



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2030
27 November 1974

ENGLISH

Twenty-ninth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND AND THIRTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 27 November 1974, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina)

Rapporteur: Mr. COSTA LOBO (Portugal)

- Tribute to the memory of U Thant, former Secretary-General
- Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use: report of the Secretary-General /277/ (continued)
- World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference /347/ (continued)
- Organization of work

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

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

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 29 NOVEMBER 1974, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 4 DECEMBER 1974.

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

U LWIN (Burma): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Government of the Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma, of members of the Burmese delegation, and on my own behalf, allow me to express our sincere thanks and deep appreciation to you and to the members of the First Committee for the tribute paid to the memory of U Thant, former Secretary-General of the United Nations.

I should like to assure you, Sir, that this Committee's tribute and expression of condolence will be conveyed to my Government and to the members of the bereaved family.

AGENDA ITEMS 27 AND 34 (continued)

NAPALM AND OTHER INCENDIARY WEAPONS AND ALL ASPECTS OF THEIR POSSIBLE USE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/9726; A/C.1/L.693/Rev.2)

WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (A/9590, A/9628, A/9636; A/C.1/L.703)

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Mexico to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.703.

Mr. GARCIA ROLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish):

Mr. Chairman, before referring to the matter under debate, allow me to say a few words on the death of U Thant. I whole-heartedly endorse the moving tribute which you, Sir, paid a few minutes ago to the former Secretary-General. I would have nothing to add to the eloquent words you uttered had there not been in my case and in the case of my country special circumstances which, in my opinion, warrant saying something more.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

U Thant was from the beginning a firm champion of a project to which Mexico gave and continues to give particular importance -- and I happen to have made a modest contribution to it. I am referring to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, otherwise known as the Treaty of Tlatelolco. From beginning to end, in the preparatory work for the Treaty until its completion, U Thant enthusiastically made his contribution. So it was that he was present at the opening of the work of OPANAL, the Agency created to draft the Treaty. He said on that occasion that the Treaty would shine like a beacon.

U Thant was in the capital of my country on two occasions -- on that occasion and on a previous one. From the very beginning, the people of Mexico, with the clear-sightedness of peoples who immediately recognize true greatness when they see it -- greatness of heart -- adopted U Thant as a favourite son. As you were saying a few minutes ago, Mr. Chairman, speaking about yourself, I personally also had the opportunity to work with the illustrious deceased on several occasions both here and in my own country. Whenever I worked with him I could appreciate at first hand the exceptional qualities of the third Secretary-General of the United Nations -- his love of peace, his devotion to the principles of our Organization and his unflinching will and courage in defending them.

That is why I thought it my duty to express my own tribute and to join in the very moving tribute which you, Mr. Chairman, paid to U Thant. I wished my own tribute to appear next to yours as that of the people and the Government of Mexico, of the delegation of my country to the United Nations and also of myself, a very modest but utterly sincere tribute.

I now have the honour to introduce to the First Committee, on behalf of the contact group of the non-aligned countries on disarmament questions and, in particular, on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, India, Yugoslavia and Mexico, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.703 on a world disarmament conference. As was the case in 1973, this draft resolution has been the subject of intense and informal negotiations, and it already has the support of the five nuclear-weapon States. We the co-sponsors are convinced that it will also win the unanimous support of this Committee. What is more, we consider that the text of the draft resolution will not require lengthy debate in this Committee since it is a very simple one.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The first preambular paragraph recalls the three previous resolutions which the General Assembly adopted on this item -- resolutions 2833 (XXVI) of 16 December 1971, 2930 (XXVII) of 29 November 1972 and 3183 (XXVIII) of 18 December 1973.

The next three preambular paragraphs, using identical language to that of the General Assembly, repeat what the Assembly has already proclaimed in one, two or all of its previous resolutions: the responsibility of the United Nations under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and for disarmament; the conviction that all peoples of the world have a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations and that all States should contribute to the adoption of measures for the achievement of this goal, as well as the conviction that a world disarmament conference, properly prepared and convened at an appropriate time, could promote the realization of such aims and that the co-operation of all nuclear Powers would considerably facilitate their attainment.

The fifth preambular paragraph refers to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, document A/29/27, in regard to which Ambassador Hoveyda, the Chairman of that Committee, made a series of very relevant remarks at our 199th meeting, held on 21 October last, when the Committee began consideration of the items relating to disarmament. In connexion with that report -- the preparation of which was entrusted to the Working Group which, under the chairmanship of Mr. Elias, the Rapporteur of the Committee, met for several weeks -- the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.203 refers to its annex -- an annex which the Secretariat prepared in an appropriate manner and at the right time -- wherein is contained a summary of the views and suggestions of Governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference and related problems, including the conditions for the realization of such a conference.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The sixth and last preambular paragraph points out a fundamental fact, that, unfortunately -- and I quote what the paragraph says -- "it does not yet seem possible to reach a final conclusion with regard to the convening of a world disarmament conference".

In operative paragraph 1 we invite all States to communicate to the Secretary-General, before 31 March 1975, their comments on the main objectives of a world disarmament conference in the light of the views and suggestions compiled in section II of the summary appended to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on this question.

This is also why, in operative paragraph 2, we decide to prolong the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee, assigning to it as priority tasks the following two functions: first, to prepare and to submit to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session, on the basis of consensus, an analytical report, including any conclusions and recommendations it may deem pertinent, concerning the comments received pursuant to paragraph 1. Secondly, to maintain close contact with the representatives of the States possessing nuclear weapons in order to keep currently informed of any change in their respective positions.

In light of the deadline set for States to communicate their remarks to the Secretary-General, it would be desirable for the Secretariat to reproduce and distribute the opinions requested as they are being received.

Operative paragraph 3 renews the invitation to the States possessing nuclear weapons to co-operate or maintain contact with the Ad Hoc Committee, it being understood that they will enjoy the same rights as the appointed members of the Committee. It goes without saying that this means that for the consensus required in accordance with the provision in subparagraph 2 (a) in regard to the report which the Committee is to submit to the Assembly at its next session, the opinion of States possessing nuclear weapons would be of equal value as that of the appointed members of the Committee.

Lastly, the two final operative paragraphs correspond to paragraphs 4 and 5 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII) which was adopted a year ago.

In concluding this brief introduction, I should like to emphasize that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.703 will serve to reaffirm the persistence with which the non-aligned countries have advocated, and continue to advocate,

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

the early convening of a world disarmament conference, an initiative whose deep roots, I should like to recall once again, must be sought at the conferences, held in 1961 in Belgrade, in Cairo in 1964, and in resolution 2030 (XX) which the General Assembly adopted in 1965, based on a draft resolution which was sponsored by 42 non-aligned States.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to announce to the Committee that the delegation of Nepal has joined the list of sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.703.

Mr. JAZIC (Yugoslavia): After the excellent introduction of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.703 by the representative of Mexico, there is very little for me to add. After the Ad Hoc Committee, established last year, had done its work successfully, in spite of the complicated circumstances in which its work had to evolve, it was only natural that it should continue its activity. This also reflects, among other things, the continuity of efforts for preparing the convening of a world disarmament conference. We hope that the Ad Hoc Committee will be able to take a step forward in its work in the coming year. For this reason, my delegation attaches particular attention to the terms of reference of the Ad Hoc Committee, which are spelled out in operative paragraph 2 of the present draft, namely, that the Committee should prepare and submit to the General Assembly, at its next regular session, an analytical report, including any conclusions and recommendations it may deem pertinent. We would have preferred this paragraph on the functions of the Ad Hoc Committee to be more explicit in the sense of defining more clearly its orientation with regard to preparations for a world disarmament conference and for determining its objectives. However, even as formulated at present, this paragraph gives ample opportunity to every Government to submit, if it so desires, concrete proposals and suggestions concerning numerous aspects related to a world disarmament conference.

(Mr. Jazic, Yugoslavia)

In our submission, the resolution pursues two aims, namely, to keep alive not only the idea of a world disarmament conference but also to ensure gradual progress towards its convening and, at the same time, to preserve consensus among us with respect to this question. We also hope that the nuclear-weapon Powers, while maintaining contact with the Committee, will co-operate with it to a greater extent.

There is no doubt in our mind that the overwhelming majority of States, in particular the non-aligned countries, are in favour of convening a world disarmament conference, adequately prepared, in a not-too-distant future. The over-all development of international relations, the continuation of the arms race and, in particular, the situation in the field of disarmament prove that it is incumbent that all States should be in a position to contribute to the adoption of measures conducive to real disarmament, and it is not possible to achieve this aim without a clear orientation towards nuclear disarmament. A world disarmament conference could mark a turning-point in this respect. For all these reasons, my delegation is sponsoring the draft resolution which is before us and expresses the hope that the resolution will be adopted unanimously by our Committee.

