

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION

*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE

44th meeting

held on

Wednesday, 25 November 1981

at 3 p.m.

New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 44TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39, 41, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55 and 135 (continued)

A draft resolution was introduced by:

Mr. Martin (New Zealand) - A/C.1/36/L.54

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/36/PV.44
6 January 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39, 41, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55 and 135 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue to take action upon all draft resolutions under the agenda items relating to disarmament. We shall first consider draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.34/Rev.1, relating to agenda item 46 'Establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East'. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the Committee's thirty-eighth meeting on 20 November. In the light of the revision to the draft resolution, the Chair understands that consideration of the amendment contained in document A/C.1/36/L.53 is not required.

May I take it that the Committee can adopt draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.34/Rev.1 without vote? Is there any objection?

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.34/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon representatives wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East is certainly one of the most urgent and important questions before this Committee, particularly in view of the explosive situation in the region.

Iraq has fully supported all previous draft resolutions on this item. It is a question of vital interest to our region. We strongly believe in the absolute necessity of preventing the production, acquisition or stockpiling of nuclear weapons in the area. My country was among the first to join the Non-Proliferation Treaty and place all of its nuclear installations under the comprehensive international safeguards system.

Since the adoption of last year's resolution, however, an unprecedented act of aggression by Israel was committed against the safeguarded nuclear

(Mr. Al-Zahawi, Iraq)

facility in Iraq. The Security Council discussed the matter last June, and in its resolution 487 (1981) it expressed its deep concern about the danger to international peace and security created by the premeditated Israeli air attack on Iraqi nuclear installations which, in the Council's words,

"could at any time explode the situation in the area, with grave consequences for the vital interests of all States".

The Security Council also considered that the said attack

"constitutes a serious threat to the entire IAEA safeguards régime which is the foundation of the non-proliferation Treaty."

A resolution adopted by the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) Board of Governors on 12 June 1981 also expressed its consideration that, in addition to affecting the peace and security of the region, this military action had shown clear disregard for the Agency's safeguards régime and the Non-Proliferation Treaty and could do great harm to the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The Board of Governors further expressed its grave concern at the far-reaching implications of such a military attack on the peaceful nuclear facilities of a member State.

Furthermore, the General Conference of the IAEA adopted another resolution on 26 September in which it considered the Israeli act of aggression against the safeguarded Iraqi nuclear installations as constituting an attack against the Agency and its safeguards régime, which is the foundation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The Committee on Disarmament, in adopting its report on 23 September 1981, also underlined the gravity of the Israeli attack and its consequences for international non-proliferation efforts and peaceful nuclear co-operation. The Committee further expressed its unanimous recognition of the necessity of ensuring against the repetition of such an attack on nuclear facilities by Israel or by any other State. The call for the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities was widely supported.

(Mr. Al-Zahawi, Iraq)

On 11 November, the General Assembly adopted a resolution containing a paragraph which considered the premeditated Israeli air attack as constituting a serious threat to the entire International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and to the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. In another paragraph in that same resolution, the General Assembly called upon all States fully to respect their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, including in particular any armed attack on its nuclear installations. It is interesting to note that Israel did not participate in the vote on the second amendment, which was adopted by 129 to none, with two abstentions.

It has been established that Israel is the only party in the region with a nuclear capability. Israel has adamantly refused to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards, in spite of repeated calls by the General Assembly and the Security Council for it to do so. The draft resolution in document A/C.1/36/L.34 failed to take note of or to take into consideration all those momentous developments and decisions by various United Nations bodies and the IAEA. The amendments submitted in document A/C.1/36/L.53 did attempt to take account of those developments and of the very legitimate concerns expressed by the majority of countries in the region. As to the draft resolution we are now considering, however, L.34/Rev.1, we find it to be a merely procedural draft. We have gone along with it, but we still feel that it is highly unsatisfactory. It has been presented in a haphazard manner at a very late hour, and it does not take into consideration the crucial developments in the region or the legitimate concern of the majority of the countries in the region.

In our view, the situation calls for a basic reappraisal of the entire question of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the area. By merely presenting last year's resolution to the special session on disarmament, we feel the Committee would be failing to fulfil the duty incumbent upon it.

(Mr. Al-Zahawi, Iraq)

We would suggest that the Chair consider the possibility of not closing consideration of this agenda item in order that the subject might be treated in a more satisfactory manner during this session.

Mr. RAJOKOSKI (Finland): The delegation of Finland joining the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.34/Rev.1. We all recall that a year ago the General Assembly adopted by consensus resolution 35/147 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. At that time, we welcomed that resolution and its adoption by consensus.

In that resolution, all the parties concerned committed themselves to the idea of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region. We therefore also concur with, and would have fully supported, the provisions of the original version of draft resolution L.34. In particular, we consider that the establishment of the envisaged zone would greatly enhance international peace and security, that adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty by all States of the region would be conducive to the speedy establishment of such a zone and that further steps should be taken towards that goal.

My delegation regrets that at this time it did not prove possible to arrive at a consensus on a draft resolution that would have dealt with the matter in a more substantive way.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): I should like to make a few remarks on behalf of the ten member States of the European Community about draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.34/Rev.1, dealing with the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, which this Committee has just adopted by consensus.

The General Assembly has for some years now endorsed the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, and in paragraphs 60-64 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament various considerations involved in the establishment of such zones are set out in some detail. In addition, the circumstances in which nuclear-weapon-free zones might be set up were examined in the study by governmental experts of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all aspects, which was completed in 1975 and was welcomed in General Assembly resolution 3472(XXX) of the General Assembly.

The ten member States of the European Community have consistently supported the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones, for a number of reasons. The establishment of a properly conceived nuclear-weapon-free zone in appropriate areas, such as the Middle East, with the full agreement of all the States of the region concerned, could considerably enhance the security of countries in the region, stimulate arms-control efforts, both on a regional basis and more widely, and help to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In addition, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in those conditions would make a significant contribution to efforts to arrive at world-wide nuclear disarmament in the framework of our efforts towards general and complete disarmament.

