

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TENTH SPECIAL SESSION
Official Records*



AD HOC COMMITTEE OF THE
TENTH SPECIAL SESSION
15th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 28 June 1978
11 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 15TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 9: REVIEW AND APPRAISAL OF THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION IN THE LIGHT OF THE PRESSING NEED TO ACHIEVE SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS IN THE FIELD OF DISARMAMENT, THE CONTINUATION OF THE ARMS RACE AND THE CLOSE INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISARMAMENT, INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 10: ADOPTION OF A DECLARATION ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 11: ADOPTION OF A PROGRAMME OF ACTION ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REVIEW OF THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN DISARMAMENT AND OF THE INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY FOR NEGOTIATIONS ON DISARMAMENT, INCLUDING IN PARTICULAR THE QUESTION OF CONVENING A WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3556.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/S-10/AC.1/PV.15
29 June 1978
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 9, 10, 11 and 12 (continued)

REVIEW AND APPRAISAL OF THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION IN THE LIGHT OF THE PRESSING NEED TO ACHIEVE SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS IN THE FIELD OF DISARMAMENT, THE CONTINUATION OF THE ARMS RACE AND THE CLOSE INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISARMAMENT, INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

ADOPTION OF A DECLARATION ON DISARMAMENT

ADOPTION OF A PROGRAMME OF ACTION ON DISARMAMENT

REVIEW OF THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN DISARMAMENT AND OF THE INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY FOR NEGOTIATIONS ON DISARMAMENT, INCLUDING IN PARTICULAR THE QUESTION OF CONVENING A WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I think all Members must be aware that yesterday important consultations and negotiations were begun at 9 a.m. and continued, with almost no interruption, until 3 a.m. today. For that reason it was necessary to cancel meetings scheduled for this Committee.

As a result of the efforts exerted during those intensive negotiations substantial progress has been made in many matters. Document A/S-10/AC.1/37, which has been distributed in all languages, already reflects the deletion of many brackets. Thus it contains the texts that had been agreed upon by 9 p.m. yesterday.

Within a few minutes Members will receive another document in the form of a conference room paper reflecting the progress made between 9 o'clock last night and 3 o'clock this morning.

In the early hours of today four countries submitted an important draft concerning the negotiating body mentioned in the section on machinery. For the information of delegations that draft will shortly be distributed along with the conference room paper.

(The Chairman)

At this very moment in the next chamber the Drafting Group on Machinery is meeting to consider that text, which would replace some of the many alternatives now featured in the section on machinery. That Group is also looking into the other aspects of that chapter so as to make as much progress as possible in these last remaining hours. I consider that the efforts of all kinds made yesterday may today lead to the settlement of some questions on which it has not up to now been possible to arrive at a consensus within that negotiating body.

For obvious reasons, Conference Room Paper No. 10, which is about to be distributed, is in English only. At the hour at which we concluded our work this morning it was physically impossible to obtain translations into the other languages. Those translations will, of course, be made as soon as possible.

I believe that the efforts made yesterday have produced positive results and substantial progress has been made. However, some issues remain outstanding. In this respect, at the request of the President of the General Assembly, I wish to announce that at 5 p.m. today there will be a plenary meeting at which the situation will be reviewed and the President intends to announce the postponement of closure of the General Assembly session for 24 hours. Thus it is anticipated that the session will end not today, as originally scheduled, but tomorrow. I believe that our negotiations today should proceed at the same rate as those of yesterday and that if need be we should work into the night - though I hope not too late - so that this Committee may hold a meeting tomorrow at 10.30 a.m., at which, whatever the results achieved, the 149 delegations may have the final draft of the final document before them and at which it may be put to the Committee for approval. If it proves possible, that document could be adopted at the afternoon plenary meeting, and the Assembly would hear the statements of delegations interested in making their positions known.

That is what I wished to tell the Committee. I shall now call upon any delegation asking to be allowed to speak to make comments or state their views on the progress of our work.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I hope that no one will consider what I am about to say as being in any way critical, let alone sarcastic. Having had some experience with the United Nations, I believe that no other Committee has so diligently and honestly addressed itself to the very intricate and complex question of disarmament.

We were honoured by the presence in the Assembly of many Heads of State, Prime Ministers and others in the seats of power and Foreign Ministers, and I believe that we have all benefited from their views in the sense that it has dawned on us that many sincere endeavours and attempts have been made but that they could not perhaps reflect the whole complexity of the question. It is easy to use such words as "intricate" and "complex" in order to say why we have failed. However, we have not failed in view of what we realize now, after all the statements that have been made and the honest work that has been done by you, Mr. Chairman, and by the co-ordinating group. And here I must mention Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico, who is an old hand at the question of disarmament - and everyone, for that matter, so as not to be discriminatory in my remarks.