Mr. P. P. Sharma (Nepal): My delegation finds no proper words to describe the intense grief it felt at the sudden demise of former Secretary-General, U Thant, whose devotion to the aims and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations were exemplary. He was also a great friend of my country. He inspired the project for the development of Lumbini, the birthplace of Lord Buddha, and was an honorary member of the Committee for the Development of Lumbini. I had the honour and privilege to work with him on the Committee which gave me the opportunity of personal acquaintance with him. His memory will be ever cherished by us. May I convey through you, Mr. Chairman, my message of condolences to the delegation of Burma on our irreparable common loss.

The question of a world disarmament conference has been before us for a number of years. We are of the conviction that disarmament negotiations of a universal character could promote the realization of the aims of disarmament to a greater extent. That is why my delegation during all these years has repeatedly called for the early convening, as soon as possible, of a world disarmament conference in which all nations, big or small, developed or developing, nuclear or non-nuclear -- including the divided ones -- could participate.

My delegation on several occasions in the past has made clear our viewpoints on basic issues relating to the convening of a world disarmament conference. My delegation is of the view that careful and adequate preparation could be carried out before the convening of a world disarmament conference. All necessary details regarding the agenda, procedures and objectives of the conference should be decided upon beforehand in a way acceptable to all the participating countries. We would also like to reiterate here our conviction that a question like disarmament which involves problems of vital importance, such as nuclear weapons and general and complete disarmament, is of serious concern to all the countries of the world, big or small, rich or poor, and therefore needs to be discussed and solved in a conference where everyone has an equal opportunity to make his views known. We are of the view that the success of the conference, however, depends upon the participation and willingness of all nuclear Powers.

We, therefore, believe, like the majority of representatives in this Committee, that a world disarmament conference with the full participation of all the countries of the world, if held after careful and adequate preparation, is bound to achieve positive results towards disarmament. A conference of such a universal character will help the people of the whole world to understand the problems of disarmament and to rally world public opinion towards its goals, which will, in itself, be an important achievement of the conference.

At the present time, when the world is experiencing an atmosphere of a relaxation of tensions among nations, due to the policy of détente in political spheres, similar progress could also be expected in the sphere of military détente. The present climate of détente, especially among the super-Powers, offers us a more opportune moment than ever before for the convening of a world disarmament conference which, in turn, may lead to some tangible progress in the field of disarmament.

As to the objectives of the Conference, my delegation holds the view that the question of the non-use of nuclear weapons should be accorded high priority, thus not only guaranteeing the security of non-nuclear-weapon countries but also eliminating the possibility of a nuclear confrontation between the nuclear Powers themselves. A logical follow-up of this concept of the non-use of nuclear weapons would be the prohibition and elimination of such weapons which, through star wars, may lead to the most dangerous of all the questions of disarmament, namely, general and complete disarmament, which should be the ultimate and main objective of a world disarmament conference. We all know, that general and complete disarmament is a prerequisite for the restoration of international peace and security which is so important for the rapid economic development of all the countries of the world.

As a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707 introduced by the representative of Mexico, Nepal believes that this draft resolution will receive full support from all delegations, especially from the five permanent members of the Security Council, whose willing co-operation is so vital for the success of the Conference.

Finally, while appreciating the work done by the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference in the past few years,

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

and taking into account the zeal and talent of its Chairman, my dear friend and colleague, Ambassador Hoveyda of Iran, my delegation fully believes that the Ad Hoc Committee, with the co-operation of all States concerned, will be able to produce valuable conclusions and recommendations and submit a report to the thirtieth session of the General Assembly facilitating the early convening of a world disarmament conference.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Syria to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic):

Mr. Chairman, the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic would like to associate itself with you in expressing condolences to the family of the former Secretary-General. With your touching words you have expressed our sentiments towards the late Secretary-General who devoted his life to the interests of humanity. His death is not only a loss to his people and his country but to all humanity as well.

In brief, I should like to submit the draft resolution before the Committee today after having introduced certain amendments which, in fact, do not touch on the substance of the draft itself but are aimed at improving the drafting. These amendments have sought to improve the fourth preambular paragraph where the preceding original paragraph was substituted by a paragraph which refers to the conclusion reached by the International Conference on Human Rights, held in Teheran in 1968, to the effect:

"... that napalm bombing is among the methods and means of warfare that erode human rights."

A new paragraph has been added to the preambular part of the draft resolution as follows:

"Emphasizing the consensus of the Conference of Government Experts held under the auspices of the International Committee of the Red Cross that severe burn wounds are probably the most painful type of wound and frequently remain so for long periods of time and that may result in permanent disability, including physical, functional, cosmetic, social and psychological disability."

In the amended text of the preamble to the draft resolution you will find the last paragraph of the original draft resolution mentioned, which was unintentionally dropped from the first amended text, which says that the General Assembly is:

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

"Deeply disturbed at the continuing use of napalm and other incendiary weapons,".

So far as the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution are concerned, certain amendments concerning the drafting of the paragraphs have been introduced. With regard to operative paragraph 1, the amendments have sought to make the paragraph clearer than the original paragraph 1 while retaining the original content and meaning of the paragraph. The amended paragraph reads as follows. The General Assembly:

"Condemns the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in armed conflicts in circumstances where it may affect human beings or may cause damage to the environment and/or natural resources;".

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

We are convinced that, while napalm is considered harmful and damaging to human beings, its harmful effects on the environment are no less serious. In my previous statement introducing the original text of this draft resolution, I mentioned that the harmful effects of napalm are suffered by both human beings and the environment, because the direct injury and burns suffered by human beings as a result of napalm are no more harmful than the effects on the environment and natural resources of burning and bombing. In the event of war, it often happens that bombing is directed against the environment and natural resources in order to create an atmosphere of terror and to affect people psychologically or damage the economy in order to force people to surrender. For example, the bombing of agricultural products and resources is no less serious than bombing directed against human beings themselves.

That is why we have sought to make our meaning very clear, leaving no opening for individual interpretations in the amended text which is now before the Committee. The first amended text gave rise to certain misinterpretations with regard to the meaning of direct or indirect effects of the use of napalm against human beings. Despite the fact that at that time we spoke of the direct and indirect effects, that is to say the direct effects on human beings and the indirect effects produced on human beings through the harm done to the environment and natural resources, nevertheless we decided to introduce this amendment.

While we thank all the delegations which co-operated with us in drafting this text, we should like to express special gratitude to the friendly delegation of Sweden, which co-operated in a constructive and positive spirit in the drafting of the final text of this draft resolution.

I should like to say once again to this Committee that we intend by this draft resolution to provide political protection for the human being and his environment and natural resources. This is in full accord with the original draft submitted by the Soviet Union seeking the protection of the environment from military action which might be harmful to the environment, which was adopted by the Committee last week. In seeking such political protection for human beings, natural resources and the environment we are aiming to consolidate international efforts to provide legal protection, for the absence of political protection might affect human beings and might encourage

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

the use of napalm, as is the case at present. That is why we consider that the provision of political protection is an essential prerequisite for the provision of legal protection in the future.

I should like to take this opportunity of reminding those who believe that political protection affects international efforts to provide legal protection that this fear is completely unfounded. I would speculate whether the silence of the international community regarding the use of napalm and the damage that does to human beings, the environment and natural resources is encouraging international efforts aimed at legal protection. I believe it is not. I believe that we should endeavour to consolidate international efforts to provide legal protection against and total prohibition of the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons by means of political protection. Therefore the international community should prove the seriousness of its efforts to provide legal protection by providing the appropriate international basis for it.

Finally, I should like to ask for a vote by roll-call on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): It had been my intention once we had exhausted the list of speakers, as is the case now that we have heard the representative of Syria, to hear explanations of vote and then proceed to the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.703. However, I have just been informed that the Secretariat is putting the final touches to the report on the financial implications and that this may take a few more minutes. In order, therefore, not to lose time while that information is being prepared by the technical experts on financial implications, we might proceed to vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2.

I call now on delegations which have asked to explain their vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2 before the vote.

Mr. LIND (Sweden): My delegation has worked for several years with others to bring about prohibition of use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed either to cause unnecessary suffering or to have indiscriminate effects. In this context we have devoted much attention to napalm and other incendiary weapons, and we were among the delegations which, in 1971, requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report on this subject. While we think it would be wrong to pay attention exclusively to these weapons, since high velocity projectiles, flechettes and many other types of arms also call for critical examination, we are convinced that the findings so far have confirmed the initial suspicion that incendiary weapons are strong candidates for a total ban on use and for subsequent possible bans on production, stockpiling and proliferation. We fervently hope that progress towards a total ban on use will be made in the coming year at the Geneva Conference on humanitarian law in armed conflicts and at the expected second conference on the same subject. A resolution on this subject has already been adopted by this Committee by 100 votes in favour, none against, and 14 abstentions.