It is in this light that the member States of the European Community welcomed the original draft of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.34 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, which requested the appointment of a special envoy of the Secretary-General who would be sent to obtain the views of Middle-East States on the modalities for the establishment of such a zone. This seemed to us to aim straight at the heart of the matter.

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

In order for a proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone to meet with success, it is essential that it be based on arrangements freely arrived at among the States of that region. It therefore seemed a very practical approach for the views of the States of the Middle East to be solicited on this issue. We regret that in the event it has not been possible to do anything more than to pass a procedural draft resolution on this item this year.

The Ten will continue to support the establishment of a properly constituted nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): We had hoped to vote in favour of the original draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.34, as we felt strongly about this constructive proposal put forward by the Egyptian delegation. Moreover, the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones in appropriate areas has long been supported by the United States, and it is our policy to continue to support their development. However, we have joined in the consensus resulting from the revision to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.34.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.34/Rev.1.

Before we proceed to the next draft resolution, I shall call on the representative of Argentina, who wishes to introduce a revision of a draft resolution that we are to consider later.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): As the Committee's agenda is overloaded, I shall reduce this statement to a minimum in introducing the revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43, which has already been distributed.

The Argentine delegation, on behalf of the group of co-sponsors, had introduced the draft resolution in A/C.1/36/L.43, on the prevention of nuclear war. As I explained then, the main purpose of the

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

draft resolution was to obtain views, proposals and practical suggestions from States possessing nuclear weapons on that question. While that was what it sought first and foremost - I emphasized the words "first and foremost" - since the nuclear-weapon States are the ones which possess the main instruments which might unleash a nuclear war. All of this, as I explained in my presentation of the draft resolution, was part of a process that was to be followed by the expression of views by other Member States of the Organization, preferably at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, where this item is to be given priority consideration.

The Mexican delegation subsequently submitted a draft amendment in document A/C.1/36/L.50. In so far as I can interpret that delegation's thinking, as we understand it the essential purpose of that amendment was to extend to all Member States of the Organization this opportunity to give their views on the subject before the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In addition, the amendment contained a number of proposals for additions to the preambular part of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43. The sponsors have talked with the Mexican delegation in an endeavour to reach a common position. This was reached without difficulty, since the sponsors of the original draft had in mind from the outset the possibility of this exercise involving all Member States. When I introduced the original draft, I said:

"The non-nuclear States have the right and duty to assess those positions in order to express their own thoughts and to make their own proposals on the subject, for their own survival is at stake and they cannot delegate to others either the quest for, or the formulation of, solutions on this matter." (A/C.1/36/PV.33, p. 56)

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

After discussions with the delegation which submitted the amendments in document A/C.1/36/L.50, I am happy to report that we have reached agreement on the matter with the result that we are submitting the revised draft resolution in document A/C.1/36/L.43/Rev.1, which includes the Mexican amendments to the preamble and - perhaps in this we find the only substantive aspect of the amendments - the addition of a second operative paragraph which invites all other Member States - other than the five nuclear States - which so desire to express their views and make proposals on the subject before the second special session devoted to disarmament.

The revised text - draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43/Rev.1 - has already been circulated among representatives. It will be noted that Mexico and other countries have joined the original sponsors. For the sake of brevity I shall not read out the names.

In view of the aim pursued by this draft resolution, it is the hope of its sponsors that it will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. HELLER (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I have asked to be allowed to speak only in order to request that draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.50 be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.18 submitted under agenda item 47, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". That draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 16 November. A recorded vote has been requested.

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

Mr. Waliur RAHMAN (Bangladesh): Bangladesh supports the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. We welcome draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.18, sponsored by Pakistan, and in conformity with our position of past years the Bangladesh delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution pertaining to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

The Government of Bangladesh believes that effective nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world would contribute to creating conditions that would further strengthen peace and security in the world. While we support the draft resolution, the Government of Bangladesh believes that necessary contacts and consultations must take place among the States of the South Asian region in order to ensure unanimity on this issue, including such aspects as defining the limits of such a zone and other cognate matters. At the same time, mindful of the complexity of the issue, my delegation believes that there should be adequate and intensive consultations among all the States of the region to help promote a consensus position on this important issue, without which the purpose for the establishment of the zone would not be achieved.

In that connexion, I should like to mention that in the recent past countries of South Asia, on the initiative of my country, have held two high-level meetings to exchange views on matters of mutual interest. We believe that such meetings would be of great help in paving the way for promoting understanding and, ultimately, consensus on such issues as we are debating now.

Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka): The draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", set out in document A/C.1/36/L.18, is virtually identical to resolution 35/148 on the same subject adopted at the last session of the General Assembly. Following the practice of previous years, Sri Lanka will vote in favour of this draft resolution. Our affirmative vote is based on our principled support for the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various areas of the world which we believe will contribute to the strengthening of regional and international peace and security.

(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

However, it is clear that nuclear-weapon-free zones in any particular area of the world could be viable only to the extent that such zones have the consent, support and co-operation of all the countries in the zone. It is essential that close consultations take place among all States in the declared zone, taking into account the particular characteristics of the zone, so that the conditions for its establishment can be agreed upon.

We understand the concerns of those who feel that a nuclear-weapon-free zone cannot exist in a vacuum and that it requires from States in contiguous areas a commitment against the threat or use of nuclear weapons against the States in the zone. We are all aware of the complex questions that must be addressed before a nuclear-weapon-free zone can be established in South Asia and the need to take full account of the concerns of all States in the zone.

It remains for me to repeat once again that, as in previous years, we shall support this draft resolution.

Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): The Bahamas Government holds the view that all States of a region should agree on the modus operandi for effecting the implementation of any proposal pertaining to the security of the region.

My delegation abstained in the votes on previous similar draft resolutions which called for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. My delegation is unaware of any change in this connexion and, regrettably, is constrained once again to abstain when the vote is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.18.