Representatives will perhaps recall what I said a couple of days ago to the effect that they should stay until midnight and eat in the cafeteria. In fact, I saw you, Mr. Chairman, and, I believe, the Ambassador of the United States eating in the cafeteria when I was there yesterday, and you no doubt worked until the early hours of the morning.

But let us face the facts. There are positive results in the sense that this document - Conference Room Paper No. 10 - reflects the situation in the world, reflects the unsatisfactory situation with regard to the question of disarmament. By changing words or adding brackets or removing them, we cannot do any more than what has already been accomplished.

What then is the reasoning behind my comments? It is this. I think that the time allotted for this special session was very useful. I am not saying this in order to console us. As I have said and as I repeat, it has brought into focus all the differences. As unsatisfactory and sad as is the existence of many of these differences, they are there. In 24 hours, 48 hours or 48 days, nothing more could be accomplished than has already been accomplished. I submit that things could perhaps get even more complicated.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

Therefore, where do we go from here? I wish to make a suggestion for your consideration, Mr. Chairman, and that of my colleagues. I am prepared to modify this suggestion; or, if anyone wants to modify it in a constructive manner, I shall be grateful, just as I am sure everyone of us would be grateful.

We shall of course follow your advice, Sir. You are our Chairman. We shall come here any time you want us - this afternoon, tomorrow, at night. But I do not think that the texts will be improved; they might even get a little worse, or, for that matter, they might not. I do not know.

Let us face the facts: the differences strike us in the eye. Some of them are acute others are a question of nuances; but, as I said, we cannot overcome them in a short time. What shall we do? I believe that the whole document - Conference Room Paper No. 10, which is the quintessence of all the efforts that have been exerted here - can be disposed of in the following manner by saying - and here I am giving a preview of the suggestion which I shall make later and perhaps amplify in the plenary General Assembly - "We take note of what has been accomplished, thanking all those who participated effectively and all those who lent their ears". As the Committee knows very well, I did not personally participate, I did not make an appearance in any of the Drafting Groups. I left it to the sagacity and understanding of my colleagues, and there was indeed no dearth of capability or of expertise and knowledge.

We should take note and dispose of this document, which, as I said, is constructive in the sense that it now reflects the state of affairs in the world with regard to disarmament. And here I want to recall what the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom mentioned, namely that perhaps in another three years we shall have another special session devoted to the question of disarmament, hoping that progress will have been made. But the next three years may prove to be a dangerous period. Things are developing fast. For example, it is mentioned in the draft resolution in document A/S-10/AC.1/37:

"Alarmed by the threat to the very survival of mankind posed by the existence of nuclear weapons ...".

Nuclear weapons may be child's play. We do not know what scientists may be devising secretly outside the pale of nuclear weapons. We are living in the

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

technological age. There may now be some secret weapons being devised which, as I said, will make nuclear weapons insignificant in comparison. What is the difference between an overkill capacity of fifteen or twenty times? As I said some four or five years ago, please, you nations, "one half of one kill" is enough. Let somebody survive.

Therefore, I suggest that now - because I do not anticipate progress - or later we should take note of this document, which is in a way a laudable one, and take up the matter at the thirty-third regular session and decide then in the First Committee how we should proceed. We could even do so in an ad hoc committee; at one time before we had the Special Political Committee we had a so-called Ad Hoc Committee of the First Committee when there were too many political items to deal with in one committee. We could decide at the beginning of the thirty-third session to establish a special or ad hoc committee devoted to this question, with the hope that something further will come forth to light the road for us towards attaining some more tangible results rather than uttering platitudes or retaining too many brackets, which, in effect, are nothing but reservations.

In conclusion, I would say that I believe that we shall all yield to your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, but I would ask you to take into account what I think would be a practicable way of disposing of the fruits of this session - if I may so call them - because we cannot afford to go round in circles. Some of us might not get dizzy, but some of us have indeed already become dizzy.

Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): It is the earnest hope of my delegation that the sole document to emerge from the special session will be the final document at present being negotiated, that that document will be approved by consensus, and that there will be no need to vote on any draft resolutions. We would support any decision by the Committee to that effect.

At the present moment, however, although great progress has been made in the past 24 hours, it does seem possible that the final document will not contain a formulation on a comprehensive test ban that is satisfactory to all delegations, and that, in consequence, the draft resolution in document A/S-10/AC.1/L.10, which has been formally introduced by the delegation of India, may be pressed to a vote.

The New Zealand delegation was an initiator and co-sponsor of the draft resolution that became resolution 32/78, which was adopted at the last regular session of the General Assembly with 126 votes in favour, including those of the three nuclear-weapon States at present engaged in negotiating a draft comprehensive test ban treaty. Unlike previous resolutions, that resolution did not contain a moratorium paragraph, because it was our hope and expectation that the draft treaty would be ready for signature at this session. It has been a considerable disappointment to us that the draft treaty has not yet reached the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), still less the General Assembly. Nevertheless, we are encouraged to learn that negotiations are still actively continuing.