The present draft resolution, in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2, focuses upon napalm and other incendiary weapons. In our view this text is complementary to the resolutions already adopted. The earlier resolution was directed at the procedure to achieve the complete banning of use of these weapons by legal action which we hope will not be too distant. The present draft resolution contains a political condemnation of the most terrifying uses of the weapons: that is, when they may be used as anti-personal weapons where civilians may be affected, or when the environmental crops or other natural resources may suffer damage. The present draft resolution further recommends a moratorium on production, stockpiling, proliferation and use of these weapons, pending the conclusion of agreements regarding the ban on use and/or a ban on production, stockpiling and proliferation.

Best Copy Available

(Mr. Lind, Sweden)

My delegation is grateful to the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic for having modified its original text in several important respects. Although the draft resolution still goes further than any previous resolution on this subject which my delegation has supported, Sweden will vote in favour.

The operative paragraphs I have referred to and the draft resolution as a whole express an anguish, which we share, about the existence of these weapons and many uses of them. We believe the text underlines the urgency of the imminent discussions at the diplomatic conference on humanitarian law and at the expected second conference of government experts concerning a legal prohibition of the use of incendiary weapons.

Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran): I should like to explain the vote of my delegation on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.693/Rev.2. The policy of my Government with respect to this category of weapons has been one of consistent support for international action to ban their use. We have supported all efforts along these lines here in the United Nations and elsewhere. On the question of the production and the stockpiling of napalm and other incendiary weapons, while clearly conscious of the practical difficulties involved in the setting up of an effective control mechanism, we have nevertheless maintained an open mind.

We have considered that the indiscriminate nature and the massive effect of these weapons, which so abhorrently victimize the civilian population, requires that the issue be examined from a wider humanitarian angle than that of arms control and disarmament. Napalm and other incendiary weapons have been, as the report of the Secretary-General testifies, responsible for more civilian casualties than any other weapons of mass destruction used in armed conflict.

The fact that these weapons continue at present to be used against non-military targets is a source of grave concern that should supersede our misgivings regarding the technical and arms control aspects of the draft that we are going to vote upon.

(Mr. Hoveyda, Iran)

It is for that reason that my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution presented by the Syrian Arab Republic as it has been revised (A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2).

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I have no more speakers for an explanation of vote before the vote. Before proceeding to the vote on the draft resolution, and if the Committee has no objection, I should like, out of courtesy, to call on the representative of Burma who has to leave and wishes to comment on a draft resolution.

U LWIN (Burma): Because of unavoidable circumstances, my delegation was not present on 29 November 1970 at the time of voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.700 regarding the establishment of a nuclear free zone in the Middle East.

I should like to state for the record that had my delegation been present at the time of voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.700, my delegation would have abstained in accordance with instructions received from my Government.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The remarks of the representative of Burma will be duly reflected in the record. We shall now proceed to vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2 relating to agenda item 27 entitled "Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use".

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has requested a roll-call vote. It is nevertheless my impression that the draft resolution could be adopted unanimously and without objections. If the sponsor of the draft resolution and the sponsoring delegations do not request a roll-call vote, I would then rule that the Committee decides to adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom): If I have understood you correctly, Mr. Chairman, and you are talking about the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691/Fev.2, my delegation would favour a vote in the normal form. I am not asking for a roll-call vote. We would like to have a vote in the ordinary way.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since one delegation has requested it, we shall have a formal vote; and since the representative of Syria has requested that in that case it be a roll-call vote, we shall now proceed to a roll-call vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Greece, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, Gabon, Ghana.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany.

The draft resolution, as revised, was adopted by 51 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. PAC (Poland): As the Polish delegation stated on 21 November in explanation of its vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691, the Government of Poland is in favour of the prohibition of the use, and of the eventual elimination, of napalm and other incendiary weapons from the arsenals of all States. We have also stressed that, in our view, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is the most appropriate forum in which to work out agreements in that regard most effectively.

We had given careful consideration to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2, and listened with interest to the statement made by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic introducing that draft. The Polish delegation is in full solidarity with the motives which led the delegation of Syria to submit that draft. We are also in agreement with the objectives of the resolution. However, we feel that it tends to prejudge efforts to elaborate an agreement on the prohibition of the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons and on their eventual elimination from the arsenals of all States. It is for that reason that the Polish delegation felt constrained to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, on behalf of the Soviet delegation I should like to associate myself with the condolences you, Mr. Chairman, expressed at the very beginning of this meeting in connexion with a sorrowful event --the untimely death of a man whose name is now inseparable from the history of the United Nations and the achievements, successes, difficulties and shortcomings of this Organization.

It is very distressing for me to speak in the past tense of the former Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, who headed our Organization for 10 years, from 1961 until 1971. Devoting to it his every effort, his whole knowledge and his experience, he was a distinguished diplomat and statesman. It was the aim of his whole life to ensure conditions for the peaceful coexistence of all States, for lasting international peace and security; to resolve international controversies by means of negotiation; to resolve problems of disarmament; to make progress in the cause of liberating colonial and dependent peoples.

The Soviet Union attaches great significance to the United Nations as an instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security and the development of international co-operation. We intend to continue making efforts to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations on the basis of strict observance of the Charter and to continue fighting for the cause for which we have fought, for which U Thant fought and gave his health.

At the present time, the dominating feature of the situation developing throughout the world is the trend towards the easing of tension. The Soviet Union considers that the possibilities are now broadening for the United Nations to enhance its effectiveness and to have a favourable effect upon the development of the international situation, at the same time strengthening the Organization's chances of promoting the solution of topical international issues and disputes, developing fruitful and equal co-operation among States so that the process of détente can become permanent and the principles of peaceful coexistence can become an unyielding rule in international relations.

In the 10 years during which U Thant was Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Organization trod a very arduous road. In that period, very important decisions were taken, decisions which marked a turning-point in international relations -- from the tension we inherited from the cold war to a policy of negotiation and co-operation based upon the principles of peaceful

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

coexistence. Throughout that period, U Thant made an immense personal contribution, and helped the Organization take important decisions, including those on the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; the Moscow Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Tests; the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; the Convention on the Prohibition and Elimination of Bacteriological Weapons; the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security; the Declaration on Friendly Relations Among States, and many other extremely important decisions of the General Assembly and of the United Nations.

We remember U Thant as an enthusiastic champion of the principle of universality of our Organization. It was precisely during his period of active work in the post of Secretary-General that the membership of the United Nations grew considerably. Forty new Members joined. In itself, that was a reflection of the immense historic changes that had occurred in the world beginning with the turbulent 1960s, especially when the wind of change blew strongly over the African continent.

U Thant's name will always be connected with the search for ways to settle military conflicts and the aspiration of the United Nations to extinguish dangerous hotbeds of tension and to prevent a world catastrophe. The turbulent international life of the 1960s caused much work for the Secretary-General of the United Nations. In that sense, U Thant helped with his devotion to the ideals, purposes and principles of the United Nations. His whole life was devoted to embodying those high ideals and principles. In that regard, permit me to remind you of the words of U Thant himself concerning his work in his last annual report on the work of the United Nations. He wrote:

"I have directed all my faith and efforts towards maintaining and developing this Organization as an indispensable centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of our common ends and as an increasingly effective instrument for peace and development.

"For the duration of my tenure I have worked ceaselessly towards the goal of peace, justice and progress and, in whatever role life thereafter sets before me, I will continue to do so." (A/3401/Add.1, paras. 151, 152)

There is no need for me to say that U Thant always enjoyed tremendous respect and authority among the broadest possible circles of Governments, States and Missions to the United Nations. U Thant was the friend of the Soviet Union. He repeatedly visited the Soviet Union as a guest of the Soviet Government. In Moscow, U Thant met with the leaders of the Soviet Government and discussed with them the most important problems of the day. His service and knowledge of political science were very highly appreciated by, among others, scientists and scholars of the Soviet Union. He was an Honorary Doctor of Legal Science at Moscow University.

Permit me to state that the Soviet Union and I personally shall always preserve the warmest possible memories of my meetings and talks with U Thant, which made for mutual understanding, the development and strengthening of the United Nations, the enhancement of its effectiveness and the expansion of international co-operation among all States.

Permit me on behalf of the Soviet delegation to express deepest grief on the occasion of the passing away of U Thant and to convey our expressions of sorrow to the Government and the people of the Union of Burma, the delegation of Burma to the General Assembly as well as to the Burmese Mission to the United Nations.