I wish to emphasize, however, that this decision does not negate my Government's acceptance of the main thrust of the text and its ardent support for regional nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Having said that, my delegation trusts that all impediments to a mutual understanding among the parties concerned will be eliminated as soon as possible and recommends that concerted efforts be made to reach an early agreement, thereby allowing my delegation in the future to cast an affirmative vote, which would be consistent with my Government's policy and philosophy that the entire universe is in jeopardy as long as pockets of regional conflicts remain unresolved.

Mr. KRISHNA (India): Over the past few years it has become patently clear that the countries of South Asia do not have a consensus on the setting up of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the area.

We have repeatedly pointed out that the proposal does not conform to the principles laid down for the setting up of nuclear-weapon-free zones, which have been universally accepted by all States. One of the basic principles is that the initiative for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should come from the States of the region concerned and that participation must be voluntary. To be viable, such a zone must be the result of the initiatives taken by the States concerned on the basis of their common security concerns and, equally important, common perceptions of the threat to their security.

In these important aspects, the proposal contained in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.18 does not conform to the internationally recognized principles for the setting up of nuclear-weapon-free zones and yet it is presented each year as if persistence could ultimately triumph over principles.

(Mr. Krishna, India)

I could of course draw attention to various other deficiencies in the proposal contained in this draft resolution. In our view, South Asia is an integral part of the Asia-Pacific region and cannot, on grounds of history or culture, be artificially isolated from that region. What is important is to take into account the geopolitical situation and security environment which currently prevail in the Asia Pacific region and which have a direct bearing on the security of South-Asian States. It is an undeniable fact that nuclear weapons are deployed in the region of which South Asia is a part and that some nuclear-weapon States have military bases in our immediate neighbourhood. Some of the States belonging to the region are also being drawn into the strategic arrangements of nuclear-weapon Powers.

All those factors complicate the security environment of the Asia-Pacific region and make the situation inappropriate for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

In introducing draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.18, the representative of Pakistan quoted from the joint communiqué issued by the Foreign Ministers of India and Pakistan on 10 June this year concerning our two countries' commitment to using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The joint communiqué also called upon nuclear-weapon States to give serious consideration to nuclear disarmament. We are glad that the representative of Pakistan drew attention to an important part of this joint communiqué. India has consistently declared that it will use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. It has also called for the urgent achievement of nuclear disarmament. However, we cannot see how these statements of our consistent positions on such key issues could be regarded as the basis for pursuing the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. We have co-operated with other countries, including Pakistan, in promoting the goal of nuclear disarmament. We shall continue to do so. We are also together with Pakistan in emphasizing that nuclear energy should be used for peaceful purposes, and not just by our two countries but by all States of the world.

But to link these statements of common positions to the proposal for setting up a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia is to distort the very context of these statements. Once again we should like to make it clear that we reject the proposal contained in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.18.

(Mr. Krishna, India)

It would be far better if the countries of South Asia continued to explore and pursue mutual co-operation in areas where they can evolve common positions. There are vast possibilities of such co-operation in the economic, social and cultural fields. The representative of Pakistan himself referred to the historical and cultural links which exist among the countries of South Asia. Would it not be better if our countries worked together to strengthen those links rather than indulge in the futile exercise of pushing through draft resolutions which only serve to heighten our differences and further aggravate our mutual suspicions? It would be much more constructive if we worked together for nuclear disarmament and for ensuring that nuclear energy is used for peaceful purposes in the spirit of the joint communiqué of 10 June 1981 rather than engage in a debate over a proposal which clearly does not enjoy the support of all the South-Asian States.

India will accordingly vote against draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.18.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): The Netherlands generally welcomes and, when possible, supports initiatives leading to regional arms control measures. The Netherlands supports the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones because we believe they can make a positive contribution to national and regional security, to the cause of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to the reduction of the risk of nuclear war.

Although the prospects for achieving a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia have not at all improved over the last years and our serious concern with certain developments has not abated, the Netherlands Government has decided to maintain its traditional vote in support of this annual initiative of Pakistan. We decided to do so on the basis of the repeated assurances from both Pakistan and India on the peaceful nature of their nuclear programmes. Not only do we note the repetition of these assurances but we also recognize that a step forward to achieving a common approach of both these States was made on 10 June 1981, when a joint press release was signed by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of India and Pakistan, which contained the following two paragraphs:

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

"Both sides reiterated their policy of using nuclear energy only for peaceful purposes. They called upon all nuclear-weapon States to engage in a serious discussion on nuclear disarmament."

The representative of India just referred to that passage. The other paragraph I should like to quote reads as follows:

"The two sides reaffirm their adherence to the principles of non-alignment, which rule out participation in military pacts. Both sides agree that each country has the sovereign right to acquire arms for self-defence. In this context they explained to each other the parameters of their defence acquisitions and decided to remain in touch with each other on a continuing basis."

So, against this background, new relevance is given to the statement made by the representative of Pakistan at the seventeenth meeting of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, which contained the following passage:

"Pakistan would suggest that India should accept the proposal, endorsed by the United Nations, to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in south Asia, involving the renunciation of the acquisition of nuclear weapons as well as the international inspection of all nuclear facilities that exist in all the countries of south Asia. Secondly, Pakistan would be prepared to accept the application of full-scope safeguards to all its nuclear facilities on a reciprocal basis, if India also indicated its acceptance. Thirdly, if India were to accede to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Pakistan would be only too happy to follow India's lead in the matter." (CD/PV.17, p.10)

Those are some very significant offers of the Government of Pakistan, and we assume that they still stand.

If progress were made in negotiations along these lines, no ground would be given to allegations that attempts were being made to impose the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone on States in the region against the wishes of one of the major Powers in that area.