In the circumstances, however, we consider that a renewed call for a moratorium is appropriate, and we are prepared to support it. We would prefer that the call for a moratorium should appear in the final document, but in the absence of such a formulation we shall support the Indian draft resolution. We consider, however, that its preamble requires amplification to bring it into line with the principles which have been consistently embodied in the resolutions adopted by the Assembly over the years in regard to a comprehensive test ban. With the co-sponsorship of Australia, my delegation therefore proposes the following amendments to the draft resolution in document A/S-10/AC.1/L.10:

(Mr. Templeton, New Zealand)

The first amendment is the addition of a new second preambular paragraph, reading as follows:

"Reiterating its conviction that the cessation of nuclear weapons testing in all environments would be a major step towards controlling the development and proliferation of nuclear weapons".

The second amendment is the addition of a third preambular paragraph, reading as follows:

"Recalling the determination of the parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, expressed in those Treaties, to continue negotiations to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time".

Thirdly, we would amend the present second preambular paragraph - which would become the fourth preambular paragraph - to read as follows:

"Recalling its resolutions on the question of nuclear weapon testing adopted each year since 1958 by very large majorities, and in particular resolution 32/78".

Finally, we would amend the present final preambular paragraph to read as follows:

"Noting with satisfaction statements by the negotiating nuclear-weapon States that a comprehensive test ban treaty is to be submitted shortly to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament".

The reasons for our amendments are the following:

In our view, the most important reason for pressing ahead with a comprehensive test ban treaty is to make further proliferation of nuclear weapons, whether horizontal or vertical, as difficult as possible. We shall regret it if because of the attitude of a single delegation it is not possible to make this point in the final document. It will be all the more important, then, in our view, to make it in this resolution. That is the reason for the first amendment.

(Mr. Templeton, New Zealand)

The second amendment makes reference to the partial test-ban Treaty and the non-proliferation Treaty in a form which has been used in previous Assembly resolutions on this subject.

It seems to us highly important also to make specific reference to the resolution adopted at the last regular session of the General Assembly, a resolution which for the first time in some years received the support of the three negotiating nuclear-weapon States. Hence our third amendment.

Finally, we found the formulation in the final preambular paragraph of the draft resolution unsatisfactory, since it refers to the finalization of a draft treaty in terms which suggest that the three negotiating nuclear-weapon States are competent by themselves to produce a final version of the treaty. It has been our very firm position all along that opportunity must be provided for the CCD to participate fully in the preparation of the draft treaty, and that after agreement has been reached in the CCD, the treaty should be submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration, and not merely to be rubber-stamped, before being opened for signature.

In conclusion, it will be noted that our amendments refer to the CCD and not to the proposed committee on disarmament. That is because we expect the negotiation of the comprehensive test ban treaty to be completed before the new body enters into existence, in accordance with the latest proposal, at the beginning of 1979.

Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I wish to associate my delegation with the views expressed by the representative of Saudi Arabia. In doing so, I must express deep gratitude to the Chairman, to the negotiators, to the co-ordinators, to the Working Groups - indeed to all those who exerted herculean efforts to bring forth the final draft document for which we have been waiting and working during these past five weeks.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

Although certain brackets have been deleted from the document, one cannot escape the conclusion that brackets - meaning reservations - are still ubiquitous. It is not my intention that anything I say should in any way prejudice the additional efforts which the Chairman of this Ad Hoc Committee has suggested. If we can succeed in deleting some more brackets in 24 hours, well and good. It is my considered opinion, however, that certain problems are still intractable and that it will not be easy to overcome them within the next 24, or even 48, hours.

I therefore suggest that, after some further brackets have been deleted, the General Assembly might adopt the final draft document with the remaining brackets. That would mean that certain States, while being prepared to have the document adopted as it is, would maintain reservations on those parts of the document still in brackets.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

Those, of course, could be referred to the deliberative body or to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly or even, later on, to the proposed world conference or some additional session, as proposed by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

The important thing is that the document that we have before us mirrors the profound concern which the entire world feels towards what is essentially a universal problem, namely, the survival of mankind in its entirety. It is not a regional problem; it is basically a universal problem.

The special session on the new economic order did not resolve in a matter of a few weeks the social and economic disparities which exist in the world. Solving such problems sometimes takes decades. How much more difficult is the case when we are dealing with questions pertaining to disarmament. I believe that this session has been a great success because for the first time in history it has alerted the masses of humanity, as well as the decision-makers, to the graveness of the situation in which the whole world finds itself today. It will be no reflection on the General Assembly, therefore, for the President of the General Assembly to have before him the final document in the manner in which it will emerge after the additional efforts have been made, and for him to say that the final document is adopted with the reservations included, or rather the brackets, as that is a polite way of talking about reservations.