Let us hope that in the future work of the United Nations and of the Secretariat we shall be assisted by the memory of U Thant, an outstanding man and statesman whose work and ideas henceforth and always will belong to the United Nations and to the whole of mankind.

I should now like to read a message the Council of Ministers of the USSR has addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Waldheim, on the occasion of the death of U Thant:

"Secretary-General of the United Nations Kurt Waldheim:

"The Soviet Government expresses to you its deep sorrow and condolences on the death of the former Secretary-General of the United Nations U Thant, and requests you to convey its sincere condolences to his family and friends. In that important office, U Thant exerted great efforts to strengthen international co-operation and to implement the lofty ideals and principles of the United Nations Charter. His work was well known and appreciated in the Soviet Union. It was designed to preserve and strengthen peace and international security.

The Council of Ministers of the USSR,
27 November 1974."

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

Permit me now to explain my vote on the draft resolution just adopted. The Soviet delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft resolution on napalm and other incendiary weapons, submitted in the First Committee at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly by the representative of Syria and contained in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2.

With regard to its attitude of principle on the problem of prohibiting napalm, the Soviet delegation has already had occasion to express its views in our statement in the First Committee on 21 November regarding the voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691, submitted by Sweden, Egypt, Mexico and others. The Soviet Union has unfailingly supported efforts by the United Nations to prohibit particularly cruel means of waging war, including, or more precisely, beginning with thermonuclear weapons. The Soviet Union is a party to international agreements concerning armed conflicts, including the Geneva Protocol of 1925 prohibiting the use in war of chemical and other weapons and the Geneva Convention of 1949 on the defence of victims of war.

The question of napalm and other incendiary weapons requires very careful consideration and has very complicated technical and military aspects. Precisely bearing this in mind, my delegation would like once again to point out the readiness of the Soviet Union to consider this problem thoroughly within the framework of the Disarmament Committee. The question of the prohibition of the use of any kind of conventional weapons and that of the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of such weapons should be resolved within the context of all the problems involved in the limitation of armaments and disarmament. Unfortunately, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2 does not provide for such an approach in resolving the problem of napalm. Therefore, the Soviet delegation found it advisable to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

At the same time, we should like to stress that the Soviet Union has a great deal of sympathy and understanding for the motives which prompted the sponsors of that draft resolution, above all those of the delegation of Syria. We add our protest to the statements of the representatives of the Arab countries in the First Committee unreservedly condemning the use by Israel of napalm against the peaceful population, against the camps of Palestine refugees. The Soviet Union considers that the use by Israeli troops of such a weapon against the civilian population -- women, children and old men -- against Arab towns and villages, is a flagrant violation of universally acknowledged principles of international law, particularly, the Geneva Convention of the Protection of Civilian Population in Time of War, 19 August 1949. Such activities by the military of Israel cannot fail to be branded by international public opinion as banditry and an international crime. Such an act of cruelty on the part of the Israeli military cannot fail to meet with universal indignation and condemnation.

Mr. MENEGATTI (Italy): Only a few days ago, the Italian delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691 concerning agenda item 7. As we all know, the question of napalm, like that of other conventional weapons, is to be further examined in the Ad Hoc Committee of the Diplomatic Conference at Geneva in 1975 and at a second session of the Conference of Government Experts which, we presume, will be held later next year.

In our view, further study and examination is required before States will be in a position to pronounce themselves on a matter as difficult and as complex as the one concerning the prohibition of certain conventional weapons which may be found to have indiscriminate effects or to cause unnecessary suffering.

This is the main consideration that prompted the Italian delegation to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution before us.

Mr. VITTHUM (Finland): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691/Rev.1 because we agree with its general purpose. Our vote, however, should not be interpreted as prejudging the procedures endorsed in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691, adopted only last week on this same item by this Committee.

Mr. SUTOWARDJO (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691/Rev.1, as we support the idea that a ban should be imposed on napalm and other incendiary weapons, the use of which may cause unnecessary suffering or have indiscriminate effects.

I should like to point out, however, with reference to operative paragraph 1, that we should not prejudge the work of the forthcoming second session of the Diplomatic Conference and that of an expected second session of the Conference of Government Experts.

Mr. BLANCO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to set on record that, although we are in favour of the draft resolution which we have just voted upon, we are also in favour of the amendments in the first operative paragraph, in particular the one which states that the use of incendiary weapons, which affect the environment, implies total condemnation of that weapon in military conflicts. Our point of view is that the term "incendiary" we should not understand as referring only to the use of incendiary weapons in military conflicts, but also all objects, materials, installations, constructions and so like, that are the result of the behaviour which was put into them.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I thought that your tribute to U Thant was about as appropriate as a tribute could be and I should like to associate my delegation completely with your remarks.

With respect to the Syrian resolution, the Committee will recall that last week my delegation explained its vote on a Swedish draft resolution concerning napalm. In that explanation we set forth our views on the proper approach to the next stage of constructive international co-operation on the questions concerning the use of such weapons. The resolution now before us clearly runs contrary to such an approach. It prejudges the outcome of the deliberations which will take place during the coming year in particular it fails to take account of the many complex issues concerning incendiary weapons which must be examined at the second session of the Conference of Experts under the auspices of the International Committee of the Red Cross, before any firm conclusions can be drawn regarding the scope of possible restrictions on the use of napalm and other incendiaries. My Government expects to participate actively in the experts' ongoing work.

Meanwhile, however, we cannot accept the categorical conclusion in the present resolution that the use of incendiary weapons is prohibited. Accordingly, the United States abstained in the vote on that resolution.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I should like first to associate myself with the expressions of condolences by the Chairman on the death of U Thant. It is with a feeling of profound loss and grief that I wish to pay a tribute to a man of historic world stature who embodied the noblest and highest expression of human virtue in the field of his activities.

We mourn today the death of a great champion of peace. His intellectual integrity, his unshakable impartiality, his unswerving determination to further world peace have won the admiration of the whole world, and the international community, placing confidence in his spirit of abnegation in his concept of duty, his sense of human solidarity so pronounced in all his actions, requested him twice to stay on in his high post. It was only when his health was failing and he could not fulfil his duties that the fervent wish of the General Assembly for his re-election had to be abandoned.

U Thant, despite the mildness of his personal manner and the suaveness of his speech, had dynamism of thought and clarity in vision of what lay beyond. He always spoke in terms that were prophetic. In the introduction to the annual report of the Secretary-General in 1969, he appealed to the United Nations for more objective reasoning and he told the Members of the United Nations that, having conducted extensive research among scientists and all others well placed to express an opinion, he had come to the conclusion that the United Nations had perhaps

"... ten years left" -- from 1969 -- "in which to subordinate their ancient quarrels and to launch a global partnership to curb the arms race, to improve the human environment, to defuse the population problem and to start an effort to save humanity from impending catastrophe."

Half of these 10 years have already elapsed and the international community has not moved one inch in any of the fields in which U Thant in his prophetic spirit, called upon the international community to move. We are still in a situation where war is not declared but constant in our world, where problems remain unresolved because there is not the moral fibre in the international community to judge wrong from right, because force still prevails and has even sunk to the level of the law of the jungle.

By his death, U Thant was saved from following the moral degradation of humanity and the inability of the United Nations to rise above its "ancient quarrels" to any reasonable level for some improvement in all these fields to which U Thant drew attention.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

And we have today the Chairman of this Committee asking the Committee very reasonably whether the draft resolution was one needing to be voted upon or one that could be unanimously adopted. When it was timidly asked that there should be a vote, we found that there were numerous abstentions. Why all these abstentions? I need not comment on them, but it is significant to note what they were based upon.

At the same time, we heard the representative of the Soviet Union pointing out very rightly that his country strongly condemns the use of napalm bombs against civilian populations which cause unnecessary and indiscriminate suffering and death in terrible agonies of burning. All theses written on napalm bombs say that napalm should be condemned because it is unnecessary for any military purpose and is a merely cruel and dastardly weapon that should be abolished. The representative of the Soviet Union very rightly condemned it in one case. But why only in one case? Why should it be limited to the case of one country against some other country and not include every case of its use.

Fortunately, there are not many countries that have used it. But we know that there are more than the one that was mentioned by the representative of the Soviet Union. And if we are to mention one country, why should we not also mention the others? I shall not mention them -- mention it because there is only one more -- since it is not necessary to do so. What is important is not who used it against whom, but the fact that this Committee was not able to be unanimous on its condemnation. This is very regrettable.

It is perhaps fortunate that K. Thant is not alive to see how the world has moved since his declaration of the need for surging their differences, for subordinating their ancient quarrels. Those quarrels have not become subordinated, they are becoming stranger, and there is need of these napalm bombs in this hateful quarrel.

It is truly regrettable to see the situation. But I think of it. I believe that K. Thant was more than a politician and a diplomat. He was a moral leader, and he passed away in time to save him the agony of seeing his sad prophecy come true.