I should like to mention another point. If we once again express the hope that the peoples of south Asia will succeed in keeping their countries free from nuclear weapons, we mean this to include also other nuclear explosive devices. Our support for this draft resolution should be interpreted accordingly:

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

nuclear-weapon-free zone means an area exempt from all nuclear explosive devices, as was expressed in General Assembly resolution 3484 (XXX). We hold that one cannot develop nuclear explosive devices for peaceful purposes without at the same time acquiring a nuclear-weapon capability. In other words, we do not subscribe to the validity of the concept of peaceful nuclear explosions. We have stated this position repeatedly over the years and we maintain it.

A similar view was put forward on many occasions by the delegation of Pakistan here in the First Committee, in the Committee on Disarmament and elsewhere.

We urge once again the two parties concerned to heed our plea to substantiate their assurances on the peaceful nature of their nuclear programmes by undertaking unequivocal non-proliferation commitments or by agreeing on the effective safeguards and guarantee measures which would eventually turn South Asia into a zone free from nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): The Swedish Government has on many previous occasions stated its position on the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones. A detailed explanation was made in relation to the comprehensive review of nuclear-weapon-free zones which was carried out in 1975 under the auspices of the then Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The views of my Government are contained in document A/31/189.

On this occasion I shall limit my remarks to basic Swedish views on nuclear-weapon-free zones. In the opinion of the Swedish Government, one of the most fundamental prerequisites is that general agreement thereon exists among all the States concerned. Another is, of course, the non-possession of nuclear weapons by zonal States. The third is the non-development or non-presence of nuclear weapons in the zone and the withdrawal of such weapons as could only be used against targets in the nuclear-weapon-free zone, thus establishing a safety area or security belt adjacent to the zone. A fourth condition is the commitment by the nuclear-weapon Powers not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against targets within the zone.

In explaining its votes on previous draft resolutions on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, the Swedish delegation declared that Sweden would welcome the submission of a draft resolution supported by all States of that particular region.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

Unfortunately, the draft resolution submitted this year does not enjoy unanimous regional support.

Although my Government supports in principle the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region in question, the Swedish delegation will, for those reasons, not vote differently from the way it did last year and, consequently, abstain in this vote. Notwithstanding the fact that Sweden cannot vote in favour of the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, we urge the States concerned to continue to explore all avenues to facilitate the attainment of the objectives contained in the draft resolution. In the meantime, all States should act to reduce tension in the South Asian region through active disarmament and confidence-building measures and refrain from actions that run counter to these objectives.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other delegation wishes to explain its vote before the voting, we shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.18.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Bhutan, India

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Norway, Poland, Sao Tome and Principe, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.18 was adopted by 32 votes to 2, with 30 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. S. DORJI (Bhutan): The concept of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world is an effort by the international community aimed at achieving the final goal of general and complete disarmament. Keeping this objective in view, my delegation has supported, and will support, draft resolutions in this Committee for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in cases where it enjoys wide support, particularly among the States concerned.

However, in the case of the resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, even after eight years since its adoption, it has so far not been able to achieve the first prerequisite, that is, agreement among the countries directly concerned. My delegation is convinced that the subject is complex and that differences of view still remain unresolved.

Therefore, my delegation believes that it is unrealistic to rush into a process for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Africa before conditions for its establishment are achieved through a process of consultation to bring about an agreement among all the States concerned. It is for that reason that my delegation has once again cast a negative vote, this time on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.18, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in south Asia".

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation considers that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, or in any other region for that matter, would contribute to the over-all objective of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as well as to the peace and security of the region in question.

That is why my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.18. However, my delegation would like to reiterate its view that the establishment of such a zone, if it is to strengthen the security of the region, would require the fulfilment of a number of conditions, among them, for example, that it should be agreed upon by all the States concerned, including the nuclear-weapon States, and that it be based on the initiative of the countries of the region.

My delegation also considers it highly desirable for the realization of nuclear-weapon-free zones that all the countries of the region concerned adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and accept the full-scope safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): My delegation supports the concept of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Brazil has signed and ratified the Treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America, and is thereby committed not to acquire nuclear weapons, as part of the only existing nuclear-weapon-free zone in the world.

We believe that the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones should be based on two fundamental elements: the consensus of the States directly involved, and the commitment on the part of the nuclear-weapon Powers to respect the status of the zone and to refrain from interfering in the respective process of negotiation. Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.18 does not reflect those fundamental principles and, for that reason, my delegation abstained in the vote on it.

Mr. NOLAN (Australia): The Australian delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.18, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

The reservation expressed by our vote reflects Australia's belief that the effective implementation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone is possible only if the support of all States of the region is forthcoming. The initiative for creating

(Mr. Nolan, Australia)

such a zone must therefore come from all States of the region, thereby avoiding any interference with existing security arrangements which States may wish to preserve. The creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone would, of course, need to respect accepted principles of international law and be fully verifiable.

The Australian delegation's vote should not therefore be seen as a lack of concern for the need for agreement on appropriate arrangements to contain the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We have made clear on numerous occasions our deep concern on this issue. Of particular concern has been the emergence of situations in the Middle East and the South Asian region which suggest that the fragile containment of proliferation in these regions may be shattered.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): The United States voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted in document A/C.1/36/L.18. This vote reflects our continuing support for the concept of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in South Asia and in other regions of the world.

We believe that effective nuclear-weapon-free zones negotiated and supported by the appropriate parties can enhance the security of their participants and reinforce non-proliferation goals on a regional basis.

The criteria by which the United States judges the effectiveness of any nuclear-weapon-free zone have been elaborated by my delegation at previous sessions of the Committee. It may be useful to mention them briefly again.

First, the initiative for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should come from the States in the region concerned.

Secondly, all States whose participation is deemed important should participate in the zone.

Thirdly, the zone arrangement should provide for adequate verification of compliance with the zone's provisions.

Fourthly, the establishment of the zone should not disturb existing security arrangements to the detriment of regional and international security.

Fifthly, the zone arrangement should effectively prohibit its parties from developing any nuclear explosive device for whatever purpose.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

Sixthly, the zone arrangement should seek not to impose restrictions on the exercise of rights recognized under international law, particularly the principle of freedom of navigation on the high seas, in international air space and in straits used for international navigation and the right of innocent passage through territorial seas.