My own personal impression, and I have read through the document carefully, is that the document is primarily tilted towards the "haves" and has more or less neglected the "have nots". Wherever there are paragraphs which give some safeguard to the "have nots" we find them somehow, and systematically, bracketed. I was amazed to see that yesterday while reading the document word for word. I have not yet had a chance to look at the new document, but I did have a brief glance at it and I find that some of those reservations are still there.

That is the kind of situation which leads to the presentation of separate resolutions. After all if we are concerned about the survival of humanity we are, of course, concerned about our own survival in our own parts of the

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

world as a part of humanity. I therefore believe that, rather than hope for the unattainable - the question of disarmament has been on the books and in the negotiating process for decades - in order to expedite the work of the tenth special session and to accomplish something which we can present to the world - and we have indeed accomplished a great deal in terms of momentum and even in terms of practical results - the document could be presented to the General Assembly and adopted with the brackets included. Those brackets could then be dealt with at later sessions.

Mr. AL-ATIYYAH (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I shall try to speak slowly so as to enable the interpreters to make a faithful translation as I want members to understand our position very clearly. The delegation of my country has co-operated with the other sponsors of our draft resolution on Israeli armaments. We have co-operated with the Chairman and other members in this special session to ensure its success. Our position throughout these few weeks testifies to the sincere wish of the sponsors of the draft resolution to achieve concrete results.

However, one delegation which spoke during this meeting has surprised us by saying that this draft resolution should not be put to the vote. May I at this juncture make it clear, very succinctly, that it was precisely our wish to expedite the work of this Committee prompted us not to propose certain paragraphs which might have made agreement difficult. On the contrary, we strove to reconcile the differing viewpoints even if it meant the strict minimum of achievement. That is why we preferred to submit a draft resolution of a separate kind on a different point from the one on which the final document was submitted and that is why we submitted the draft resolution concerning military co-operation with Israel.

Once more I should to make it quite clear that, in view of our desire to co-operate with the Chairman and to expedite the work of the Committee, we heeded the appeal addressed to us by the Chairman and agreed to postpone a vote on the draft resolution regarding military co-operation with Israel until the draft resolution in the disarmament document had been fully discussed

(Mr. Al-Atiyyah, Iraq)

and settled. My delegation is convinced, as are the other sponsors of our resolution, that this initiative would be welcomed and today, after having waited a long time - several weeks in fact - we are surprised to note that a minority is trying to invoke a procedure to prevent a vote. That would mean the minority imposing its will on the majority.

(Mr. Al-Atiyyah, Iraq)

My delegation, in a spirit of co-operation, has shown its willingness to accept a consensus on the final disarmament document because we did not wish to give the impression of creating any obstacle in the way of an agreement. My delegation, like the other sponsors, cannot in any circumstances undertake at this stage to approve any agreement that may be reached on the general disarmament document, for a very simple reason: it would not be fair or just to impose the views of a minority on the majority. The Arab group has co-operated with the Chairman in that respect. I now appeal in all sincerity to the Chairman, and to all those who are thinking of resorting to procedural methods, to refrain from imposing the views of the minority on the majority since that would be in the interests of neither the present special session nor the principles of the United Nations. We are ready to co-operate and to meet half-way those who have views which differ from ours, but we could not accept the imposition of a minority view on the majority.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I am grateful to the representative of Iraq. May I assure him that in so far as the Chairman is concerned, the co-operation extended by the delegation of Iraq has been highly appreciated. I should also like to express my gratitude to him for saying that he is prepared to continue with that co-operation. I am sure that that will make it possible for us to reach a satisfactory outcome to our discussion.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): My delegation also hopes that the three draft resolutions before this Committee will not be pressed to a vote. However, if they are taken to a vote, my delegation would like to propose two amendments to the draft resolution on the urgent need for cessation of further testing of nuclear weapons (A/S-10/AC.1/L.10). Together with a number of countries, Japan has repeatedly appealed to all the nuclear-weapon States to halt nuclear tests. From that basic position, the attitude of Japan to this draft resolution is generally favourable. However, my delegation cannot ignore the problems involved in that draft resolution. Therefore, with a view to improving the text, my delegation wishes to propose the following amendments. First, in order to halt the nuclear arms race, it is essential to prevent any further increase in the number of nuclear-weapon States. Therefore, my delegation proposes that the operative paragraph of this draft resolution be amended to read as follows:

"Calls upon all States, in particular all the nuclear-weapon States ...". Those words would replace the existing formulation in the draft resolution: "Calls upon all nuclear-weapon States".

The second point is that it is not entirely clear whether or not this draft resolution covers peaceful nuclear explosions. It has been and will be a part of Japan's basic policy on nuclear disarmament that no peaceful nuclear explosions would be conducted unless an international agreement were reached on an international supervision and control system which would ensure that no weapons testing could be carried out under the guise of a peaceful nuclear explosion. Therefore, my delegation proposes a reformulation of the words to the following effect:

"... to refrain from conducting any further testing of nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices."