Allow me now to finish what I have to say about K. Thant. It is a matter of concern for all humanity to pay the greatest possible tribute to K. Thant and I hope that something will be decided so that the expression of the international community will have a more official, more solemn form than has started at the beginning or the end of the discussion of daily items.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Therefore I shall desist now from saying anything further about U Thant and I shall hope to have occasion to give a fuller account of what he has done for the world. I had the privilege of knowing him very profoundly, particularly on the question of Cyprus, on which in all his reports he gave his real sense of justice. From every one of those reports, although mildly expressed, there always transpired the need for a solution of the problem on the basis of the principles of the Charter. I wish through you, Mr. Chairman, to express my Government's profound grief at the death of U Thant and our sincere condolences to the representative of Burma, to the Governor of Burma, and also to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for the loss of a great man of the United Nations.

With regard to the resolution that has just been adopted, I wish to recall that my delegation has been the one responsible for the postponement of the vote on the resolution as revised at the last meeting on this item. Since then, we have worked on this resolution, and I am very happy to say that we have given it a form that is acceptable to my delegation because it really returns to the original content by mentioning all the cases in which a napalm bomb would be highly injurious and condemnable.

Therefore, we have voted for it and we hope that this resolution will not remain a dead letter but, by next year, we shall have a complete prohibition of this terrifying weapon that is, unfortunately, still being used.

Mr. TRAORE (Mali) (interpretation from French): My delegation wishes to associate itself, first of all, with the tribute you paid to the memory of U Thant, that man of integrity who devoted his life to the cause of justice, truth and peace.

Secondly, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2 because the provisions of it are in accordance with the opinion of my delegation regarding the use of certain weapons. We do not believe it is necessary to hold further conferences to bring to light the harmful effects of napalm and other incendiary weapons.

(Mr. Tracore, Mali)

However, although it voted in favour of the draft resolution, my delegation believes that the formulation of operative paragraph 1 would have been far better understood and would have been in accordance with our ideas on disarmament in general if the sponsors had adhered to the initial wording of the draft resolution. Because of the words "in circumstances where it may affect human beings", and so on, in a sense weakens the condemnation which we consider that there should now be an unconditional condemnation of the use of napalm. We wonder whether this wording does not diminish the scope of operative paragraph 1. Because, if we say we condemn the use of napalm in circumstances where it may affect human beings and so on, then the question is who would have the sad task of assessing the risk? We believe that the use of napalm should be condemned without reservation, and that is why, although we voted in favour of the draft resolution, we have reservations on the second part of operative paragraph 1 -- that is to say, on the words "in circumstances where it may affect human beings or may cause damage to the environment and/or natural resources".

Mr. NEUGEBAUER (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic is very much concerned about the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in armed conflicts. The use of these weapons has given rise to strong opposition on the part of Governments and public opinion in many countries, including our own. Nobody can forget the picture of the victims of napalm in Viet-Nam. Now we are alarmed at the use of this very weapon in the Middle East. In both cases, large numbers of civilians were the victims of this cruel weapon. In both cases, it was a weapon serving aggression.

Therefore, my delegation strongly supports the main idea of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.197 Rev.2. But there is still the question of which organ should deal with the matter. We advocate that the prohibition of the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons should be placed on the agenda of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. That body is, in our view, the competent organ to deal with such a problem. It is this very fact that also prevented our delegation from supporting the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.196 and it is also the reason that my delegation abstained in the voting we just had.

Mr. OLCAY (Turkey) (interpretation from French): I would first like to associate my Government and my delegation with the condolences which have been expressed by our Organization to Burma and to the family of U Thant on the occasion of his death. After everything that has been said, I shall confine myself to repeating the sentence which I believe on such occasions always sums up the sense of loss which we feel in the death of a great man: the world is the poorer for it.

The Turkish vote on the draft resolution just adopted here reflects the hesitation of my delegation as to the justification of the manner in which the matter was approached. Not only does the text confine itself to condemning one use of napalm, which has, unfortunately, many uses which should equally be prohibited, but it does not take account of the need to consider this problem in forums that are technically, legally and politically more appropriate. I would also like to stress in this that the favourable vote of my delegation on the text submitted by Sweden last week indicates the attitude of my Government on this subject.

I would have confined myself to this statement and to these simple remarks if, as I had thought would happen, simple decency had directed the representative of the Greek Cypriot administration who preceded me to hold his peace, in spite of the subterfuge of not actually mentioning here, today the name of my country -- something he does in all the committees when he speaks of my country. I think this does require an answer from me. I do not want to be hypocritically polite and to remain silent.

(Mr. Olcay, Turkey)

If there is a blood-stained administration which, not content with internecine killing from time to time, at regular intervals creates bloodbaths among the Turkish Cypriots of Cyprus and repeatedly -- not today and not right now -- has made attacks, scarcely veiled attacks, about the way in which military operations were carried out by my country in Cyprus --

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Cyprus on a point of order.

Mr. FOSSILES (Cyprus): Here we have a discussion on napalm bombs. I have spoken in favour of the draft resolution which was just adopted and I thought, as you had thought originally, that it should have been adopted unanimously. I said that if remarks are made about one country having used it and that therefore it is an international crime in that case, then it should be an international crime equally in the case of use by another country. I did not mention which country. The guilty party, feeling the guilt of it, jumped up to reply. I should be very happy to hear him reply if he was going to say that he had not used the napalm bomb or if he was going to say that the napalm bomb in that case was a justified weapon to be used. But to start a long tirade of unreal, unproven things which he had said on previous occasions and which were effectively answered, merely in order to confuse the issue, is out of order. If he is going to say anything in respect of napalm bombs he can say whatever he likes: as to whether or not they used them, or they properly used them, he should not start a slander which has nothing to do with this matter because we can discuss it at any other time he likes. Not during the discussion of this item on napalm bombs.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should be grateful to the representative of Turkey if, in his statement explaining his vote, which has now acquired the nature of a right of reply, he could, in so far as is possible, abide by the rules we have adopted in the Committee, namely, to speak only to the item under consideration.

Mr. ●LCAY (Turkey) (interpretation from French): The simple fact that I dealt with this matter in the way I did is because of the fact that I am not, and my country and delegation do not like hypocrisy. Therefore the fact of mentioning my country without naming it is a subterfuge which seemed to me to warrant a reply with regard to the substance of the question. But I agree I should not transcend the context of the subject and would simply like to say that it is not very appropriate for the delegation of an administration which has committed bloody crimes against the Turks of Cyprus, to become a judge about the actions of my own country. That is all I wanted to say, but I shall continue on this subject.

We do not approve of the use of any weapons. Certainly we do not approve of the use of a weapon which cannot be aimed with such accuracy that it does not represent a threat to civilian targets. We feel even more pronounced disgust about actions the only object of which is the massacre of innocents, which is the favoured method of the compatriots of Ambassador Rossides, as witnessed by what we discovered throughout Cypriot territory. That is something which has been true for more than a decade now. That is why I do not think that there is any real reason to treat the Greek Cypriots more gently than the Turkish population of Cyprus.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): Mr. Chairman, may I at the outset associate my delegation with the tribute you, Sir, and other previous speakers paid to the memory of U Thant. Secondly, I wish to express my regret to members of this Committee, and especially to the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic, for arriving here a few minutes too late to cast a vote when the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2 was put to the vote. I should like to place it on record that had my delegation been present it would have voted in the affirmative.

Things are hotting up in the plenary Assembly and a vote will soon be taken on the question of Cambodia. I am hoping to be able to be present here in the first Committee when the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707 on the world disarmament conference is put to the vote. Should I find it difficult to do so, in view of my duties in the plenary Assembly, I wish to place it on record as of now that my intention is to vote in favour of the draft resolution. I should

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

be grateful, therefore, if the Secretariat would make a note of my statement and if procedure so allows, record an affirmative vote for Mauritius in the event of the absence of my delegation; otherwise, to record my intention to vote in favour without the necessity of my taking the floor again.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I have no more speakers on the list in explanation of vote. Having thus concluded the explanations of vote after the vote I shall call on other delegations on the list. I first call on the representative of Israel.

