary, it could only be used by the super-Powers to spread illusions about peace and lull the vigilance of the world people to the detriment of the world people's struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism.

We hold that in order to talk about disarmament, it is imperative first of all to reveal the present source of the threat to the security of the people of the world; it is imperative thoroughly to expose and denounce the super-Powers' arms build-up, war preparations, aggression and expansion, and to urge all the nuclear States, particularly the two super-Powers, to completely prohibit and thoroughly destroy nuclear weapons, and as a first step to undertake the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, particularly not to use them against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones, and to withdraw all their nuclear bases and nuclear forces from abroad. Then it is essential to call upon the people of the world to unite in resolute struggle against the super-Power policies of aggression, expansion and war. This is the only approach conducive to the world people's struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism and to the defence of the security of the people the world over.

Basing itself on the above position of principle, the Chinese delegation will not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2.

Mr. LIKHACHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2 with regard to the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement.

(Mr. Likhachev, USSR)

The Soviet Union has proposed and still proposes that we consider the problem of disarmament in its totality at a world disarmament conference. However, as we know, no progress has been made with this appeal because of the resistance of certain States which do not reflect the mood of the overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations.

In the circumstances, the Soviet Union supported the idea of convening a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, viewing it as an interim stage before the convening of a world disarmament conference. We see the task of the special session as laying the ground for a world disarmament conference and preparing by its decisions a broad and thorough consideration of the problem of disarmament at a world disarmament conference. If the special session is to be successful, it should not amount simply to the adoption of general resolutions, enough of which already exist in the archives of the United Nations. The organization of it should be such as to ensure a break-through in resolving the problem of disarmament.

In our view, in its work there should be a reflection of the responsibility for the cause of disarmament on the part of all States of the world and primarily the major Powers which possess the most powerful armaments and armed forces.

It is precisely in this spirit that the Soviet delegation will support draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian):

The States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, including the German Democratic Republic, have always attached great significance to the achievement of effective measures to check the arms race and to bring about disarmament. Just a few days ago at the conference in Bucharest, once again the readiness and wish was expressed actively and constructively to co-operate with all States in order to achieve a reduction of stocks of armaments and to ensure a break-through to disarmament. Along with other proposals they expressed the view that it would serve to strengthen peace and security and trust among nations and peoples if all States which had signed the final act in Helsinki assumed the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other.

My delegation believes that the initiatives of the conference will be a source of new momentum and will have a favourable effect also on the achievement of progress in implementing other disarmament measures. Guided by the will and desire to co-operate and promote all measures which may make a contribution to the cause of disarmament, my delegation will support the draft resolution calling for a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In this connexion, my delegation, however, would like to confirm the view that this special session cannot replace a world disarmament conference, because only a world disarmament conference attended by all States on an equal footing can make a decisive contribution to resolving the fundamental problems of complete and general disarmament under strict international control. As is shown by the report of the Special Committee on a World Disarmament Conference, to the thirty-first session of the General Assembly the idea of holding a world disarmament conference has met with broad support from Member States of the United Nations. The Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries in Colombo also reconfirmed the urgent need to take effective measures leading to the convening of a world disarmament conference. It provided for the inclusion of this item on the agenda of the special session of the United Nations on the question of disarmament.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic regrets that in spite of this, this draft resolution convening the special session completely omits to mention the question of the convening of a world disarmament conference. Our delegation would prefer a resolution which unambiguously specified the special

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

session as a stage on the road towards a world disarmament conference. In our view, the special session should be an important stage on the road towards a world disarmament conference.

In this spirit, the German Democratic Republic will constructively take part in preparations for the convening of the United Nations special session on the question of disarmament.

Mr. THOMPSON (United States): Over the years, several factors have governed our approach to various arms control proposals, particularly proposals for large conferences. We believe that serious efforts at achieving concrete arms control measures can only be the product of careful, detailed preparation and negotiation. Large conferences ordinarily do not lend themselves to this type of effort. Unrealistic public expectations can be stimulated by the promises often associated with large conferences and are just as frequently disappointed. Public understanding and public support of arms control measures are too important to risk this. Consequently, the United States has favoured smaller expert groups, such as the CCD, which have demonstrated an ability to deal successfully with complex issues of arms control in a realistic fashion. Thus, the United States approaches the proposal for a special session on disarmament with both caution and hope. We are cautious because of the size of the conference and the fact that its objectives remain vague and unspecified. We are hopeful, however, because of the strong interest on the part of many United Nations Members for such a conference and the seriousness of purpose which accompanied the sentiments expressed regarding the necessity of its success. We also are hopeful because the resolution before us specifies a preparatory process which, if approached realistically and constructively, can bring about a special session which contributes to the broader objective of arms control and disarmament.

For these reasons, the United States supports the resolution and is prepared to participate constructively and actively in the special session's preparatory phase.

The CHAIRMAN: May I take it that the Committee is ready now to adopt by consensus the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2 on the

(The Chairman)

convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament?  
I hear no objections. It is so decided.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2) was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no delegation wishes to explain its position after the decision, we have thus concluded the consideration of the question concerning the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

We shall now deal with item 35 of the agenda, "Incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons". The draft resolution is contained in document A/C.1/31/L.30, and it was introduced yesterday by the distinguished representative of Sweden. The financial implications are contained in document A/C.1/31/L.38. A wish has been expressed by the sponsors to have the draft resolution adopted by consensus.