Those words would replace the present formulation in the draft resolution, "... to refrain from conducting any further testing of nuclear weapons." In this context, my delegation wishes to recall a passage of the statement by the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Desai, on 9 June at this special session, in which he said:

(Mr. Osigo, Japan)

"We are the only country which has pledged not to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons even if the rest of the world did so. I solemnly reiterate that pledge before this august Assembly. In fact, we have gone further and abjured nuclear explosions even for peaceful purposes."

(A/S-10, PV.24 p. 3-10)

In the light of that statement by Prime Minister Desai, my delegation hopes and believes that the Indian delegation will have no difficulty in accepting the amendments which my delegation has just proposed.

Mr. BARTON (Canada): I shall be quite brief. I should like to express concern over the way in which the discussion is going this morning. It was my understanding when the special session was convened that the approach we had all agreed upon was that we were attempting to assemble by consensus a testament of our goals and what we were trying to achieve in disarmament. I recognized, as I am sure everybody else did, that there were some basic issues which we would not be able to resolve per se, but that we could reach a consensus at least on the way in which we would express those differences. I think that when our senior co-ordinator, Mr. Garcia Robles, spoke the other day, he mentioned that specifically. I have implicit faith that you, Mr. Chairman, the Committee officers and the supreme co-ordinator will exercise the correct judgement on how that should be accomplished, when the negotiations have gone as far as they can go and when we should address ourselves to the end results. I shall not presume to give you advice on how to do that.

The other aspect is that we were to try to achieve this by consensus. I have listened to resolutions being introduced, and I see that this has changed from a deliberative forum where we were attempting to act by consensus into a replica of the First Committee. In my view that was precisely what we were trying to avoid. I would hope, therefore, that we could proceed with approving the best document that it is possible to produce in the time available, and that what I regard as extraneous developments in the form of additional resolutions would be abandoned by those putting them forward.

Mr. LING (China) (interpretation from Chinese): At the final stage of drafting work I do not intend to create any problems for you, Mr. Chairman. However, I regret that I must point out that, having taken a look at the final draft text distributed today, we discover that the various amendments proposed by the Chinese delegation have not been included, but the different views of other countries remain in square brackets. This situation is not fair. We believe that the final document should fully reflect the reasonable propositions and proposals of the various countries. China, of course, should be no exception. We hope that, at the very last stage of drafting the final document, the various proposals of the Chinese delegation will be given full and serious consideration and will be included in that document.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of China for his comments. There are two things which I should like to make clear. The proposals of China which were between brackets in the various texts appear in document A/S-10/AC.1/37, which was distributed today; what have disappeared from the document are some annexes with amendments also proposed by the delegation of China. I should like to explain to the representative of China that this may be due to a misinterpretation on my part of what was said in the very fruitful and positive consultations I had a few days ago with his country's delegation. If the delegation wishes to insist on the retention of those annexes we shall, of course, take due account of their wishes. I accept the full responsibility in this matter because, as I have said, my understanding after our very constructive and valuable consultations with the Chinese delegation was that the square brackets in some texts should be retained, but that the annexes were to be withdrawn. I have in any case taken due note of the comments of the representative of China, and I should like to have a private consultation later with his delegation on this point.

Mr. KOVALEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): At the beginning of our meeting, Mr. Chairman, you gave us an important and, I should say, promising piece of information to the effect that tangible progress had been made in the last hours. Many of the people in this room would agree that time, while it is a reliable ally of diplomats - we can all appreciate that - is a capricious companion of the participants in this special session. Looking at the clock we see how late it is. Therefore my delegation heeds the appeal which you, Sir, made at the beginning of this meeting. In view of the lateness of the hour we think it would be useful to get on immediately with the procedures which you have proposed for our further work.

Mr. MISTRAL (France) (interpretation from French): My statement will be on the lines of what was said by the representative of Canada. I am bound to say that my delegation feels some perplexity; we should really like to know what the present state of affairs is. I had thought, on the basis of the proceedings during the past five weeks, that we were working towards a consensus. During the course of this meeting, however, I have heard members of several delegations give various indications relating to a draft resolution, in particular draft resolution A/S-10/AC.1/L.10 concerning a possible moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons. I would point out that this item is between brackets in the text of document A/S-10/AC.1/37. In the circumstances I wonder whether the practice of working for a consensus is compatible with the other practice of withdrawing a text on which there is no agreement and resubmitting it as a separate draft resolution. I must say that my delegation wishes here and now to express its formal reservations on the adoption of such a procedure, and that the logical consequence that we may draw - and to which we shall or may revert later - is that such a change brings into question the whole balance of the text as it now stands in the section on nuclear testing, that is paragraphs 55, 56 and 57 of the present document.

(Mr. Mistral, France)

My purpose in making a statement at this stage of our work is to ascertain how you, Mr. Chairman, and other members interpret this procedure and how we are to understand it. We are simply seeking clarification.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I think that, in reply to the request by the distinguished representative of France for clarification, it might be fitting for me briefly to recapitulate what was decided by the Preparatory Committee, of which I had the honour to be Chairman.