Mr. ERELL (Israel): I asked to speak in order to exercise my right of reply in reference to certain remarks made by the representative of the Soviet Union when he explained his vote on the previous draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Unfortunately I have not been taking an active part in the work of the First Committee lately and should therefore like to know whether the procedure in the First Committee is similar with regard to the exercise of rights of reply to that of the Assembly. In the Assembly we normally have the rights of reply at the end of the meeting. We are now at the height of the meeting. We voted on one draft resolution and we are now going to vote on another, so I am wondering whether it is appropriate for the representative of Israel to exercise his right of reply? If we apply the same rules of procedure in the First Committee as we do in the plenary of the General Assembly, then he could very well speak at the end of the meeting of the Committee after the vote on the second draft resolution. I should simply like clarification on this point.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The procedure followed in each Committee is always left to the Chairman, as is indicated in the rules of procedure which state that the Chairman is primarily responsible for conducting the debates. In the First Committee so far, since the beginning of

(The Chairman)

this session, we have called on speakers in exercise of rights of reply for each item under discussion. Since what we are now discussing is a draft resolution on napalm which has been adopted, and in the course of the debate on which some assessments have been made which in the opinion of the delegations concerned require a reply, the Chairman, following past practice, gives the right of reply to representatives who wish to exercise it on that same item. The representative of Israel has the floor.

Mr. EMMEL (Israel): I am grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to proceed. The delegation of the Soviet Union was unable to support a draft resolution presented by Syria. Accordingly, the Soviet representative abstained in the vote. So, in order to provide what is called in the United States a "consolation prize" to the Arabs, he saw fit to identify himself with attacks based on untruthful allegations which were made in this Committee by the Arab countries in the course of its earlier deliberations.

(Mr. Erell, Israel)

These allegations were that Israel was attacking refugee camps. I should like to make it absolutely clear once again that there is no truth whatsoever in these allegations. If the Soviet representative had read carefully the record of our discussions in this Committee, he would have noticed that there was at least one Arab delegation which had the honesty and the courage to say that Israel was attacking what he called commando camps. We would rather call them apartment-house commandos, but that is quite another matter. If there was any sincerity in the attitude of the Soviet representative in the context in which he spoke, then he would have used his time much better to ponder the fact that the terrorist camps which are being attacked by Israel send out people armed with Soviet weapons to murder women and children in apartment houses in Israeli towns. He might also have considered that he could to much better purpose devote his attention to the fact that Syria used napalm in its aggressive attack on Israel in 1973, and also to the fact that another Arab country, a neighbour of Syria, is using napalm in its war of extermination against a Kurdish community.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): First of all, the representative of Turkey violates every rule of procedure in this Committee by calling the representative of Cyprus the representative of the Greek administration. If one representative can call another anything but what his credentials show him to be, then I could call him many names which would suit him, but that would be turning this Committee into a jungle, which is what the representative of Turkey and his country want to turn the world into. He brings Turkey's arbitrary conduct in the world community, the aggression against Cyprus, into this Committee by calling the other representatives names. He can call any name.

Secondly, in all the cases in which they have brought accusations against Cyprus as regards "bloody government", and so on, they have not only not produced any proof but not mentioned a single instance, whereas in the Security Council we gave a list of some of the crimes they have committed, with all the details. In answer to that they made slanderous allegations just to throw mud and dust in the eyes of those who are following the matter, without any regard for responsible statements, and not backed up by any proof or any suggestion that their allegations have any basis. We produced all the reports

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

of the Secretary-General for the 11 years during which they say the Turkish Cypriots suffered under the Cyprus administration, and the reports point out that they were suffering at the hands of their own leaders. We quoted them and we could easily quote them again, but I do not want to take up the time of this Committee. The representative of Turkey was not able to reply in the Security Council when all these proofs were given, but he comes to another Committee and throws out the same slander. Are we to bring all the evidence forward again here?

I think he should not be allowed by way of reply to answer in any other way than to the point. The representative of Israel answered to the point regarding napalm bombs; he accused others of using napalm bombs. But the representative of Turkey does not speak of napalm bombs. He just makes arbitrary statements in an arbitrary, irregular and disorderly way, and this should not be allowed.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): May I draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that I have three more speakers on my list to exercise their right of reply. Very little time remains and the purpose of the meeting of this Committee this afternoon was to vote on two draft resolutions. May I appeal, therefore, to delegations which are on the list to reply, when they do so, in such a way as to place clearly on record the views of their delegations, without provoking new counter-exercise of the right of reply, because that would take up all the time available to us.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to explain very briefly that the history of Israeli representatives at the United Nations proves beyond any doubt that their presence in this Organization is for the purpose of distorting facts. Syria has not used and will not use napalm and therefore wishes to establish this fact beyond any doubt. Israel, on the other hand, has used napalm throughout its long history, uses it every day and insists on using it in the future, whether against military personnel or civilians, and even against the camps of the Palestinian refugees who have been expelled from their country by all kinds

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

of terrorism. Its war against the Arabs and the Palestinian refugees is a war of extermination and not a war in any other sense of the word.

Sufficient to prove the real intention of Israel and its determination to use napalm against the Arabs without any discrimination between children, women, civilians or military personnel or as regards the environment or natural resources is its abstention in the vote on this humanitarian draft resolution which has been adopted by the majority of the members of this Committee.

Therefore I should like to state once more that we have documents which prove beyond doubt that Israel has used napalm even against civilians, and that with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to submit these documents at any time you wish.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The representative of Syria has made my task easier. He has shown and proved that the statement and declarations of the representative of Israel about what he calls the non-use by the Israeli military of napalm is, to put it mildly, an untruth. It is quite clear from this that there is just one conclusion to be drawn. The statement of the representative of Israel is one more piece of evidence of the fact that the ruling circles in Israel have learned nothing in the course of their catastrophic international political defeat at this session of the General Assembly and have forgotten nothing of their bloody, aggressive policy towards the Arab countries. Apparently they do not want to realize their profound moral and political isolation in the United Nations and throughout the world because of their provocative aggressive policy. In all probability in Tel Aviv they still have not recovered from their chauvinistic fever and are still relying on blackmail, political provocation and threats of provocative actions not only with regard to the Arab States but towards the United Nations as a whole, and accordingly with regard to the overwhelming majority of the States Members of this Organization.

We have already said, and I stress once again, that the hopes of the Israeli ruling circles for success in their policy of provocation and defiance, and the policy of force, even going so far as to use napalm -- as confirmed today by the representative of Syria -- against the Arab countries and the Palestinians, is a tremendous miscalculation which is fraught with serious consequences, and by no means least for Israel itself and its people.

It is precisely from this standpoint that the Soviet delegation supported the motives which prompted the delegation of Syria to put forward the draft resolution just adopted by the Committee.

Mr. GUVEN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): I shall not reply to Mr. Rossides since my Ambassador told him everything he deserved.

Mr. ERELL (Israel): I should like to tell the Committee that my delegation was completely unimpressed with the threats of the Soviet representative, with the fresh evidence which he gave of the close and complete collaboration between his country and Syria, which attacked Israel in 1973 and which makes no secret of its intention and wish to see what it can do to bring about Israel's end.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic on a point of order.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The Israeli representative speaks on issues unrelated to the item under discussion. Now we are speaking about napalm and the prohibition of the use of napalm, and the condemnation of such use, and we should not discuss other matters unrelated to the subject. Mr. Chairman, I should like you to call him to order.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that what we have been discussing is napalm. There is no limit to the verbal duels which can occur when one delegation, in the exercise of its right of reply, addresses itself to another delegation by mentioning any other matter which is not under debate. I therefore believe that we should consider that we have concluded this exercise of respective rights of reply. To end the matter, I shall call on the representative of Israel, but I shall ask him not to make incursions on other subjects which are not under debate now.

Mr. ERELL (Israel): I believe that it was the distinguished and experienced representative of the Soviet Union who led the discussion far outside the limit within which it was being conducted, and if he is called to order, I shall certainly not wish to proceed.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I was talking about napalm. The representative of Syria confirmed that I was right.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): If the Committee has no objection, I think we should consider that we have come to the end of the rights of reply. I think I have been impartial and fair in giving all delegations an opportunity to speak and state their views, but I very much fear that if we continue this debate, we shall not end on time with the adoption of the draft resolution. The points of view of various delegations who have spoken in the exercise of the right of reply will appear in the verbatim record. It seems to me that all have adduced arguments to prove their respective points of view. So I appeal to the delegations that we consider this matter to have come to an end and that we now proceed to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.701.

Before doing so, I shall call on the representative of Zaire for an announcement in regard to his delegation.

Mr. KAM (Zaire) (interpretation from French): To start with, my delegation associates itself with the tribute you have paid to the memory of U Thant. We express to the Government of Burma, as well as to the family of the deceased, our most heartfelt condolences.

As regards the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2, I wish to say that had my delegation been present, we would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Accordingly, we shall now proceed to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.703, on agenda item 34, relating to the "World Disarmament Conference", which was presented at the beginning of the meeting this afternoon by the representative of Mexico.

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

Mr. SCALABRE (France) (interpretation from French): I believe it is fitting to recall, since we are devoting this meeting to disarmament, that U Thant, whose passing away we mourn, always considered that this was one of the most important matters of our times. He was a man of peace and I think we can bestow upon him no nobler title. Let us hope that the aim he always proposed to us during his life will remain ours now that he is gone.

