

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1713th
MEETING**

Monday, 8 December 1969,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 29: Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (<i>continued</i>) Consideration of the draft resolutions	1
Agenda item 32: Question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction (<i>continued</i>)	3
Organization of work	4

Chairman: Mr. Agha SHAHI (Pakistan).

AGENDA ITEM 29

Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*continued*)* (A/7639, A/7681 and A/7741-DC/232; A/C.1/989, A/C.1/992-995; A/C.1/L.490 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.492-495)

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

1. The CHAIRMAN: Before I make a statement regarding the work of our Committee for today, I should like to call on the representative of Sweden concerning the resolution that was adopted last Thursday on the item entitled "Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament"; the draft resolution [A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1] was sponsored by the delegations of Brazil, Burma, Chile, Ethiopia, India, Ireland, Jamaica, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Sweden, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia.

2. Mr. EDELSTAM (Sweden): This is a very small matter, Mr. Chairman, but at the suggestion of the Secretary of the Committee I wish to raise it with you now.

3. As you will recall, we voted on the draft text but, at the suggestion of the United Kingdom delegation, we deleted the words "as early as possible and not later than 15 July 1970" from paragraph 3. The result was that under the adopted text the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was requested to "submit a special report to the

* Resumed from the 1711th meeting.

General Assembly on the results of their deliberations", leaving out entirely any reference to a time element. I think it should be understood that the reference to reporting to the General Assembly means reporting to the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly. Therefore, on the recommendation of the Secretariat, I should like to suggest that we come to an understanding here that what is meant by the text is that the report should be submitted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly and that this understanding should be mentioned in the report of the Rapporteur to the General Assembly.

4. The CHAIRMAN: If the Committee has no objection, the understanding referred to by the representative of Sweden will be reflected in the report of the Rapporteur to the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

5. The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the decision which has already been taken, I now invite the Committee to take up for consideration the draft resolutions relating to agenda item 29, "Question of general and complete disarmament". The draft resolutions so far submitted to the Committee under this item are the following: the thirteen-Power draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.490 and Add.1; the draft resolutions submitted by Malta contained in documents A/C.1/L.492, A/C.1/L.493 and A/C.1/L.494; and the five-Power draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.495. In addition to those draft resolutions, the Committee has before it four working papers, submitted by Canada, Brazil, Sweden and Mexico, contained in documents A/C.1/992 to 995 respectively.

6. In this connexion I should like to inform the Committee that Italy has become a co-sponsor of the proposal contained in the working paper submitted by Canada in document A/C.1/992.

7. With regard to the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof, which is to be found in annex A to the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [A/7741-DC/232],¹ it is my understanding that the two authors would like to give their reactions in a few days' time to the various comments made by a large number of delegations in the course of the general debate. If the Committee has no objection to deferring the consideration of the draft treaty on the sea-bed and the ocean floor for perhaps two or three days, we shall now take up for debate and action the various draft resolutions already submitted

¹ Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1969, document DC/232.

under the item entitled “Question of general and complete disarmament”.

8. In that connexion I should like to inform the Committee that another draft resolution under the same item has been submitted by the delegations of Italy and Japan; it is being mimeographed and will be circulated shortly.² I should like to add that this draft resolution is also being sponsored by Ireland.

9. I shall now call on any representative who desires to speak. It was my understanding that a number of delegations that have submitted the various draft resolutions under this item wished to make statements regarding those draft resolutions and also to introduce certain amendments or revisions.

10. I have just been informed that amendments to the thirteen-Power draft resolution [*A/C.1/L.490 and Add.1*] have been submitted by the delegation of the Netherlands. Those amendments will be found in document *A/C.1/L.501*, which will be distributed shortly.

11. Mr. ESCHAUZIER (Netherlands): By way of clarification, I wish to state that the amendment you referred to, Mr. Chairman, has been handed to the Secretariat and will be distributed to the Committee in the names of Canada, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland and the United Kingdom.