As no delegation wishes to explain its position before a decision is taken on the draft resolution, may I take it that the Committee is prepared to adopt the draft resolution by consensus? I hear no objection. It is so decided. The draft resolution has been adopted by consensus.

The draft resolutuion (A/C.1/31/L.30) was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations that have expressed the wish to explain their positions after the decision.



Mr. MISTRAL (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation did not wish to oppose the consensus just arrived at on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.30, essentially because the French Government is still in favour of international legislation to govern the use in war time of certain weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects. French experts have taken an active part in the work of the specialized conferences of the International Committee of the Red Cross held at Lucerne and Lugano. Our delegation submitted working papers there, especially on the use of mines and booby traps. We feel these studies will prove useful to Governments by enabling them to take informed decisions. Similarly, the French Government is not opposed to the principle of regulating the question of the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in particular circumstances and on the basis of modalities to be determined.

The reservations that my delegation wishes to make are of a different kind and relate basically to the framework for attempts to regulate the use of cruel weapons: the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts, and more especially its ad hoc committee. We have felt, since this problem was raised, that the Diplomatic Conference was not an appropriate forum for arriving at effective decisions on the subject. The problem of unnecessarily cruel weapons obviously has two aspects -- a humanitarian aspect, but also a political aspect, since the regulation or prohibition of certain types of weapons affects the security interests of States and is likely to make more difficult or even, in certain cases, jeopardize their defence. We consider that this aspect of the question is equally as important as the humanitarian aspect and cannot be sufficiently taken into account by a conference which necessarily concentrates on the purely humanitarian aspects of the law of warfare. If the Diplomatic Conference succeeds in elaborating rules and regulations on the subject, they will lack the necessary authority for their implementation. We have always felt and said that this work is properly the task of a body with political authority -- in this instance, the General Assembly, which should take measures to carry out an in-depth study of these problems.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation did not object to the adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.30, relating to incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons. However, the Soviet Union is still firmly of the view that the question of prohibiting or restricting the use of individual types of conventional weapons should be resolved within the totality of problems of disarmament in appropriate international forums, particularly the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. In the light of this, if this draft resolution had been put to the vote, the Soviet delegation would have abstained.

Mr. di BERNARDO (Italy): The Italian delegation did not oppose the consensus to approve draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.30. However, the text, in our view, reflects an approach about which we still have some doubts. I wish to recall in this connexion the relevant part of the statement made by my delegation during the general debate on disarmament. In particular, I wish to reiterate our conviction that the problem addressed by the draft resolution deserves to be further studied in all its implications, not the least of which are those concerning security. We are moreover convinced, as we have stressed on numerous occasions, that the most suitable body for examining the matter is the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. However, we stand ready to give our full contribution to the search for a rational and practicable solution to the problems of conventional weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other representative wishes to speak on this particular subject, I declare concluded the consideration of agenda item 35, "Incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons".

We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.31, relating to agenda item 42, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". The draft resolution carries no financial implications: it is co-sponsored by 35 States, and was introduced by the

(The Chairman)

representative of Nigeria yesterday. A wish has been expressed also in this case by the sponsors to have the draft resolution adopted by consensus. May I take it that the Committee agrees with that suggestion? As I hear no objections, I declare the draft resolution relating to agenda item 42, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa" adopted by consensus.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/31/L.31) was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their positions after the decision.

Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom): My delegation has not obstructed the consensus on this item and if there had been a vote, we would have voted in favour of the draft resolution, although we regret that it does not do more to encourage actual negotiations by the States of the region. We note, furthermore, that in its third preambular paragraph the resolution recalls an expression, made elsewhere, of grave concern over collaboration with the South African Government: "particularly in the military and nuclear fields, thereby enabling it to acquire nuclear-weapon capability". My Government is not aware that South Africa has acquired nuclear-weapon capability, or that it is preparing to do so. We would strongly deplore any collaboration with South Africa in order to help it to acquire this capability. Again, we are not aware that such collaboration actually exists.

(Mr. Allen, United Kingdom)

The British Government's position has already been made clear, but it bears repeating. It is this: because of its general nuclear non-proliferation policy and, in particular, its opposition to apartheid, my Government would not sanction the export to South Africa of any nuclear material equipment or technology contributing to the development of a military nuclear capability.

The British Government's policy on trade with South Africa in the civil sphere was explained in the British Parliament on 4 December 1974 and in a General Assembly document circulated under the symbol A/9918. British companies are free to engage in civil trade and in business such as uranium mining in South Africa. For example, British firms conduct a trade in isotopes for medical, biological and ordinary industrial and agricultural uses, and some uranium exported from South Africa is converted into hexafluoride. We do not, however, enrich uranium for South Africa, nor have we any plans to do so. My Government has made no secret of its policies on trading with South Africa, which it is prepared to defend on their economic and political merits. This trade is confined to the civil sphere, in accordance with our international undertakings. Our position is as I have stated it today, and on that we stand.