As soon as the idea of a world disarmament conference was advanced by the Soviet Union, France has upheld the principle. It seemed to us in fact that it was necessary to give new impetus to the efforts of the international community to solve a problem which is vital for the world. No one can deny that we are now in a deadlock. Resolutions pile up, conventions succeed one another, but weapons none the less continue to be stockpiled and perfected.

It must therefore seem that our approach to the problem has been a bad one so far and that the agencies we have set up to solve the problem are not suited to their task.

We must tackle the problem of true disarmament, that of the most powerful, rather than pursue in vain the disarmament of the disarmed or hide behind futile paper barriers.

(Mr. Scalabre, France)

The purpose that the world disarmament conference must set itself is clear: to undertake the progressive and controlled destruction of weapons and to create organs capable of carrying out this programme -- in a word, at last to find a way out of the rut in which we have been sunk for so long.

My delegation therefore gives its total support to the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.703) in the hope that this text will enjoy the support of all the Powers -- and in particular the nuclear Powers, without which no serious disarmament effort can be attempted.

I should like here to salute and thank those who have given their best to the prudent but constant progress of our work towards the convening of a world conference: in particular, Ambassador Hoveyda of Iran, thanks to whose wisdom we can today affirm that the road before us is now more open.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/L.703) which Ambassador Garcia Robles has just introduced represents substantial progress in comparison with the resolutions previously adopted by the General Assembly on the subject. It recognizes that the search for conclusions and recommendations is within the terms of reference of the Ad Hoc Committee entrusted with studying the conditions for holding a world disarmament conference. The draft very wisely determines that those conclusions and recommendations are to be adopted by consensus, because no valid achievement can be made on the subject without the consent of all. This is a difficulty which we shall have to overcome, but which is already known to us. The draft resolution (A/C.1/L.703) courageously recognizes its existence; at the same time, it marks the beginning of a new, perhaps decisive, phase, and we congratulate its sponsors.

I should like to declare, on behalf of my delegation, that we shall endeavour to contribute to the achievement of the necessary consensus, and shall unreservedly contribute to the implementation of a project to which we are more attached than to any other, since it seems likely to bring us closer to what may be the major achievement of the century: the understanding of genuine and controlled disarmament, that will finally free the world of the spectre of war and allow it to devote itself to peaceful enterprises.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, my delegation wishes, first of all, to associate itself with your words which expressed our general feeling on the passing of that enlightened and unforgettable former Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant.

My delegation will support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.703, which we hope will be unanimously adopted by the First Committee. In our view, this draft contains all the necessary elements to render the future work of the Ad Hoc Committee effective and useful in clearing the way and facilitating our progress towards a world disarmament conference. The draft resolution recognizes that a decision to convene the conference is not feasible at this time. This circumstance must be duly taken into account, but it should not discourage those who are interested in the noble objectives pursued here. The draft resolution therefore rightly advocates that Governments should continue to co-operate and to make known their views on changes in circumstances which might influence their respective attitudes. This is especially important in regard to Powers such as the nuclear States, for example, which have special responsibilities when it comes to disarmament.

The Ad Hoc Committee is to carry out an analytical study of this material, not limiting itself to a repetition or reflection of the various points of view, but striving to inquire into the meaning and consequences of the existence of diverse positions which in part coincide and, in part -- at least apparently -- are contradictory, regarding the world disarmament conference. If this study is carried out with the hoped for seriousness and impartiality by the members of the Committee and by the great Powers, which are to co-operate with it, we may expect the General Assembly at its thirtieth session to be in a position to consider this matter, since it will be in possession of new elements for a decision which will make possible effective and realistic progress towards the creation of a universal forum to deal with this most grave and urgent world-wide problem of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

For these reasons, my delegation unreservedly supports this appropriate and important draft resolution, and will take special satisfaction in participating in the unanimous decision which we expect on it.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As no other delegation wishes to explain its vote before the vote, we may now proceed to the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.703.

The representative of Mexico, in introducing this draft, made reference to the intensive negotiations and consultations which took place during its preparation, particularly among the representatives of the five nuclear-weapon States. I would not wish, however, to make an incorrect assessment by assuming that it can be adopted unanimously. I shall therefore consult the Committee as to whether it has any objections to the draft's unanimous adoption. I would again point out that if any delegation requests a vote, we shall have a formal vote.

There are no objections, but before declaring the draft resolution adopted, I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee to outline the administrative and financial implications of this draft.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee): Under the terms of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.703, the General Assembly is requested to decide that the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference shall resume its work on 1 April 1975, and shall submit a report to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session.

The Secretary-General understands that the Ad Hoc Committee would plan to meet in three sessions, with two meetings daily, during 1975, namely, 3-4 April, 7-15 July, and 25-29 August. On the assumption that interpretation would be required in Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish, the Secretary-General estimates that the cost of holding the sessions of the Ad Hoc Committee would amount to approximately \$285,500, comprising \$5,500 for interpretation, \$133,000 for translation, typing and reproduction of summary records, and \$47,700 for reproduction of documentation in the five languages.

Should any language not be required as a working language of the Ad Hoc Committee, the estimates could consequently be reduced. Accordingly, should the assumption stated at the outset of my remarks be accepted by the First Committee, and should the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.703 be adopted by the Assembly, an additional appropriation, provisionally estimated at \$285,500, would be required, under section 3 of the programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): If hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.703 unanimously.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Before I call upon delegations wishing to explain their positions, I should like on behalf of the Committee to say that we are most grateful to the representative of Mexico, Ambassador Garcia Robles, for his strenuous efforts to arrive at a text of the kind we have just voted on deserving of the unanimous support of this Committee.

I also wish on behalf of the Committee to address my congratulations and express my gratitude to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee Ambassador Ferayoun Hovakimyan of Iran, who strove so devotedly to that end, and to the Chairman of the Working Group, Minister Antonio Elias of Spain.

I shall now call upon representatives wishing to speak in explanation of their positions.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the draft resolution just adopted by the First Committee on the question of the world disarmament conference, the initiators and sponsors of which were the delegations of a group of non-aligned countries -- Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, India and Mexico -- the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement.

As has already been repeatedly pointed out in statements of the USSR delegation in the United Nations, the Soviet Union has always supported the immediate convening of a world disarmament conference, and that support has been based upon the assumption that a properly prepared conference would promote the further normalization of international relations and would give a strong boost to the implementation of new measures in the field of disarmament and the reduction of the arms race.

Many of those who have spoken on disarmament questions in the First Committee and in the course of the general debate of the General Assembly have quite rightly pointed out that favourable conditions have now

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

been created for the earliest possible convening of a world disarmament conference thanks to the fundamental positive changes that have occurred in the international political climate. The USSR delegation shares that view.

Recently, Comrade Brezhnev, speaking in Ulan Bator on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Mongolian People's Republic, stated:

"In conditions of early détente and easing of international tension we find ever more broadly and clearly expressed the aspirations of countries towards the elimination of the threat of war, towards genuine lasting peace and fruitful co-operation. Movement towards that goal requires a stubborn political struggle to overcome the resistance of many who are aggressive or simply have untoward thoughts. However, in spite of many obstacles, powerful trends towards détente and peace are gaining ground."

The Soviet delegation considers that in the circumstances the question of the implementation of new broad multilateral steps in disarmament is becoming particularly timely. As members are aware, one such step was the recent and first meeting in the Vladivostok region, between the President of the United States, Mr. Ford, and the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR, Comrade Brezhnev. In the course of that meeting, which took place in a very good and constructive atmosphere, there was a new confirmation and development of the policy of improving Soviet-American relations that has been noticeable in recent years. Furthermore, both parties to that meeting quite clearly and definitely confirmed their determination to act in such a way that the increasing development of relations may more effectively serve the resolution of the historical problems involved in ridding mankind of the threat of a new world war and strengthening universal peace.

That was the major purpose of the meeting. In his speech in Ulan Bator yesterday, to which I have already referred, summing up the meeting with President Ford in Vladivostok, Comrade Brezhnev said:

"It is natural, therefore, that in talks very great importance should be attached to the search for new mutually acceptable possibilities for limiting and subsequently reducing missiles and other nuclear weapons. And comrades, one can quite safely say that in that regard substantial progress was made at the Vladivostok meeting. We agreed with President Ford

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

that in the course of the next few months work would be done in reaching agreement on this matter, which is so important for the peace and well-being not only of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States but of the whole of mankind. In the light of what has been said, it is quite understandable that the results of the new Soviet-American summit meeting have met with a very favourable and broad response throughout the world, and" -- he stressed this -- "we note that with great satisfaction, since in such responses we see manifested very powerful international support for the policy of peace and international co-operation pursued by our party and by the Soviet State."