12. The CHAIRMAN: I take it that no delegation desires to speak on the draft resolutions before us, and that it should therefore be possible for us to proceed to a vote on them this afternoon in order to dispose of the item—a vote not only on the draft resolutions which have already been submitted on general and complete disarmament, but also on certain others that I indicated will be distributed shortly. If that is the case, I propose to adjourn the meeting of the Committee until 4.30 this afternoon, if there is no objection. Certain delegations have requested that the Committee should start its meeting later this afternoon.

13. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq): I should like to ask for a point of clarification, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the draft resolution submitted by Malta [*A/C.1/L.492*], concerning a report that we are requesting from the Secretary-General. My delegation would like to know if the formal report on the *United Nations and Disarmament, 1945-1965*,³ was also issued following a resolution by the General Assembly, or if it was issued as one of the responsibilities of the Secretariat and the Secretary-General. If the latter was the case, my delegation does not think that there should be a new resolution requesting the Secretary-General to issue another report on the same subject. It would be only natural and to be expected, I think, that the Secretary-General would issue another report in due course.

14. The reason why I say that is that my delegation, for one, has been overwhelmed with all sorts of resolutions; we have hardly the time to look into them and read them. It may not be necessary to adopt a resolution on this score; the Secretary-General could very well issue a report on the matter. I just wish to submit this point for clarification.

The Secretariat could tell us about this matter this afternoon, if not this morning.

15. Mr. CHACKO (Secretary of the Committee): With reference to the question raised by the representative of Iraq, I should like to say that the original document was issued on the initiative of the Secretariat without any formal request from the General Assembly.

16. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq): That is exactly what my delegation had understood was the case and we do not think there is any reason for this draft resolution to be put to the vote. The Secretary-General has already listened to the discussions here and most probably he will issue a report on this question.

17. While I have the floor, I should also like to reserve my delegation's right to make some observations in the afternoon on some other draft resolutions which again we do not think are really necessary at this stage as they are only expressions of hopes or are repetitions of other resolutions. The reason we say this is that at this late stage of our deliberations my delegation has found it a little difficult to follow so many draft resolutions. On that score you have said, Mr. Chairman, that there have been consultations in this Committee concerning some of the draft resolutions. I should like to say that some delegations have not been consulted. Had we been consulted we would have advised that shorter draft resolutions—and indeed fewer draft resolutions—should be presented to the Committee at this stage.

18. Mr. HUSSAIN (India): I also want to express some misgivings about the number of draft resolutions we are being asked to vote upon this afternoon. For one thing, you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, that a draft resolution is being submitted by the delegations of Italy, Japan and Ireland. We have not seen that text yet and we have not yet been told, nor are we aware, when this draft resolution will be available to us. We would need to study it carefully and I am not sure whether my delegation would be ready to vote on it this afternoon, unless we received it in good time and were able to consider it.

19. Mr. CHACKO (Secretary of the Committee): Three draft resolutions and a set of amendments submitted this morning are at present being translated and typed for reproduction and distribution. It was hoped that it would be possible to distribute them before the Committee adjourned as usual at 1 o'clock, but since the Committee is adjourning now, they could be made available in this room as soon as they are ready and could be picked up by those delegations that would like to have them in advance. I could arrange for someone to be here with copies of those documents in approximately one hour or so.

20. Mr. HUSSAIN (India): I am grateful for the information given by the Secretariat as to how soon those documents will be available, but without seeing the new draft resolutions as well as the amendments, my delegation is not able to commit itself to saying that it will be prepared to vote on them within a matter of a few hours after receiving them.

21. The CHAIRMAN: I should like to assure the members of the Committee that as Chairman I shall be guided by the

² Subsequently circulated as document *A/C.1/L.499*.

³ United Nations publication, Sales No. 67.I.9.

wishes of the Committee. If the Committee is not disposed to vote on the draft resolutions under the item on the question of general and complete disarmament this afternoon, naturally it will be for the Committee to so decide. Do I take it that the Committee agrees to meet at 4.30 p.m. to take up the various draft resolutions under this item? Since I hear no objection, I take it that the previous decision is confirmed, that the Committee will meet at 4.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 32

Question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction (continued)* (A/7622 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/7750)

22. The CHAIRMAN: Before the meeting is adjourned, I should like, with the permission of the Committee, to revert to the question of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction meeting in Geneva; that question was raised by the delegation of Ceylon last week. The proposal of the representative of Ceylon was that the First Committee should agree in principle that the Sea-Bed Committee should hold its 1970 summer session at Geneva and that a final decision on this proposal should be taken in the Fifth Committee, having regard to all the relevant implications. That was the proposal of the representative of Ceylon, on which some discussion took place. If the Committee has no objection, I shall take it that it is so decided.

23. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): I feel that decision on this matter should be postponed until another meeting, when representatives concerned with the problem of the sea-bed and the ocean floor are present.

24. Mr. DEJAMMET (France) (*translated from French*): There seems to be here both a question of substance and one of procedure. Where procedure is concerned, I believe that the Fifth Committee is to take a decision very soon and that it would therefore like to have our opinion at the earliest possible date. Where substance is concerned, I believe that this is not a matter for the separate delegations, but for the Committee as such. Hence it is for the Committee and not for any person or persons to take a decision. In accordance with the wish just expressed by the Chairman, the Committee could, I think, vote on the recommendation this very morning.

25. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I just wish to say that I fully support the suggestion made by the representative of France. My delegation also feels that this is a question of a procedural nature, rather than one of substance, and that we can take a decision now rather than delay it. After all, the Fifth Committee is bound to take a decision itself. We

have given full consideration to its competence and I believe that we can proceed along the lines that have been suggested by the representative of Ceylon, in the terms that you, Sir, have read out.

26. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the Byelorussian SSR has proposed that a decision on this question should be taken at a later meeting. On the other hand, there are other delegations which wish to have the matter decided at this meeting. Does the representative of the Byelorussian SSR insist on his proposal for postponement of a decision?

27. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. Chairman, when we discussed this question before, I requested you to ask the Secretariat whether it is a normal procedure for the First Committee to state its opinion on the place of a conference—any conference. I pointed out that the existing procedure calls for a decision by the organs concerned—in particular, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction—followed by a discussion and decision in the Committee on Conferences, then by recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, and lastly by a decision by the Fifth Committee.

28. I cannot remember a single case when the Second Committee or the Third Committee, for instance, made any recommendations concerning the place of meeting of organs reporting to them.

29. Consequently, before we take a final decision, I should like to hear from the Secretariat whether a recommendation by the First Committee is required in the present case, seeing that quite a different procedure is already in use in the United Nations.

30. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I find myself in sympathy with what has been said by the last speaker because I find it closer to what you put to the Committee when you asked if there was any objection. I cannot see that this Committee can pronounce in principle on whether certain meetings should take place until it has the report of the Fifth Committee, which is considering the whole conference schedule for Geneva. When this matter was raised I pointed out that the figures of the extra cost involved were not entirely clear nor was the information concerning the facilities that it would be possible to provide for this conference available to this Committee. I see no point in deciding in principle that the Committee should certainly meet at Geneva when that is related, surely, to what the implications are for cost and convenience.

31. I would support what you said in the first place, Sir: namely, that the matter should be decided in the Fifth Committee where every delegation here is represented. It would make no sense for a delegation to take one position in the First Committee and a different position in the Fifth Committee. This is surely a matter for decision by the Fifth Committee in the light of the information it has about conference facilities and costs. I support your proposal, Mr. Chairman.

32. The CHAIRMAN: I think that it is perhaps necessary for me to read out again the exact proposal that I put to

* Resumed from the 1710th meeting.

the Committee, which was the one made by the representative of Ceylon last week [1710th meeting], namely, that the First Committee should agree in principle that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction should hold its 1970 summer session at Geneva, and that a final decision on the proposal, having regard to all the relevant implications, should be taken in the Fifth Committee.

33. That is the proposal before the Committee. The representative of the Byelorussian SSR has addressed a question to the Secretariat; I understand that it will be difficult for the Secretariat to give an opinion on this matter. I do not know whether I should make this statement, but if it would help the Committee it seems, to the best of my understanding, that the Fifth Committee would like to have an indication from the First Committee as to whether a meeting of the Sea-Bed Committee in Geneva is desirable; if this Committee agrees in principle, the Fifth Committee will examine the question of the extra expenditure and will be able to take a decision in the light of all the circumstances. However regarding the question raised by the representative of the Byelorussian SSR, I believe that we are not likely to get any opinion that would be of help to this Committee in deciding the issue.

34. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): Perhaps the Secretariat can furnish some explanations regarding the accepted practice. For example, if the Commission on Social Development should wish to hold its session at Geneva, does the Secretariat think that a recommendation by the Third Committee would be necessary?

35. The Commission on the Status of Women has also been asking for several years to hold its sessions at Geneva. Is a decision in principle, a recommendation, by the Third Committee, which considers all the Commission's reports, needed or is it not needed?

36. We are not here in the Committee on Conferences. We have merely decided that a certain organ should meet and consider the questions referred to it. That is what we had to decide. Where and when it will convene is no business of ours.

37. The CHAIRMAN: In view of the statement of the representative of the Byelorussian SSR, I think that perhaps this question should be taken up at this afternoon's meeting when the Secretariat has been able to study his statements and give him a reply. I take it that that is agreed.

Organization of work

38. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Mr. Chairman, reverting to what the representative of India said earlier concerning the voting this afternoon on certain proposals on general and complete disarmament that have not yet been circulated to members, I understand you to say that this would be a matter for the Committee to decide. Surely everything is in the hands of the Committee, but, according to rule 80 of the rules of procedure, proposals should normally be introduced and circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting in which the voting takes place. Therefore, we should have twenty-four hours in

which to consider a draft resolution. If the Committee decides that the draft resolution is of such a nature that it does not need particular consideration, it may decide to vote on it. Otherwise, unless on the face of it the draft resolution does not need consideration, time should normally be given for such consideration and for representatives to communicate with their Governments if necessary.

39. Mr. VILLACIEROS (Spain) (*translated from Spanish*): I merely wish to take advantage of your generosity in inviting me to speak, Mr. Chairman, to support the proposal just made by the representatives of India and Cyprus.

40. Without wishing to establish any order of importance, we believe that many of these draft resolutions are truly important, as are the amendments which may be submitted. We would therefore ask for your indulgence and that of the Committee in allowing us a little more time to determine our position on these texts.

41. The CHAIRMAN: In view of the statements made by the representatives of India, Cyprus and Spain, perhaps it would be desirable for the Committee not to proceed to a vote on the new draft resolution which is in the course of being translated and will be distributed later. I suggest to the Committee that a meeting at 4.30 this afternoon would be useful to enable the delegations which have sponsored the relevant draft resolutions and amendments to present or explain them. The voting, if the Committee so wishes, could be deferred until tomorrow. However, if the Committee would rather not meet this afternoon, I am in its hands.

42. Mr. DEJAMMET (France) (*translated from French*): In the light of the information we have just received, I would once again draw attention to the fact that the Fifth Committee is awaiting the view of the First Committee on the question just raised by the Chairman.

43. I listened very closely to the arguments presented earlier by the Byelorussian representative and supported by the Canadian representative. If the Committee should really decide that it is not within its province to take any decision on where the Committee on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor should hold its July session, the Fifth Committee would no doubt be free to take up the matter and examine it in all its aspects. Nevertheless, the Fifth Committee has expressed the view that our Committee must take a decision in the matter.

44. I believe that the view taken by the Fifth Committee is based on material submitted to it by the Secretariat. I would therefore be grateful if the Secretariat would kindly clarify this theoretical point, which should, after all, apply equally to all the Main Committees: should the Fifth Committee wait for a decision by the First Committee because the Secretariat has suggested it, or should the First Committee, because the Secretariat is not yet able to give it an answer, state that the decision lies entirely with the Fifth Committee?

45. In any case, I believe that we have two options: we can either decide that the Fifth Committee alone should settle the matter; or we should inform the Fifth Committee that the First Committee favours the suggestion made last Wednesday by the representative of Ceylon. There are two

decisions possible, and it is for the Committee to choose between them.

46. The CHAIRMAN: With reference to the statement of the representative of France, I suggested to the Committee earlier that it should decide this matter this afternoon and it was so agreed. Therefore, unless the Committee wishes to change its decision, I propose that we do not consider the subject of the venue of the Sea-Bed Committee any further at this meeting.