Mr. MISTRAL (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation has very willingly associated itself with the consensus just arrived at on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.31, concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. We would have voted in favour of this text if it had been put to the vote. My delegation would not have wished to explain its vote if, on the submission of this draft, the representative of Nigeria had not raised the problem of the construction by my country of the nuclear electric power station at Koberg. I should simply like to recall, on this subject, that in the general debate in the General Assembly, the representative of France, in a statement made on 5 October (A/31/PV.18), gave all necessary explanations about the construction of this station. He made it clear how the French Government had ensured the absolute impossibility for South Africa to progress towards obtaining military nuclear capacity because of the functioning of the Koberg power station, and particularly towards obtaining by this means

(Mr. Mistral, France)

the enriched uranium or plutonium which are necessary for the manufacture of nuclear weapons. This is both materially and contractually impossible. I do not want to take up the time of the Committee by repeating this argument and these explanations, but I would hope that delegations which are interested in this matter would be good enough to acquaint themselves with the explanation we gave on this subject.

Mr. SCHLEICH (Federal Republic of Germany): The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany has participated without any reservations in the consensus on the draft resolution concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. I need not particularly stress that, on the basis of our adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and our membership of the International Atomic Energy Agency and our general non-proliferation policy ensuing therefrom, we do not permit the export to South Africa of nuclear material, equipment or technology which might contribute to the development of a nuclear-weapon capability by that country. The draft resolution just adopted by the First Committee is entirely in line with the policy of my Government. As early as 1963, long before the Federal Republic of Germany became a Member of the United Nations, the Federal Government placed an embargo upon the supply to South Africa of military weapons, ammunition, military vehicles and installations for the production of raw materials. This policy has been repeatedly reaffirmed since then by the Federal Government and it is being strictly observed. It is an essential principle of this policy not to contribute in any way to the establishment of a nuclear potential in South Africa.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to explain its position on this draft resolution, I declare concluded the consideration of agenda item 42, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa".

(The Chairman)

I should like to announce at this stage that Kuwait and Iran have become co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.33 and that Denmark and Norway have become co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34.

A number of delegations have requested me to postpone action on some of the remaining draft resolutions until tomorrow, due to the lack of instructions from their Governments, and as consultations on some draft resolutions are still in progress, I have been asked to suspend the meeting for 15 minutes. If the Committee consents, I suggest that the meeting should be suspended until 4.15 p.m., when we shall proceed with the consideration of further draft resolutions.

The meeting was suspended at 4 p.m., and resumed at 4.15 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: As we resume the meeting, the situation is as follows. I have been approached by a number of delegations asking that we postpone until tomorrow action on draft resolutions A/C.1/31/L.32, L.33 and L.34 because they are still awaiting instructions from their Governments. On the other hand, I have been informed that we can proceed with item 45 of the agenda, "Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environment modification techniques".

I call on the representative of Mexico on a point of order.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, when we began the meeting this morning the Mexican delegation asked you to be so good as to tell us the order in which we would be voting on the different draft resolutions. Subsequently, you told us that we would vote on three draft resolutions, and in fact, we did so. Later, you told us that in the afternoon, we would continue with those in the order in which they were submitted beginning with A/C.1/31/L.7. I asked for the floor at the end of this morning's meeting, but apparently it was too late for me to speak. I am reminding you of what you told us on two or three occasions to the effect that all members of the Committee should be prepared to vote on any draft at any time. I wish to say that my delegation is ready to vote in the order indicated by you, yourself, this morning.

But this is not all, the delegations of Argentina, Cyprus, Ecuador, Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica, Mauritius, Panama, Peru, Dominican Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela and Mexico this afternoon handed in to the Secretariat for reproduction and distribution a revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4. In addition, when you suspended the meeting for a few minutes I went to you and told you that I wanted to make a statement on the draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4 and you told me that you had no speakers on the list. I would, therefore, request that you give me the floor to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Mexico is quite right in reminding the Committee about the order of our work this morning. Then I of course indicated that we would start this afternoon's meeting with action on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7 and proceed with those draft resolutions which the Committee will find ready for action. It is quite true that I have appealed on numerous occasions to delegations to be ready to take action on any draft resolution before the Committee, but as the situation stands now not all delegations have received instructions to vote on all the drafts before us, and since the time-limit for discussing disarmament items expires tomorrow only, I see no binding reason why we cannot postpone action on some of those drafts until tomorrow. On the other hand, in order to make the best use of our time I see no obstacle to proceeding with those questions which may be ripe or which delegations may wish to raise. It is quite correct that the representative of Mexico approached me and asked me to inscribe his name and indicated that he would like to speak at the end of the afternoon meeting to make -- as he put it -- a conciliatory statement concerning draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4. I have his name inscribed here to speak at the end of the meeting. But this is not the end of the meeting. I did not know what his particular intention was; he did not inform me about a revised draft of A/C.1/31/L.4 or any other specific matter, and in the meantime I have inscribed the names of others who indicated their readiness to speak. So while I have the name of the representative of Mexico inscribed to speak, according to his wish, at the end of the meeting, I suppose I can move him up now if he so wishes. But since there are some other representatives, and in particular the representative of Finland, inscribed before him, I would call on the representative of Finland now.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Mexico on a point of order

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, at about 4 o'clock you suspended the meeting for 15 minutes because you said there were informal consultations under way. We were told that there were informal