And, finally, the establishment of a zone should not affect the existing rights of its parties under international law to grant or deny transit privileges, including port calls and overflights to other States.

While we strongly support this draft resolution, we want to make it clear that our vote is not directed against any particular State in the region. Moreover, it is our firm belief that any nuclear-weapon-free zone arrangement must effectively preclude the conducting of any nuclear explosions. Moves by any State towards development of nuclear weapons concern us all equally.

As we did last year, I should like to take particular note of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which urges all States in the region to refrain from any conduct contrary to the objective of the draft resolution. The United States decision to vote for the draft resolution is based on our expectation that the sponsors and others supporting it will demonstrate that they also take this provision with the utmost seriousness.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.19 on agenda item 51 (b), "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session", entitled "Report of the Committee on Disarmament". It is sponsored by 27 countries and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 31st meeting of the Committee on 16 November. The sponsors are: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

As no delegation wishes to explain its vote before the voting, we shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.19.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.19 was adopted by 115 votes to none, with 8 abstentions. *

* Subsequently the delegations of the Bahamas, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Panama advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. PROKOFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution on the report of the Committee on Disarmament, contained in document A/C.1/36/L.19.

However, in connexion with the formulation of its operative paragraph 4, in which members of the Committee on Disarmament are invited to submit a full report on their separate negotiations and the results achieved, the Soviet delegation wishes to emphasize that recently negotiations on disarmament have been marking time, and that therefore no results have been achieved. Also, the content, volume and character of the information concerning the negotiations which may be conducted outside the framework of the Committee on Disarmament fall within the competence of States which are parties to such negotiations.

We also consider that the organization of the work of subsidiary bodies of the Committee on Disarmament, the formulation of their mandates and the definition of the practical tasks allocated to them which are to be carried out in the course of negotiations are the prerogative of the Committee on Disarmament itself.

Ms. BOYD (Australia): The Australian delegation voted for draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.19 on the Report of the Committee on Disarmament.

We should like to place on record, however, that Australia has reservations over certain aspects of the draft resolution. In particular, it seeks to instruct the Committee on Disarmament on how it should conduct its work and offers value judgements on the best available machinery for the conduct of this work. It is the belief of the Australian delegation that this constitutes an unwarranted interference by the General Assembly in the work of the Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): Members of the Committee may recall that my delegation abstained on a similar draft resolution adopted last year. Our intention in abstaining both this year and last was not to call into question the role of the Committee on Disarmament. Indeed, we reiterate our support for the Committee.

The draft resolution before us, however, deals with a number of issues which, as recorded in paragraph 120 (e) of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, are for the Committee on Disarmament itself to decide. In particular, the Committee on Disarmament decides at the outset of each session which questions it will address and what organizational arrangements for their consideration should be.

As for the role of the Committee on Disarmament in substantive negotiations on priority questions of disarmament, while we all agree on the important role of the Committee we do not accept that it is the only forum for arms control and disarmament negotiations or that it should have primacy on all substantive items which might be under negotiation in other forums. It was never envisioned that the Committee would deal with every issue on the international arms control and disarmament agenda or take up issues without reflection on whether the subject was appropriate for the Committee's consideration or ready for negotiation in this multilateral body.

Logically, certain issues should be addressed by the countries directly concerned, and involvement by the Committee on Disarmament at an inappropriate stage could even jeopardize the productive potential of particular negotiations. For example, the Final Document of the special session stressed that nuclear disarmament issues are the primary responsibility of the nuclear-weapon States. In addition, measures of a bilateral or regional character are, of course, the primary responsibilities of the parties directly concerned.

For these reasons my delegation cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.19, although we continue to support the work of the Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.19. We regret particularly that we were unable to cast a favourable vote as we did last year, in the vote on resolution 35/152 J.

Nevertheless, Belgium wishes to express its total support for the work of the Committee on Disarmament, of which it is a member.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.19 unfortunately does not sufficiently take into account the fact that the lack of progress in the work of the Committee is due mainly to causes outside its field of action.

Moreover, we do not believe that it is useful to dictate to a negotiating body the working methods that it should adopt to achieve its aims. The determination of these methods can be based only on the agreement of every member of that Committee.

Mr. ERSUM (Turkey): Turkey voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.19 for a very simple reason. This draft resolution is no more than a procedural text for non-member States of the Committee on Disarmament requesting to establish ad hoc working groups in order to speed up its work. How can any non-member State object to such a reasonable objective? But I shall take this opportunity to express my astonishment regarding the somewhat contradictory attitude of the actual membership of the Committee on Disarmament. Everybody is aware that Turkey is among the candidates for membership of this negotiating body. We are frequently told that the Committee on Disarmament is a sovereign body outside the United Nations system, thus the United Nations General Assembly has no authority to interfere in its internal affairs. In fact there is quite a theological discussion about the relationship between the General Assembly and the Committee on Disarmament. But curiously, in several draft resolutions prepared by different groups and adopted in this First Committee, there are references to the creation of working groups, appeals for the establishment of priorities, in sum, suggestions and demands dealing intimately with the procedural or substantive aspects of the Committee's work. I shall not take up any more time on this matter, but my delegation will be pleased to provide - if requested - anyone who wishes to have some concrete illustrations of this incomprehensible fact with same.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation would have sincerely wished to have been in a position to vote in favour of the draft resolution that has just been adopted. We were compelled to abstain by reason of a number of the provisions in the text, the main one being operative paragraph 1. In fact, we do not believe that it up to the General Assembly to intervene in the organization of the work of the Committee on Disarmament or to recommend methods of work. I am thinking in particular of the establishment of ad hoc working groups. Further, we believe that such groups, at the present stage, are not the appropriate place for the substantive discussion of certain items on the agenda and I have in mind in particular nuclear questions.

Having said this it goes without saying, and I wish to state this here very clearly and with strong conviction, that this in no way minimizes the special importance that my delegation attaches to the work of the Committee on Disarmament or our desire to contribute fully thereto, especially to the development of its competence in the field of negotiation.