A guarantee of further success in the preparatory work for the convening of a world disarmament conference is provided by the favourable experience of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee for a World Disarmament Conference under the leadership of the representative of Iran, Ambassador Hoveyda. That Committee undertook an extremely important and useful analysis of the views and proposals of the Governments of almost all States Members of the United Nations with regard to the advisability of convening a world disarmament conference and presented to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session a comprehensive report on the subject, reference to which is made in the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee.

We can express satisfaction that in the resolution just adopted provision is made for further work by this Committee. We are convinced that, in addition to the members of the Committee named in that resolution, and apart from the Soviet Union, two other nuclear Powers will be participating more actively: the United Kingdom and France.

The statement we have just heard from the representative of France gives us hope that France will take an active part in the Committee's work. We are firmly convinced that that is a favourable development and as far as we know many other members of the Committee share our conviction that that position will be further developed and consolidated in the future work of the Committee.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

One of the speakers here, the representative of Spain, has already expressed regret at the fact that there are still two nuclear Powers standing apart from preparations for a world disarmament conference, and we associate ourselves with this expression of regret. So far they prefer to co-operate with the Committee or maintain contacts with its Chairman without directly becoming members of this important working body of the United Nations. However, we are convinced that in time they, too, will respond favourably to the appeal of all the other Members of the United Nations and will review their attitude to the question of convening a world disarmament conference.

We continue to believe that it is the duty and obligation of all States, primarily the permanent members of the Security Council which, under the United Nations Charter, bear primary responsibility for the maintenance and preservation of international peace and security, to involve themselves actively in the work which should finally lead to the convening of a world disarmament conference.

It is precisely from this standpoint that we supported the resolution and the renewed appeal it makes to States possessing nuclear weapons to co-operate or maintain contact with the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee for the World Disarmament Conference. In other words, to cease their boycott of its work and, along with other States, to ensure that concrete recommendations are made on practical questions connected with the convening of the Conference. This is precisely what is wished for by the overwhelming majority of the Member States in the United Nations, particularly the non-aligned States which initiated the idea of a world disarmament conference. It is precisely they -- as was pointed out here today, and we were reminded of this in the Committee by the representative of Mexico, Mr. Garcia Robles, beginning in 1961 with the Belgrade Conference -- who supported this and repeated decisions have been taken calling for the convening of a world disarmament conference. And they still continue to support the convening of a world disarmament conference. This is shown by the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference and also the general debate in the General Assembly and the discussion of the question of disarmament in the First Committee of the Assembly.

The convening of a world disarmament conference is supported by the overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations, and this is shown by the resolutions on a world disarmament conference adopted unanimously at the twenty-sixth, twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth sessions of the General Assembly, and today's resolution adopted by the First Committee at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly. No one voted against those resolutions. Of course, the resolution just adopted by the First Committee is still far from perfect. It is quite obviously a compromise. Therefore, the delegation of the USSR cannot fail to reserve its position with regard to the last paragraph of the preamble of this resolution which contains, if I may so put it, a somewhat pessimistic provision to the effect that:

"... it does not yet seem possible to reach a final conclusion with regard to the convening of a world disarmament conference."

We know the consultations about this paragraph. However, in the view of the Soviet delegation -- this is something we said repeatedly -- this matter has long ago been positively settled in favour of the convening of a world disarmament conference. We needed a compromise for this. However, the final conclusion in this matter is clear to the majority.

The convening of a world disarmament conference is necessary. It is important, therefore, not to revert to the past and not to mark time, but to take effective measures to eliminate the last remaining impediments and obstacles and to move forward towards the preparation and convening of the conference. There can be no justification for any arguments in favour of any further delay in this matter. Furthermore, it can do direct damage to the cause of limiting armaments and disarmament and hence to peace and security and the cessation of the senseless arms race which swallows up \$250,000 million a year which are so essential for the peoples, for the purposes of national development and primarily for the developing States.

In the draft resolution adopted, provision is made for studying the fundamental purposes of the conference and the presentation by the Ad Hoc Committee of the conclusions and recommendations on comments on this question to be sent in by Member Governments by 31 March 1975 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. We view this as a new mandate for the Committee and

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

a step forward towards a more concrete consideration of the practical aspects of preparations for convening the Conference. And in this sense we entirely agree with the statement just made by the representative of France when he said that this resolution opens up a new stage.

As we know, after the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, a similar appeal was made to the Governments of all Member States of the United Nations to communicate their views and ideas with regard to a world disarmament conference. On the basis of the answers coming in from Governments and also the views stated by delegations at the General Assembly, it has become quite obvious that an absolute majority of Member States of the United Nations are in favour of convening a conference. A new round of appeals to States is a further development in this direction. In accordance with this new appeal we should expect that States will answer the question of how they view a world disarmament conference, what should be its fundamental goals, orientation, and what are the major questions it should consider. And we can be sure that many States will do this as thoroughly as the Governments of the USSR and Mexico and a number of other countries did, presenting their answers on the question of a world disarmament conference as far back as 1972.

I should like to refer to the Mexican document of 1972 on this question. Even at that time I called it the "Robles document". And I should like to draw the attention of all delegations and hence the Governments of Member States of the United Nations to that document. A responsible approach on the part of States towards the recommendations contained in this resolution which has been adopted and a thorough study of the answers to be sent in by Governments will make it possible for the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference to consider the question of the fundamental aims of the Conference in their full scope and to make the appropriate positive conclusions and recommendations to the thirtieth session of the General Assembly.

.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

As for the Soviet delegation, we wish to state our readiness to co-operate actively with all members of the Ad Hoc Committee in the search for a successful conclusion of the task before it.

In conclusion, I should like to express my gratitude to the sponsors of the draft resolution -- the representatives of Mexico, Algeria, Afghanistan, India, Yugoslavia and your own delegation, Mr. Chairman, Argentina, and you personally -- for the efforts made to ensure the unanimous adoption of this draft resolution. We are convinced that the sponsors of the resolution, along with other members of the Committee, will do everything they can to ensure that in the course of its further work the Ad Hoc Committee will achieve progress in concrete preparations for the earliest possible convening of a world disarmament conference.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As no other delegation wishes to explain its vote after the vote, I call now on the representative of Spain, who has asked to make a comment.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): In the interpretation into Spanish of the statement just made by the representative of the Soviet Union, it seemed to me that I heard him say that the delegation of Spain had expressed regret because of a lack of co-operation of the nuclear States with the Ad Hoc Committee. If that is not what Ambassador Malik said, I apologize at once.

At any rate, I have given a copy of my statement to the Secretariat, and if there has been any misunderstanding I should like to request permission to read out the last paragraph of my explanation of vote which I believe may have given rise to Ambassador Malik's interpretation. I said the following:

"The draft resolution recognizes that a decision to convene the conference is not feasible at this time. This circumstance must be duly taken into account, but it should not discourage those who are interested in the noble objective pursued here. The draft resolution therefore rightly advocates that Governments should continue to co-operate and make known their views on changes in circumstances which might influence their respective attitudes. This is especially important in regard to Powers such as the nuclear States, for example, which have special responsibilities when it comes to disarmament." (Supra, p. 72)

Best Copy Available

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I apologize to the representative of Spain for perhaps incorrectly understanding the Russian interpretation of his words. But I thought he was laying stress on the particular responsibility of the five permanent members of the Security Council, which are at the same time nuclear Powers and whose participation is highly desirable and even essential in preparations for and the convening of a world disarmament conference. I am sure that we agree on that.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As no further representative wishes to speak, by the adoption of the two draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.698/Rev.2 and A/C.1/L.703 we have thus concluded consideration of all the disarmament items.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to announce that the delegation of Uganda has joined the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.677 on the question of Korea.

Before adjourning, I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that next week there will be no afternoon meeting either on Tuesday or on Thursday. We shall meet on all the other days. In this connexion I should like to ask representatives whose names have been inscribed on the list for the debate on the question of Korea on two or more dates -- with the clarification that these are tentative inscriptions -- bearing in mind what has already been said about our schedule of meetings, to confirm one of the dates and leave the others free, since tentative inscriptions often prevent delegations having the firm intention of participating from doing so.

As the Committee is aware, we shall resume the debate on the question of Korea when the Assembly has concluded consideration of the question of Cambodia. May I therefore request that representatives consult the Journal for the next meeting of this Committee, when that question has been concluded by the Assembly.

I am told by the Secretariat that, at any rate and as we agreed upon earlier, there will be no meeting tomorrow, Thanksgiving Day, either in the morning or in the afternoon, so that if any meeting of this Committee is held this week, it will be on Friday and the announcement will be published in the Journal.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.