(The Chairman)

In the course of our deliberations in the Preparatory Committee the idea was approved by consensus that the General Assembly should have available to it a draft final document comprising all the issues relating to disarmament in four sections: Introduction, Declaration, Programme of action and Machinery. That recommendation of the Preparatory Committee is reflected in its final report.

However, paragraph 48 of that report says that the Committee "decided to recommend that the principal document to be adopted at the special session should be a single document consisting of four sections".

(A/S-10/1, vol. I, para. 48) The introduction of the word "principal" in paragraph 48 may perhaps not be fully in accord with the spirit that has prevailed during our proceedings, but in any case it does suggest the interpretation that the document would in effect be the principal document and that apart from the principal document there could possibly be others.

I would also point out that many delegations, both in meetings of this Ad Hoc Committee and even in the course of the Preparatory Committee's meetings, have referred to the desirability of having a single document. The consensus rule was also a recommendation that was approved by the General Assembly. It is in that spirit that we have been working during all these weeks with a view to preparing the final draft document.

If I am not mistaken, delegations which have submitted draft resolutions as alternatives to texts in the draft final document maintained, at the time the draft resolutions were introduced, that it was their intention to achieve by consensus the inclusion of certain points of view in the draft final document and, therefore, that acceptance of those points of view, after negotiation of course, would make it unnecessary for the draft resolutions to be put to the vote.

I should like to believe that there is still time to arrive at a reconciliation of differing views, so that those draft resolutions, which would be alternative versions of some sections of the document, might be the subject of negotiations in the next few hours, so that delegations which submitted the texts would not find it necessary to insist on calling for a vote and that thus the amendments submitted this morning would automatically disappear.

(The Chairman)

I trust that with a little flexibility on all sides we may, as has been the case with other texts, arrive at a satisfactory solution in the hours remaining today.

May I once again urgently appeal to delegations which are interested in those particular aspects of the draft final document to make yet another effort, in order that the text may reflect a consensus on those matters.

I trust that I have thus given - perhaps with excessive detail - the explanation that the representative of France in his concern rightly called for.

Mr. VELLODI (India): I should like first to express our gratitude to the representative of New Zealand, who spoke also for Australia, and to the representative of Japan for their statements, which we take as a positive reaction to the draft resolution in document A/S-10/AC.1/L.10. They have submitted certain amendments and we and the other sponsors of the draft resolution will certainly study them with the attention they deserve.

Reference has been made to "the principal document". We should like to say very clearly that we entirely concur, Mr. Chairman, in your interpretation of paragraph 48 of the Preparatory Committee's report. The wording of that paragraph is very clear. It says only that the principal document to be adopted at the special session should be a single document. That does not necessarily preclude other documents.

It has also been mentioned that these draft resolutions should not be pressed to a vote, or even considered, because of some things in the consensus. Reference has been made in particular to the part of the programme of action section relating to a comprehensive test ban.

As my delegation has more than once indicated, we submitted these draft resolutions because the consensus document did not at all, whether adequately or otherwise, reflect these views to which we and I believe many delegations attach considerable importance. We did indicate at the time, and I am sure all

(Mr. Vellodi, India)

members of the Committee will remember this, that if the consensus document could adequately reflect those views we would then consider whether or not the draft resolutions should be pressed to a vote.

You, Mr. Chairman, are aware of the efforts that we have made during the past 72 hours to reach a consensus on paragraphs relating to these issues in the document, and as you know those negotiations are in a sense still continuing. For the time being, therefore, I do not intend to enter into a discussion or debate on either the amendments to or the substance of the draft resolutions, but I do want to indicate that the draft resolutions are before the Committee and that we shall come back to them when we see the final shape of the document.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since I was discussing the draft resolutions submitted by the delegation of India when I made my previous remarks, may I take this opportunity to appeal most urgently to that delegation, and to the delegations which have submitted amendments to the Indian draft texts and other delegations which have been in touch with the delegation of India and have analysed this item in the negotiations held yesterday, really to make a last-ditch effort to try to arrive at a text within the final document, so that it will not be necessary, as Mr. Vellodi has just said, for the Indian delegation to request a vote on its texts.

Mr. KITTANI (Iraq): Last Friday, when my delegation had the honour to introduce the 32-Power draft resolution in document A/S-10/AC.1/L.1/Rev.1, it will be recalled that we had an exchange with you, Mr. Chairman, as to procedure. The result of that exchange was a tacit agreement and a hope. The tacit agreement was that we would await the result of the negotiations on the main document and, when they were completed, return to the question of procedure and what this Committee, which is the master of its own procedure, would do concerning the totality of the documentation before it for decision. The hope, which you, Mr. Chairman expressed, was that all this would happen last Monday. We shared that hope, but as is very clear it was not realized.