The CHAIRMAN: We now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.2, agenda item 55 (c), General and complete disarmament; confidence-building measures. This draft resolution has 32 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany at the 38th meeting of the First Committee on 20 November. The following countries are the sponsors: Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Mauritania, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Zaire.

Before we take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.2 I have been asked to allow the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and of the United Kingdom to speak, not in explanation of vote but in reference to the revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.23.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): The new revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.23 Rev.2, has not been introduced since it was only published a very short time ago. On behalf of the sponsors and my own delegation I should now like to introduce this revised draft resolution and indicate that this version is the outcome of further consultations which the sponsors had with Member States taking a particular interest in the field of confidence building. In these consultations both the sponsors and the other interested countries showed a high degree of flexibility for which I should like to thank them on this occasion. The changes to the draft resolution are very slight, but they were important to the delegations just mentioned. I should like to express the hope and the wish of the sponsors that the draft resolution in this revised form will now be adopted without a vote.

Mr. SUMIERHAYES (United Kingdom): Speaking on behalf of the ten member States of the European Community, I should like to make some remarks about draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.2 concerning confidence-building measures.

The Ten welcome the initiative taken by the Federal Republic of Germany for a comprehensive study on confidence-building measures. They also commend the Secretary-General and the experts from various countries for the dedicated and valuable work they have done.

The Ten have consistently supported the concept of confidence-building measures. They hold the view that such measures can strengthen international peace and security and contribute to the development of confidence, better understanding and more stable relations between nations, thus creating and improving the conditions for fruitful international co-operation. Thus confidence building should facilitate the process of arms control and disarmament negotiations, including verification.

One important task for confidence-building measures is in our view to allay fear and insecurity resulting from important routine military activity, through indicating as reliably as possible States' peaceful intentions. Any major deviation from agreed parameters of confidence-building measures would thus give a strong indication of dubious intent, for example to provide warning of a possible surprise attack. The value of such measures will increase the more as they relate to the nature of the specific military threat considered to be of greatest concern in a specific region at a specific time.

In the view of the Ten, one of the main characteristics of confidence-building measures must be that they translate universally recognized principles - such as renunciation of the use or threat of use of force in accordance with the United Nations Charter - into reality by the application of concrete, specific and verifiable measures.

In this connexion it is obvious that misconceptions and prejudices which may have developed over an extended period of time cannot be overcome by a single application of a confidence-building measure. The seriousness, credibility and reliability of a State's commitments to confidence building without which the confidence-building process cannot be successful can only be demonstrated by the continuous, regular and full implementation of such measures.

Confidence-building measures can only achieve their desired stabilizing effect and contribute to preparing progress in disarmament if they enhance the security of States. Therefore, in order to maintain and strengthen the security of States it is indispensable to ensure equality and balance between those participating in the process. This requires a uniform application by all States committed to a specific measure.

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

The Ten believe that one essential element of confidence-building measures is transparency in military matters, which can effectively reduce or eliminate miscalculations or misapprehensions which may lead to the creation or exacerbation of tensions. They welcome, therefore, that, while there were differences of views concerning the degree of openness necessary for confidence building, all experts agreed in principle on the need for an exchange of information on the military activities of States and matters related to mutual security.

The Ten are of the opinion that this Committee as well as the Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament can play a valuable role in the further development of confidence-building measures. We therefore support draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.2 which, among other things, invites all States to consider the possible introduction of confidence-building measures in their particular regions, in keeping with conditions and requirements prevailing in their respective regions. We express the hope that the General Assembly at its second special session on disarmament will give intensive consideration to this item, so as to further enhance the prospects for an effective and lasting intensification of the confidence-building process thereby making a substantial contribution to our pursuit of balanced and verifiable disarmament measures.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have suggested that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to submit information on the financial implications of A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.2.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The Budget Division has informed the Secretary of this Committee that the expenses involved in producing the requested publication will be met through the existing resources of the publication programme of the Department of Conference Services.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representatives who wish to explain their position before the Committee's decision.

Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation has no objection to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.2 on confidence-building measures. If this resolution were put to the vote, my delegation would abstain because of the presence of the United States of America among the sponsors. We do not have confidence in confidence-building measures when we find the United States among sponsors who quite honestly are trying to build confidence.

If we look at the fourth preambular paragraph, where concern is expressed "about the deterioration of the international situation and the further escalation of the arms race", and so on, it is ironical or perhaps a falsehood that the United States, which is the originator of this international situation, should be co-sponsoring a draft resolution containing such a paragraph, as well as the eighth preambular paragraph, where reference is made to a "climate of trust and confidence among States". What confidence can the States of Africa have in view of the support given by the United States to South Africa and apartheid? What trust or confidence can Arab States have in view of the support of the United States for Zionism in its fight against the Palestinians and the Arab States? What confidence can Nicaragua have when it is threatened by a blockade or direct aggression, as expressly stated by the present leaders of the United States? What confidence can Cuba have when it is blockaded and threatened with direct aggression by the Government of the United States?

In operative paragraph 8 the draft resolution "Invites all States to consider the possible introduction of confidence-building measures", but the only way in which the present Government of the United States can inspire confidence is to cease its war-mongering provocative campaign against all peoples who are fighting for national liberation.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to explain its position before the Committee adopts a decision and I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution without vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.2 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representatives who wish to explain their position after the Committee's decision.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): My delegation has joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.2 because it supports the basic goals of the draft resolution to elaborate and reaffirm the concepts of confidence-building measures, and points out their importance and possible contributions to creating favourable conditions for undertaking measures to curb armaments and general disarmament.

We attach great importance to the expansion of confidence-building measures. During previous years Yugoslavia has endeavoured, particularly within the framework of the process launched by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, to contribute most directly with its views and proposals, not only to the development of the concept of confidence-building measures, but to the concrete implementation of such measures in Europe. Yugoslavia's present efforts at the Madrid Conference are oriented in the same direction.