(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

consultations on a number of draft resolutions. I think that we have gained time by having that suspension at that time and I think that we would save even more time if we were to have a break now for other additional consultations. I therefore propose formally that we suspend the meeting for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Committee agree with the proposal of the representative of Mexico? According to the rules of procedure such a proposal has to be put to a vote immediately if the Committee does not consent. May I take it that the Committee consents to the proposal to suspend the meeting for five minutes? As I hear no objection we shall suspend the meeting until 4.30 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 4.25 and resumed at 4.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now resume our meeting and I do hope that we shall proceed in an orderly manner. I can understand the differences of opinion, it is only natural of course, but I would like to preserve some decorum in this Committee. The first speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Finland to whom I now give the floor.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): Thank you Mr. Chairman for giving me the floor at this time, and I wish also to thank the representative of Mexico for making it possible for me to introduce on behalf of the co-sponsors a new second revision of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5. I would draw your attention to the fact that this revision was tabled in this Committee on 29 November 1976 in order to give both delegations ample time to study the revisions made and also to get instructions from their Governments to act on this revised draft. This Committee has heard by now a broad exchange of opinions on the issue of environmental warfare. Previously, I have had ample opportunity to make clear the views of my own Government on this item in general. Therefore, today, in introducing revision 2 to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5 on behalf of my delegation and the other delegations who are co-sponsoring this text, I will be as quick as possible.

At this stage I would conclude that basically our views have remained unchanged. It is the conviction of the Finnish Government, and I believe the conviction of the other delegations who have been kind enough to co-sponsor this resolution, that the draft convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques should be commended by this General Assembly and not be sent back to the CCD for further negotiations. Neither would it seem to us that there are any good reasons, here in the First Committee, to reopen the negotiation process that has already provided us with a text which the Finnish Government -- and, we believe, a great number of other Governments -- find a fully acceptable text of a draft convention. In this assessment, we base ourselves on the basic contents of the draft treaty. It is our conviction, it has been our conviction, and it so remains, that the prohibition provided for by the treaty establishes an effective ceiling to the utilization of environmental modification techniques for military and other hostile purposes. While holding this view, however, we are perfectly prepared to take measures to keep the options open, so to say, for improving on the present achievements, even

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

after the entry into force of the convention. Likewise, we for our part would be prepared to take every step needed to ensure that the convention fulfilled its main purpose, that of effectively eliminating military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. While our view and that of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5 remains that the treaty should be commended by this General Assembly, to all Governments for signature and ratification, as has been the case with previous actions by this Assembly in similar cases. We are perfectly willing to meet as many as possible of those concerns that various delegations have expressed in relation to this item. This is why my delegation now, on behalf of some 30 co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5 would like to introduce a further revision of the resolution. As I said, this revision has been circulated to delegations on 29 November and it appears in document A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2. In the light of the comments that have been made both formally and informally, it seems crucial to find a way for reflecting the views of those Governments that wish to have additional assurances that their interests have been properly taken account of in the process of preparing the convention. We believe that the new elements and changes made in the resolution in its revised form meet these concerns.

I now come to a more detailed explanation of the revisions. A new second preambular paragraph has been added to the resolution. By this new preambular paragraph, the General Assembly would recall its resolution 1722 (XVI) of 20 December 1961, in which it recognized that all States have a deep interest in disarmament and arms control negotiations. As another step in the same direction, a new seventh preambular paragraph makes it clear that the product of disarmament and arms control should be the result of a process of effective negotiations. In our view, such instruments should as far as possible take into account the views and interests of all States, so that the agreements can be joined by the widest possible number of countries. For this purpose a new ninth preambular paragraph has been added referring to the relevant documents and negotiating records of the CCD. This reference naturally includes the CCD's agreed understandings with respect to the draft convention, which, as the Committee will recall, had been circulated in another instance to the Committee as an information paper. This

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

reference to a genuine process of negotiation is a way of emphasizing that in multilateral negotiations the views stated by all countries concerned are to be considered. The process, of which the draft convention is a product, in our view, largely reflects this aim.

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

I now come to the revisions which have been effected in the operative part of the draft resolution. A new operative paragraph 5 "requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament all documents relating to the discussion by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session of the question of prohibiting military or another hostile use of environmental modification techniques". This new operative paragraph has been added to the draft resolution in order to ensure that any subsequent consideration by the CCD of the environmental modification question will have the benefit of the views and comments made at this session of the General Assembly.

With regard to another major comment which has emerged in the debate, the revised draft resolution affords several assurances of a subsequent opportunity to appraise the effectiveness of the Convention once it has come into force. Thus, a new preambular paragraph 8 contains an explicit reference to article VIII of the draft Convention which contains the provision that the first conference to review the Convention shall be required to examine this question.

The same purpose is sought by the addition of a new operative paragraph 4 which calls upon the CCD " ... to keep under review the problem of effectively averting the dangers of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques". This is the main objective of the Convention, as stated in its preamble. It is to be emphasized further that operative paragraph 4 specifies that the CCD should carry out that appraisal "without prejudice to the priorities established in its programme of work".

This stipulation relates directly to the Assembly's concern expressed in this Committee that the CCD, in its ninety-seventh session, should concentrate on urging negotiations on disarmament and arms limitations measures; that is on issues of high priority.

These two new paragraphs are thus based on a widely-shared view that the Convention should not be sent back to the CCD, and that any subsequent consideration of the issue of hostile use of environmental modification techniques should not divert the CCD from its consideration of more pressing arms limitation and disarmament problems, particularly the problems of chemical weapons and the comprehensive test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

Finally, I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to a number of other new elements in the revised draft resolution. The fourth preambular paragraph now expresses a conviction that broad adherence to the Convention will contribute to our common objective, that is the strengthening of peace and averting the threat of war. The new tenth preambular paragraph expresses the Assembly's conviction on a matter stressed by many countries, notably including a large number of developing countries, that the Convention should not affect the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes, inasmuch as such activity could prove beneficial for both present and future generations.