Whether it is within reach or not, I think the tacit agreement should have remained. We are rather surprised and not happy at all that the side that ostensibly attaches the greatest importance to a single consensus document is at this midway stage referring to procedural matters and what should be done about other documents before the Committee.

For our part, we should like to stick to the tacit agreement. We should like to participate, as we all have done, in urgent and earnest efforts to reach whatever consensus is to be put - and I would emphasize these words - to be put before this Committee. Until this Committee and the General Assembly have pronounced themselves on the documentation, there can be no talk about a consensus on anything.

There have been many attempts at defining consensus. My own definition is that as a minimum consensus means that everyone, however reluctantly, will go along with it; otherwise, there is no consensus.

I had hoped that after you, Mr. Chairman, had outlined the procedure at the beginning of this meeting, the Committee would adjourn and await the results of the final efforts to arrive at whatever document is going to be put before us in final form.

Therefore, without further discussion, may I formally propose that this meeting be adjourned under rules 118 and 119 of our rules of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In the last few days the representative of Iraq has indeed shown much understanding and been most co-operative. I am most grateful to him.

I should like to reiterate that my interpretation and decision of Friday last stand - that is, that in due course we shall, if need be, ask this Committee to pronounce itself on the 32-Power document, as also, of course, on other documents that have been introduced. All that may have changed - and this not through my doing - are the dates. I had thought that in principle we would be able to approve the final draft document on Monday. That did not happen because, as I explained in my opening statement today, negotiations are being pursued very intensively. But changing the date changes neither the order of events nor the points of view expressed by me.

As regards the final draft document, from the very outset, in the Preparatory Committee and in this Committee, we have all made every effort to have a text adopted by consensus, and I feel we shall succeed. As regards the 32-Power proposal to which the representative of Iraq has referred, on Friday, if memory serves, in his introduction he said he was submitting the draft resolution because it was obvious there would be no consensus. The absence of a consensus on this draft resolution should not be detrimental to a consensus on the final draft document nor make it impossible to arrive at such a consensus.

The representative of Iraq has just made a proposal under rule 118. According to the rules of procedure, a proposal to adjourn must be put to the vote immediately without debate. May I appeal to the goodwill of the representative of Iraq once again? I have only two more speakers on my list. It is almost 1 p.m., and I myself have to attend a lunch within a few minutes. Therefore, if the representative of Iraq has no objections, since we are coming to the end of this meeting, we shall hear the two speakers remaining on the list and then adjourn without having to take what would be the first vote at this session of the Ad Hoc Committee. I am certain I can count on the goodwill and acquiescence of the representative of Iraq so that we may avoid taking a vote under rule 118.

Mr. KITTANI (Iraq): Mr. Chairman, my delegation would be the last to prevent anyone from speaking. Indeed, we did not know there were any more speakers on the list. However, one matter is of importance to us, and that is that if there

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

are to be further references to procedure and what should or should not be voted upon in this Committee, then let us have a full-scale, a full-dress debate on the matter. Subject to that, I withdraw my proposal on the understanding that the meeting will be adjourned as soon as the two representatives have spoken.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Iraq most warmly for his goodwill and understanding.

As to how we are to take up the various documents before the Ad Hoc Committee, I would endorse the appeal made by the representative of Iraq that for the time being no comments be made on the possibility or otherwise of voting until we have utilized every opportunity of negotiating outside this forum. Should circumstances render it necessary, it would then be my duty to report to the Committee on the status of the various documents, and then in the appropriate order and manner, we should deal with the various documents on which this Committee is to pronounce itself.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Because of the late hour, I shall try to confine my statement to the points I consider to be most significant.

In the first place, and since my delegation - as is no secret to anyone who has participated in the Preparatory Committee - was one of those which most firmly proposed and defended the idea that this special session should produce only a single final document, I shall confine myself to reading out the second paragraph of the "Introductory note" in document A/AC.187/89 of 24 January 1978, wherein the delegation of Mexico submitted, as a working paper, an "Outline of a draft final document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". This paragraph simply stated what my delegation had said in the course of the general debate on 1 September last year. It reads as follows:

"The foregoing conclusion of the Preparatory Committee appears appropriate from every point of view. The concentration in four sections of a single final document of all the conclusions and decisions of the special session will make it easier to organize and co-ordinate future work on disarmament and avoid the risk of dispersion which is so apparent in the case of the many resolutions on the subject which the General Assembly has adopted year after year, and will provide world public opinion with convincing proof that a new approach has been adopted which there is reason to hope will yield more fruitful results." (A/AC.187/89, p. 1)

Mr. Chairman, I share your optimism that between now and the time of the closure of this session we shall yet be able to arrive at a consensus and that that consensus will relate to a single final document.