Certainly, confidence-building measures cannot serve as a replacement for disarmament measures, but they should and can play a significant role in enabling and implementing the process of disarmament. In order to achieve that, it is indispensable to bear in mind the need that the confidence-building measures should reflect the specific character of the regions in which they are to be applied, and that they should be in accordance with the requirements resulting from the reality of international relations.

We shall examine with due attention the study on confidence-building measures, prepared by an expert group, to the elaboration of which we have from the very beginning given our full support.

Mr. KAPILLANI (Albania): We should like to state from the outset that if this draft resolution had been put to the vote, we would not have participated in the voting. The following is an explanation of why we cannot accept the ideas, views and recommendations contained in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.2.

First, it must be pointed out that what are referred to as confidence-building measures dates back to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe which, in our view, has brought nothing good to Europe, but has, on the contrary, been used by the imperialist super-Powers for achieving the goals of their aggressive and hegemonistic policies on our continent. The so-called confidence-building measures, which are said to have been applied in Europe in the spirit of the Helsinki recommendations, refer mainly to the prior notification of the holding of certain military exercises, and the exchange of observers among the member countries of the military aggressive blocs within which those games are held. We have never believed, nor do we believe now, that such measures will serve to build confidence. But we know that the imperialist super-Powers and their aggressive NATO and Warsaw Pact blocs ceaselessly continue their military exercises and war preparations, and that they have stepped up their arms race.

That is why we find it inappropriate to express satisfaction, as in the formulation in the preambular part of the draft resolution, at the positive results that have allegedly been yielded by the confidence-building measures applied in a certain region.

Secondly, the so-called confidence-building measures do not serve the purposes of real disarmament, as is claimed. Confidence begins, and is built up, when measures leading to real disarmament are adopted not when measures are proclaimed which do not affect in the least the military might of the imperialist super-Powers, and which do not exercise any influence on their aggressive aims and policies.

The essential causes of the arms race and of the war threat are not to be found simply in a lack of confidence, in miscalculations, misunderstandings or misinterpretations. The root causes of war lie in the very nature of imperialism and social-imperialism. Lack of confidence, miscalculations, misinterpretations and other such factors are direct consequences of the aims and ambitions of the big imperialist Powers for hegemony and domination.

Hence, we hold that the concept of confidence-building measures itself has many inherent limitations and defects. It may create a wrong impression as to where the real danger of war comes from and as to which ways lead to real disarmament.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

This concept may be exploited, as has in fact been done, by the imperialist super-Powers and their aggressive NATO and Warsaw Pact blocs. Depending on when and by whom this concept is used, it may, in our opinion, in addition to conveying certain naive and harmful ideas, also serve as fertile ground for dangerous demagoguery. We think that efforts aimed at confidence-building have nothing to do with efforts aimed at genuine disarmament, at decreasing and eliminating the danger of war.

In fact, they are mainly concerned with certain rules of conduct which the two super-Powers and their military aggressive blocs will find acceptable and beneficial to their arms race and war preparations.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My Government supports the idea contained in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.2, in particular in operative paragraph 7 which

"Believes that promotion of confidence-building measures where appropriate conditions exist will significantly contribute to facilitate the process of disarmament".

With this basic viewpoint, my delegation joined in the consensus on the draft resolution just adopted. However, my delegation believes that, for the consideration of the possible introduction of confidence-building measures in particular regions, the specific political, military and other conditions and requirements prevailing in the region concerned should be fully taken into account. It also believes that, as the basis and prerequisite for the promotion of mutual trust among nations, all States must scrupulously observe in their international conduct the spirit and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as other established international norms.

In the light of the situation prevailing in the region to which my country belongs, my delegation is obliged to say that conditions are not ripe for the possible introduction of specific confidence-building measures in that region.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): India attaches importance to the building of relations of trust and confidence among States. We therefore welcome the study carried out by a group of experts on the subject. My Government has not had an opportunity to study the report, or to express its considered views on the results and recommendations contained therein.

It would therefore have been preferable, in our view, for the sponsors of the draft resolution to have introduced a purely procedural resolution, as has been the practice with regard to other studies carried out by the United Nations. Such a procedural draft resolution would have merely taken note of the report of the group of experts, and referred it to Member States for their further consideration.

We recognize the role that confidence-building measures can play in promoting disarmament. However, confidence-building measures cannot be a substitute for the negotiation of disarmament measures, and lack of confidence among States cannot be allowed to become a pretext for avoiding or delaying negotiations on disarmament. This in fact was recognized in the report of the group of experts itself.

Another aspect of the relationship between disarmament and confidence-building measures that perhaps needs to be highlighted is that the cessation and reversal of the arms race and the achievement of genuine measures of disarmament would itself lead to greater trust and confidence among States. That is clearly recognized by the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The draft resolution which has just been adopted could have benefited from a greater emphasis on that aspect of the question.

Our considered views on the report will be expressed after my Government has had the opportunity to study carefully its entire contents. Our joining in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.2 is without prejudice to our position in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.27, under agenda item 50, "World disarmament conference". The draft resolution has ten sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 36th meeting of the First Committee on 19 November. The sponsors are: Burundi, Cuba, Madagascar, Mongolia, Niger, Panama, Peru, Poland, Spain and Sri Lanka. The sponsors have suggested the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees with that suggestion.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.27 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position.

Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania): The Albanian delegation has from the very beginning been against the idea of convening a world disarmament conference, which has been put forward by the Soviet Union for mere propaganda purposes. As many meetings of all kinds devoted to disarmament problems have been held already, and especially as there has been a special session of the General Assembly devoted to these problems and there is to be a second such special session next year, which will certainly be attended by all Member States, we think it unnecessary and of no value to hold another world conference on disarmament. It would only drag us into another marathon of unproductive discussions.

Moreover, in our view holding such a conference would do no good and would adversely affect the significance of the other disarmament activities within the United Nations system.

For those reasons, we think that the work of the preparatory committee for the world disarmament conference is also unnecessary.