To sum up, therefore, it is my conviction and expectation -- and I also hope the conviction and the expectation of the co-sponsors of this draft resolution, and an overwhelming majority of this Committee -- that the revisions I have just introduced meet the concerns raised both by the co-sponsors of the other draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.4, which is still before the First Committee, and by a number of other delegations during our debate.

Accordingly, we hope that in the light of these new elements it will be possible for the Committee now to take action on this matter in accordance with the line suggested in draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2.

The CHAIRMAN: May I now ask the representative of Mexico whether he would like to speak at this stage or at the end of the meeting.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico): I should like to refer to item 45 entitled "Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques" concerning which, as the Committee knows full well, there are two draft resolutions: one contained in document A/C.1/31/L.4, which was revised by its authors; and the other in A/C.1/31/L.5, which has been the subject of two revisions, the second of which has just been introduced by the representative of Finland.

I should like to address myself briefly to A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2, inasmuch as Mr. Pastinen mentioned that the changes introduced were sufficiently drastic as to enlist the general support of the Committee and more still of the sponsors of resolution A/C.1/31/L.4. I should like to refer to two of these changes made.

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

The first amendment relates to paragraph 5 of the preamble, which states, inter alia: "Noting with satisfaction that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has completed /I repeat, has completed/ and transmitted ... the text of a draft Convention. ..." This is a distortion of the facts. The CCD never completed the draft. What it transmitted was a report to which all the working papers are annexed, among them the report of the Working Group which dealt with a text of a draft convention.

There is another aspect reflected in A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2 in the seventh preambular paragraph where it is stated: Bearing in mind that draft agreements on disarmament and arms control measures submitted to the General Assembly by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should be the result of a process of effective negotiations and that such instruments should duly take into account the views of interests of all /I repeat of all/ States, so that they can be joined by the widest possible number of countries.

On an earlier occasion we have already spoken about the manner in which the draft the Assembly is asked to accept was negotiated. I think there is one great truth in this paragraph, as there is great truth in what some, I would venture to say a large number of representatives have told us formally in meetings of this Committee, or in informal meetings. What they have told us is that we should allow for a waiting period in dealing with this issue, in order to make it possible for all Member States of the United Nations to consider this all-important question.

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

The co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4 thought that this could be achieved by requesting the CCD to continue, without prejudice to the priorities established in its programme of work, negotiations on a draft text which would take into account the views put forward at the current session of the General Assembly. But, in the light of what had been said by a large number of representatives, for example, by the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania and of New Zealand, the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4, that is, the delegations of Argentina, Cyprus, Ecuador, Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica, Mauritius, Panama, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela and Mexico, thought that it might be desirable to make some slight changes in their draft in order to meet the concern voiced by a large number of delegations, concerns which could be summed up as follows: the text should not be referred back again to the CCD because of the dangers of reopening the whole question and prejudicing work on other important matters, as we have been told repeatedly.

For this reason the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4 thought that they could add a last paragraph to the preamble which would read as follows:

"Being aware that Member States have not had time to give that text [that is to say the text of the draft convention] the consideration it deserves,"

this being followed by the three paragraphs below, which would replace the present two operative paragraphs, put in the following three paragraphs, first:

"Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to all States the text of the draft convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, contained in document A/31/27, as well as all other relevant documents relating to this question;"

Operative paragraph 2 would read:

"Invites all Member States to communicate to the Secretary-General their views and suggestions on this question no later than 30 June 1977;"

Operative paragraph 3 would read:

"Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to all Member States the replies submitted pursuant to paragraph 2 above;"

The present paragraph 3 of A/C.1/31/L.4 would become paragraph 4.



(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

The co-sponsors felt that this would effectively make it possible to do what the sponsors of A/C.1/31/L.5 say in the preambular paragraph mentioned earlier, namely, "... that the instruments forthcoming from the CCD should duly take into account the views and interests of all States so that they can be joined by the widest possible number of countries".

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, my delegation takes it for granted that the Committee will pronounce on these drafts in their order of presentation, and I would add straightaway that if there is any question or doubt whatsoever on this point, then my delegation requests formally that they immediately put to the vote the following motion, namely, does the Committee agree that it will pronounce on the draft resolutions on agenda item 45 in their order of presentation?

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Mexico for his statement. Would he kindly clarify whether his last sentence is a formal proposal, and would he be kind enough to read it out again?

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): It is a sentence that is conditioned by the word "if". The motion is conditioned by the fact that if there is any question of doubt as to whether the Committee is to vote on these draft resolutions in their order of presentation, then my delegation, if there is any question or doubt, firmly requests that we vote immediately on the following motion: the question being, does the Committee agree that it should vote on the draft resolutions on agenda item 45 in their order of presentation?

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): I think this is a very strange proposal. Normally it would have been put to the vote in the normal sequence. Only when a motion has been tabled can we discuss it. This is, I think, an irregular proposal.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to consult the Committee since the question put by the representative of Mexico sounds to me somewhat peculiar. I do not know whether this is a formal proposal or not. He said, "if there is any doubt". Well, may I then consult the Committee, because I cannot speak for the Committee on whether there is any doubt or not. Does any representative wish to take the floor on this particular question?