Next, I should like to recall what I said here at our meeting on Monday. I shall not repeat that statement because it appears in full in document A/S-10/AC.1/PV.14 of 26 June, but I wish to reiterate our clear opinion in the same terms which appear in that document:

"... it would be a disaster, from the point of view of the impact on public opinion, if our final document were to have sections or annexes or whatever you like in which there were texts in square brackets. In my view that possibility must be completely ruled out." (A/S-10/AC.1/PV.14, p. 42)

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Also as I said on Monday, it is of course obvious that there will be some items or subitems on which it will not be possible to reach agreement. Instead of being included in square brackets, these items or subitems would be omitted in the final document, and that omission would be explained in terms similar to those I indicated on Monday, a draft text of which I ventured to submit yesterday in the Co-ordinating Group. In my Delegation's opinion that explanation could come after paragraph 45 of the draft final document, that is, it would be one of the first paragraphs of the programme of action. Since the paragraph is very brief, I shall read it out as I submitted it to the Co-ordinating Group:

(spoke in English)

"There are a few other measures of fundamental importance on which, because of the complexity of the issues involved and the short time at the disposal of the special session, it has proved impossible to reach satisfactory agreed conclusions. Among such measures are included several relating to..."

(continued in Spanish)

and here we would give examples of those measures on which it was not possible to reach agreement. Finally, the paragraph would end as follows:

(spoke in English)

"For the reasons stated above they [those questions] are treated only in very general terms and in a few instances even not treated at all in this programme of action. It should be stressed, however, that a number of alternative approaches to deal with those questions emerged from the exchange of views carried out in the General Assembly which will undoubtedly facilitate the continuation of the study and negotiation of the problems involved in the competent disarmament organs."

(continued in Spanish)

This text, this explanation of the absence of texts on some points - including some fundamental points - would be supplemented by another paragraph, of which I also submitted a draft yesterday, to be included among the final paragraphs of the final document with a wording along the following lines:

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

(spoke in English)

"The General Assembly notes with satisfaction that the active participation of the Member States in the consideration of the agenda items of the special session and the proposals and suggestions submitted by them and reflected to a considerable extent in the final document have made a valuable contribution to the work of the special session and proved instrumental in its successful conclusion. Since several of those proposals and suggestions deserve to be studied further more thoroughly, and taking into consideration the many relevant comments and observations made both in the general debate of the plenary and the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee, the Secretary-General is requested to transmit to the appropriate deliberative and negotiating organs dealing with the questions of disarmament the official records of the tenth special session of the General Assembly."

(continued in Spanish)

The Secretariat, as it always does in those cases, will no doubt add a footnote indicating all the relevant documents which constitute the official records of this session.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Finally, I would say this: The draft final document submitted to us today concludes with matters that might be called technical matters. In my delegation's opinion, these concluding paragraphs are not on the same high level as the initial paragraphs of this document - the paragraphs appearing under the heading "Review and Appraisal". Therefore, the delegations of Sweden and Mexico - which, as will be recalled, endorsed the draft introduction originally presented by the Chairman - have today given the Secretariat, for distribution as a working document, a draft set of concluding paragraphs of the final document the tone of which is in keeping with the lofty tone of the introduction and the declaration.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Apart from the merits or demerits of this special session - and I think there are far more merits than demerits - and notwithstanding the difficulties that have been encountered, some of which have been eliminated, thanks to your wise leadership, Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that one important and positive effect of this special session has been that it has brought out more emphatically the relationship of disarmament to international security. Not enough attention has been given to this relationship in the past. There is now a realization of the important fact that progress on disarmament actually depends on international security. The cessation of the arms race depends on international security. That awareness, felt by many delegations in this room, should be expressed in a way that will help further efforts towards the achievement of agreement on disarmament, either in special sessions or in other international conferences.

I therefore wish to propose that this Ad Hoc Committee and the special session of the General Assembly decide that, in view of the importance to progress on disarmament that there be sufficient and appropriate development of international security, the next special session on disarmament should be called the "special session on disarmament and international security".

That is a proposal not merely of form, but of substance. I believe that it will help to bring the essence of international security to the whole problem of disarmament, as should be done.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We have taken note of the proposal just made by the representative of Cyprus. In order to facilitate the negotiations that will take place this afternoon, I would suggest that he transmit the exact text of the proposal to the appropriate co-ordinator, so that it can be discussed at the proper time.

Mr. SY (Senegal) (interpretation from French): I should like to put a question to you, Mr. Chairman. Is it not a fact that one of the working rules of this Committee is that a proposal by a State may not be withdrawn without prior consultation? If that is indeed one of our working rules, it seems to us that Conference Room Paper No. 10, which was distributed this morning, contradicts that rule. In that Conference Room Paper there is a proposal, among other things, to eliminate from paragraphs 101 to 113 a number of proposals put forward by Member States. I should like to have some clarification on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): With regard to the concern just expressed by the representative of Senegal, I would point out that in document A/S-10/AC.1/37, paragraph 113 appears between brackets. That means that there is not yet final agreement on it. Hence, it is still subject to consultations and negotiations. The brackets appearing at the beginning and the end of the paragraph indicate that this is a text on which consultations are still proceeding.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.