47. The question is, as I put it to the Committee after hearing the interventions of a number of delegations, that the Committee is perhaps not prepared to vote on the draft resolutions and the amendments relating to the item on general and complete disarmament this afternoon, but that it would be useful for the Committee to meet this afternoon in order to enable those who have sponsored those draft resolutions and amendments to present or explain them. The question I put to the Committee is this: I propose to convene a meeting, as decided earlier, at 4.30 this afternoon. If we do so meet, then we need not pass to a vote on the draft resolutions on general and complete disarmament but the sponsors will be able to explain them. The question raised by the representative of France could also be considered at this afternoon's meeting. I take it that there is no objection.

48. Mr. HUSSAIN (India): My delegation did not intend to suggest that we should not meet this afternoon. We should certainly meet this afternoon, and as you have suggested, Mr. Chairman, the delegations which have sponsored the various draft resolutions, as well as amendments to those draft resolutions, should be listened to that would be beneficial. Apart from that, those draft resolutions that have already been submitted and have been available to us for some time could be voted upon, but we may defer till tomorrow decisions on those draft resolutions which have not yet been made available to us or which may be made available in an hour or two.

49. Mr. ANDRADE (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): In order to contribute to the success of our deliberations, I should like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, for a clarification. If I have understood correctly, you seem to feel—and, I think, the Committee does too—that we should meet this afternoon to examine, among others, draft resolutions A/C.1/L.490 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.492, A/C.1/L.493, A/C.1/L.494 and A/C.1/L.495; that does not include a document that is being processed by the Secretariat. I do not know whether thus far I have understood correctly what you said.

50. I would merely venture to suggest, if the Committee and the offices agree, that we leave open the possibility of voting this afternoon on these first five drafts, with which the various delegations are already more or less familiar, since they were circulated in due time.

51. If the Chairman, with the Committee's consent, feels that we could come to a vote, I think it might be useful to do so to ensure the success of the Committee's work.

52. The CHAIRMAN: In response to the question put by the representative of Colombia, I did not rule out the possibility of the Committee voting on the draft resolutions on the item on general and complete disarmament which have been before us for voting since Friday. It seems to be the general desire that the new draft resolution sponsored by Italy, Ireland and Japan which has yet to be distributed, should not be voted upon this afternoon, in order to enable the delegations to study it and, if necessary, to obtain instructions. I cannot anticipate exactly what will be the position this afternoon. Therefore, it is entirely open to the Committee to proceed to a vote on those draft resolutions it wishes to vote upon and to defer the vote on others.

53. The only question I put to the Committee is that we should meet this afternoon at 4.30 to enable the sponsors of the various draft resolutions and amendments to present and explain them. After that I shall put to the Committee whether it wishes to proceed to a vote on the draft resolutions and any amendments thereto which have been before us since last week. I hope that this clarification will satisfy all members of the Committee.

54. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) (*translated from French*): I apologize to the Chairman for possibly complicating his task, but I do believe that, to expedite the Committee's work, it would be useful to know in advance, with some degree of certainty, at which meeting such important votes might be taken. If there is a possibility of the vote being taken this afternoon, we should discuss the matter now and take a decision. If, on the contrary, as the Chairman has proposed, we hold a late meeting this afternoon to hear comments on the new texts and to take a decision with regard to the forthcoming session of the Committee on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor, my delegation would have no objection. I understand that the vote would then be taken at tomorrow's meeting. I confess that my delegation would prefer this arrangement, rather than the uncertain possibility of taking some votes this afternoon and others tomorrow.

55. The CHAIRMAN: It seems that the Committee needs time to consider this matter further, so I suggest that we should adjourn now and reconvene at 4.30 this afternoon, and take a decision regarding the question of voting at that meeting. I think that would facilitate the work of this Committee.

56. Mr. HILLIER-FRY (United Kingdom): Just as a matter of clarification, Mr. Chairman, is it your intention that when we meet at 4.30 this afternoon we should first discuss the Geneva meeting of the Sea-Bed Committee?

57. The CHAIRMAN: If the representative of the United Kingdom so desires, and if it is agreeable to the other members of the Committee, at 4.30 this afternoon we shall commence with the discussion of the venue of the meeting of the Sea-Bed Committee.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.