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to ask the Chairman whether we have concluded discussion of the item on the draft resolutions before us. As far as I understand it, apart from the statements of the representative of Finland and the representative of Mexico, there are no further speakers. Are you proceeding to the vote now, or if we are going to proceed to the vote and there are no further speakers, then we can discuss the point which was raised. But if we have not concluded discussion, then I consider that such an ultimatum is inappropriate. We have to conclude the discussion of the two draft resolutions before us, particularly because we have just heard of revision of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4, a few second ago and I hope the representative of Mexico will give us at least a few seconds to think over his proposal. So I would request continuation of the discussion of draft recommendation A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2 and the document which we have not yet seen and which we just suddenly heard about.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on other speakers, I should like to inform the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that it was not my intention to put the two drafts to the vote immediately as I have other speakers on my list on this particular item, namely, item 45 of the agenda.

Mr. ITOUA (Congo) (interpretation from French): I have asked for the floor to support what was just said by the representative of the Soviet Union. But to this I would add a second element, namely, that we cannot take into consideration for the present the proposal or draft proposal just put forward by the delegate of Mexico because we are not certain that all the draft resolutions considered by our Committee were considered in the order in which those drafts were presented. It seems to me that some drafts were considered before others, bearing in mind various situations as they arose in the course of our work. So I feel that this proposal is not logical. In the view of my delegation it is unrealistic.

Mr. MISHRA (India): I was wondering whether we were going to change rule 131 of our rules of procedure. So far as I know, draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4, by virtue of being L.4, has priority over draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5 under rule 131. Some delegations ask that this priority be changed. I would therefore request that we come to this question only when there is a proposal from the floor which seeks to change the priorities. Until then the Committee cannot of course take a decision.

The CHAIRMAN: From what I have heard, I can state that the feeling of the Committee, or at least of a number of delegations, is that we should proceed with the discussion on the two draft resolutions relating to the same item, namely, item 45, and then proceed to votes or decisions according to the rules of procedure.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): Mr. Chairman, I wish that some of the discussions which have just taken place had not taken place before my taking the floor. However, I think that the ruling you have given is the correct one and that we all appreciate the need to show understanding and co-operation.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

I also want to express my deep appreciation and gratitude to the co-sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/31/L.4 and A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2, the latter of which has just been introduced by the representative of Finland, for the patience they have shown in the negotiations which have taken place concerning both draft resolutions.

My delegation is profoundly moved by the courtesies which have been shown to it and to my person at all times by the sponsors of the two draft resolutions. We are also most grateful to have had the opportunity to participate in those negotiations.

I want to make some points clear. In all the discussions we have been involved in our main object has been, first of all, to give the highest priority to the items of disarmament -- real disarmament -- on the agenda of the CCD. The draft convention before us, despite its apparent and obvious importance, does not in our view command pressing attention to the point that the CCD should divert attention from its consideration of a CTB treaty or a CWB treaty, and open negotiations on the said draft convention. Secondly, the CCD should not rest on its oars by accepting a treaty on a partial ban. In our view, a partial ban treaty or convention can only be a first step to a comprehensive ban. I am glad to note that such an undertaking has been given by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2. Thirdly, the provisions of the draft convention, particularly its article 1, were not interpreted in such a manner as to permit military or hostile use of environmental modification techniques. We were particularly impressed by the argument that the developing countries should not be put in the position of accepting the convention so as to injure their security and legitimate interests. To some extent, we now have such assurance in draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

Fourthly, the procedures of the consideration of the draft convention should not be hurried in such a way as to brush aside legitimate concerns and interests. We believe, and this has been reaffirmed time and again by the United Nations, that all States, I repeat, all States, have interests in disarmament negotiations.

And fifthly, we were concerned that we did not have a confrontation over a convention, even if that convention was of crucial importance, dealing with disarmament and arms control measures. From my experience, all the treaties and conventions on disarmament and arms controls measures that were received and considered in the United Nations, were compromise measures. We expect and we have the right to expect, that one day we can obtain more adequate, more comprehensive, and I will even say perfect texts that will truly reflect the mood and will of the international community.

In the light of what I have just said, I have noted with a measure of satisfaction, albeit not complete, that document A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2 contains some of the elements I have just referred to. But my delegation, and I believe I also speak for quite a number of others, still believes that there is room for improvement. We see some need to restate more categorically the purposes of the draft convention. I also see further need to ensure that the States, Member States of the United Nations, be given an opportunity to receive and consider the draft convention before signing it. In fact, there seems to be need to reconsider the procedure whereby important documents, say from the CCD, are brought to the attention of Member States for consideration. Hence I wish to propose some oral amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2, along the lines I have just indicated.

My first oral proposal, is for a new preambular paragraph. The new preambular paragraph will read as follows:

"Noting further that the convention is intended to prohibit effectively military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques in order to eliminate the dangers to mankind from such use,"

This proposed amendment relates to the purpose of the treaty. We wish to make it quite clear by this amendment that the draft convention provides for an effective ban on military or hostile use of environmental modification techniques. Even if

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

it is a partial ban, this construction that we have just put on it must be accepted as its own legitimate meaning and significance.

Secondly, we wish to propose that the draft convention be referred to Member States for their consideration with the eventuality that they will exercise their sovereign rights to sign it and in their own time. This proposed amendment would result in the deletion of the present operative paragraph 1 in document A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2 and the substitution of the following:

"Refers the convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, the text of which is annexed to this convention, to all States for their consideration, signature and ratification."

The three actions that we have suggested in this formulation would ensure all the essential obligations of any States parties to the convention or States Members of the United Nations to consider the draft convention appropriately before signing it and before undertaking the necessary domestic legislative action to ratify it.

There is no presumption in this amendment that there is a time-limit for the consideration of the draft convention by any State party, nor does it prevent any State that feels very strongly that the draft convention satisfies all its needs, from signing it.

I must confess Sir that these two oral amendments that I have just proposed are not perfect and that they will not satisfy the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2 100 per cent. But in our view, they point the way to delegations like mine who feel that the best need not be the enemy of the good and that, as a compromise, the resolution be amended as I have just proposed. I therefore wish to appeal to the sponsors of the draft resolution to give serious and sympathetic consideration to my proposed amendments. I wish to assure them that the proposed amendments are the product of very wide, and I will even add, intensive, consultations. I have been assured by many friends whom I will refer to as middle-roaders, that they can support them. Similarly, I would be less than even-handed if I did not address an appeal to my other friends, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4. I must admit that I cannot rightly appeal to them for any understanding because my amendments are to draft resolution

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2, but I am doing so because I am rather concerned by the charged atmosphere of our debate on this item. But above all, the distinguished representative of Mexico and my other friends who sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4 know, probably more than others, how much I admire their role and reputation at the CCD in Geneva on all matters concerning general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

I do not need anyone to tell me that they will not like my proposed amendments but if they can live with them, this will be all I ask of them. Friends may disagree but as long as there are interests and relations that override causes for the occasional disagreement, they should be circumspect and conciliatory in their actions. Happily, Nigeria and their countries enjoy excellent relations; equally happily, our personal relations at all levels are warm and friendly.

I have learned with interest this afternoon, a few moments ago, that the sponsors of A/C.1/31/L.4 have made some changes in their drafts. I have not had the advantage nor the privilege of seeing the new version, but I do welcome the statement just made by the representative of Mexico, that he no longer insists on referring the draft convention back to the CCD so as to confound and block its important agenda. I can safely say that there is not a single member of the CCD who would welcome receiving the draft convention next year.

I am therefore in your hands, Mr. Chairman, as I do not know how you wish to proceed with our work. I had in mind to appeal to my dear friend, the representative of Mexico, and my other friends who sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4 not to insist on their position as expressed in that document. In spite of the changes that they have made in that text, I still wish to address an appeal to them not to press for a show-down on their texts or on A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2 as just amended. I hardly need to reassure them that Nigeria respects the principles that dictated their action and that my delegation cannot forget the patience, the courtesies and the understanding they showed me in all my contacts and consultations with them regarding the two resolutions before the house.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has noted the two oral amendments that the representative of Nigeria has submitted to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): Mr. Chairman, I took the liberty of signalling to you to ask for the floor even before Ambassador Clark had finished his statement and immediately after he read his oral amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2. I did so because I felt that the thrust of his remark called for an immediate response from my delegation and also from my delegation on behalf



(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

of the other co-sponsors of A/C.1/31/L.2/Rev.2. I listened with great care to the statement that Ambassador Clark was good enough to make a moment ago, both as far as the substantive points that he made were concerned, and also his eloquent plea for conciliation and compromise instead of confrontation. This is very much in line with what this Committee and also the CCD through the years has learned to expect from Ambassador Clark and the representatives of Nigeria in these bodies. I have personal experience of that, having had the privilege of co-operating with Ambassador Clark for a number of years within the framework of the CCD, be it then in my capacity as an international civil servant and later on in this Committee as a representative of Finland. I feel that his statement -- the five points which he made -- are largely responsive to the sentiments of the co-sponsors of A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2. In fact they reflect, to a large extent, the points which I made earlier this afternoon in introducing, on behalf of the co-sponsors, this draft resolution.

I now come to the substance of his oral amendment. Ambassador Clark has been kind enough to hand them over to me and, I believe, to the other co-sponsors of this draft shortly in advance of his statement. His first oral amendment was to add a new preambular paragraph following the present fifth preambular paragraph to this effect:

"Noting further that the convention is intended to prohibit effectively military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques in order to eliminate the dangers to mankind from such use"

and I find for myself and I believe I speak for the other co-sponsors that he used excellent arguments in support of that amendment.

The second oral amendment concerns operative paragraph 1, which he requested the co-sponsors of A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2 to reformulate in the following terms:

"Refers the convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, the text of which is annexed to this resolution, to all States for their consideration, signature and ratification."

This redraft gives, at least to my delegation, some disquiet. It does so because in all the statements which I have made on behalf of my delegation in this

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

Committee, I have emphasized that we find no substantive reason not to follow the enshrined practice of this General Assembly of commending draft treaties negotiated in the CCD to signature and ratification by States. I have said that this is the normal procedure which the General Assembly in earlier years had followed with great consistency even concerning more controversial treaties than this one. However, in the spirit of compromise and conciliation -- and taking particularly into account the very onerous task that Ambassador Clark on behalf of a number of other countries has performed during the last few days in order to effect a compromise which, we hope, will carry the consensus of this Committee -- I have been authorized, on behalf of the co-sponsors, to accept also the second oral amendment.

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

Finally, I should like to join Ambassador Clark in the appeal which he addressed to the representative of Mexico and, through him, to the other co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4 to act in this matter in the same spirit of compromise and conciliation and seriously to consider withdrawing their draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee takes note that the representative of Finland, on behalf of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2, has accepted the two oral amendments proposed earlier by the representative of Nigeria. An appeal has been made both by the representative of Nigeria and by the representative of Finland to the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4 to withdraw, or not to insist on a vote on their draft resolution.

Mr. DUMAS (Trinidad and Tobago): We were very interested to hear the statement by the representative of Finland and note with interest that, on his own behalf, on behalf of his delegation, and on behalf of the other delegations that are co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2, he has accepted the proposals put forward by Ambassador Clark. I should like to take this opportunity, on behalf both of the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago and of the other co-sponsors, to pay a tribute to the work done by Ambassador Clark. He has, for these last few weeks, been shuttling back and forth between a number of delegations and he must be a very tired man. I think he needs a rest before going back to Geneva.

But since the representative of Finland only a few minutes ago accepted the amendments proposed by the Nigerian delegation, the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4 have obviously not been able to consult with each other on what should be done. I therefore assume, Mr. Chairman, that you and the Committee will have absolutely no objection to our taking this matter up again tomorrow, after we have had an opportunity to sit and talk to each other, in the light of the new proposals.

The CHAIRMAN: I would, of course, go along with any suggestion aimed at conciliation and speeding up the work of the Committee. Does any other representative wish to take the floor at this stage? Apparently there are none. Then, I would suggest that we adjourn the meeting until tomorrow morning to give delegations time to consult, and I do hope that we shall meet them with an agreed position, so that we can proceed promptly to a decision satisfactory to all. Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to announce that Iceland has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34.

I call on the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on a point of order.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): A few moments ago we learned that the delegation of Mexico was submitting a revised version and I should like to know when we can see the text. When is it to be distributed? Tomorrow, if I understand rightly, is the last day of work for us on these items and we should like to be able to consult our Government.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is absolutely right. According to the decision taken by this Committee at its organizational meeting on 18 October, if I am not mistaken, we have to complete consideration of the agenda items relating to disarmament by tomorrow. We have at the most two more meetings. According to normal practice and the rules of procedure, all amendments or motions should normally be submitted in writing 24 hours before any action is taken on them. I would, then, ask the representative of Mexico about his position on this question.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): If you wish, I could read out very slowly what I said at the beginning of this resumed part of the meeting. The idea we are proposing in the revised text is in no way exotic or rare, it is an idea that we have been dealing with in this Committee since the debate began on 1 November: in other words, that we should allow the opportunity to all States to consider the text of the draft convention with the time and attention it deserves.

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

If the Committee wishes, I shall again read out the revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4, but I believe that a delegation like that of the Soviet Union, which has vast human resources, could easily request instructions for tomorrow concerning the idea itself and see whether the wording is in keeping with the norms followed by the General Assembly in respect of all draft resolutions.

I would add that the revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4 was handed into the Secretariat and I understand that it will be ready first thing tomorrow morning; but, if you wish, I can read it out again. It is for you to decide, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to have the feeling of the Committee. May I take it that the Committee will be satisfied with the statement just made by the representative of Mexico to the effect that the text will be available in writing and distributed by the Secretariat tomorrow morning on the understanding that tomorrow we shall take action on both draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4 and draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2 so that I would not like that a situation arises when a representative raises a point that he got the text too late to get instructions tomorrow. So, if that would be the case I would request the representative of Mexico to read out slowly his amendments again. If this is not the case, then I shall request the Secretariat to have the text distributed by tomorrow morning on the understanding, I repeat, that tomorrow each and every delegation will be able to take decisions on both draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4 and draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2

Mr. MISHRA (India): Since the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2 have all been sitting here, they have not consulted amongst each other. But I should like to express the hope that the Secretariat would be able to put out a further revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.2 incorporating the amendments which have today been proposed by Nigeria and accepted by the co-sponsors.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): I think I have spoken too often already in this Committee and I would not have wished to take the floor at this stage but I would myself make an appeal, not to the Mexican delegation this time, but to our friend from the Soviet Union, that the rules of procedure are very fine, but at the same time they are made to enable us to come to some sort of agreement. I have the feeling, after what my good friend, Ambassador Reginald Dumas of Trinidad and Tobago has just said, that there is hope, there is a possibility that it will not be necessary to go through the whole gamut of rules of procedure and that probably out of courtesy and in due respect for the principles which our friend from Mexico has always stood for, we should take the version which has been give to us into account and adjourn the meeting to enable us to carry on whatever discussion would be necessary on the basis of what our friend from Trinidad and Tobago has just said.

The CHAIRMAN: I have been assured by the Secretariat that both texts might be ready and distributed by tomorrow morning for the convenience of the delegations and they will be distributed. If I may be permitted to say so, I entirely share the hope expressed by Ambassador Clark that it will not be necessary to continue an at times acrimonious debate, but will prove possible to come to an agreed solution. Perhaps this evening, during the night and early tomorrow morning, delegations co-sponsors of those drafts will be able to think things over so that tomorrow at the morning meeting we shall achieve a satisfactory solution and adopt one draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.