The Albanian delegation cannot and does not approve of the draft resolution.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Speaking on behalf of the Ten member States of the European Community, I should like to draw attention, in connexion with the draft resolution that we have just adopted, to certain aspects of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, contained in General Assembly document A/36/28. Representatives will have noted that in part III, entitled "Conclusions and recommendations", the Committee said that it considered that, inter alia,

"no consensus with respect to the convening of a world disarmament conference under the present conditions has yet been reached among the nuclear-weapon States whose participation in such a conference has been deemed essential by most States Members of the Organization."

The deterioration in the international situation, as reflected in paragraph 15 of the report, has made it more difficult to resolve the question of convening a world disarmament conference. In those circumstances, while not opposing

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

consensus, the Ten doubt whether further meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee in the present circumstances, and before the conclusion of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, would lead to the advancement of the idea of a world disarmament conference.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to give us information about the financial implications of the draft resolution.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): Document A/C.1/36/L.57 relates to the financial implications of the draft resolution.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): I should like to state for the record, as my delegation has stated in connexion with a resolution on another subject, that we assume that any expenditure incurred as a result of the adoption of the draft resolution will be made without prejudice to the zero-growth budgetary policy of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.17/Rev.1, relating to agenda item 54 entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". The original text was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 32nd meeting on 17 November. He wishes to make a statement on the revised version.

Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): I had the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.17 in this Committee on 17 November. The central thrust of the revised version remains the same, but changes have been incorporated after consultations with some delegations. They are either purely drafting changes or have been incorporated to bring the text of the draft resolution into line with the current state of the discussions on the subject in the Committee on Disarmament and with the report of that Committee for this year's session. They have been made

(Mr. Ahmad, Pakistan)

in the third, sixth, seventh, seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth preambular paragraphs and in operative paragraph 2.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the representative of Canada for an explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. MENZIES (Canada): The Canadian delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution, because we support its general thrust on the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We also appreciate the effort made by the delegation of Pakistan to amend the language of its original draft to make the draft resolution more widely acceptable.

Before voting for the draft resolution, we wish to put on the record that we have reservations about the specificity of the language in operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 5, in so far as it may appear to prejudice the responsibility of the Committee on Disarmament for determining its own working procedures, particularly since a working group of that Committee is already engaged on a study of this subject.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution

A/C.1/36/L.17/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None.

Abstaining: India, Ivory Coast, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 4 abstentions. *

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.17/Rev.1, and we wish to display thereby our interest and our support for the efforts made in this connexion in the Committee on Disarmament, particularly in the search for a common approach. In that connexion, we wish to make it clear that we consider that the text of operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 should not be interpreted as giving preference to any particular legal form or in any way prejudging solutions which, in this connexion, could be negotiated within the Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. LEHNE (Austria): The Austrian delegation has, in its explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10, stated its position on the issue of so-called negative security assurances and, in particular, its reservations concerning the idea of the convention incorporating such assurances.

We are glad to note that the references to this idea in the revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.17 are of a more balanced and moderate nature than those in A/C.1/36/L.10 or those in the relevant resolutions of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. The Austrian delegation could therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.17/Rev.1.

* Subsequently, the delegations of Bahamas and Rwanda advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The delegation of Finland voted in favour of the draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.17/Rev.1. We did so on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10 as well. Both of these draft resolutions deal with the question of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. From the point of view of non-nuclear-weapon States, the question of security assurances being given to them against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is a most legitimate concern.

Finland has welcomed the unilateral assurances given by the nuclear-weapon States: as expressions of political commitment, they contribute to the further consideration of the question, but they obviously fall short of the goal of effective international arrangements.

Recent developments in the field of nuclear-weapon technology have given a new dimension to that question. Finland believes that all approaches to achieving arrangements for non-use assurances should continue to be explored, including the further development of unilateral declarations, as well as multilateral agreements. All interested Governments should be involved in the process and have an opportunity to express their particular security concerns.

In view of these basic considerations, Finland supported both draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.10 and A/C.1/36/L.17/Rev.1.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): On 23 November, I made an explanation of vote on behalf of the Swedish delegation regarding the two draft resolutions on negative security assurances which had been submitted to the First Committee - A/C.1/36/L.10 and A/C.1/36/L.17. In that statement, I briefly outlined my Government's reservations concerning an international convention in which the non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or any other legally binding agreements in which they have undertaken not to acquire nuclear weapons would be requested to repeat their undertakings in this respect.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

I also referred to the possible implications such a convention might have for the policy of neutrality of my country. However, my delegation has noted with appreciation that the draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.17 has subsequently been amended in such a way as to diminish considerably the emphasis on an international convention. The Swedish delegation has therefore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.17/Rev.1.

In conclusion I should like to reiterate the position of my Government, that the responsibility for formulating co-ordinated assurances acceptable to all rests with the nuclear-weapon States. The Swedish Government shares the view that negative security assurances should be made in a legally binding form, but it considers it premature to make any commitment as to the legal framework of these before having a more precise idea of the substance of those assurances. In this regard, my delegation would favour a treaty concluded between the nuclear-weapon States only.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation has reservations about the reference in operative paragraphs 2, 3, and 5 of the draft resolution just adopted to a specific modality of negative security assurances, which reference would seem to prejudge the work of the Committee on Disarmament. However, we recognize that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.17/Rev.1 showed a significant improvement over last year's corresponding resolution. We are pleased to see that the trend of the work of the Committee on Disarmament's Working Group on negative security assurances has been reflected in the text, in particular the mention of a common formula which figured prominently in the discussions in the Working Group. We also took note of the additional amendments that were introduced a few minutes ago by the representative of Pakistan. In appreciation of these efforts by the sponsor to take into consideration the difficulties that last year's resolution presented to us and the results of those efforts, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. SANGARET (Ivory Coast) (interpretation from French): It goes without saying that the Ivory Coast delegation is fully in favour of assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. However, my delegations believes that the best such guarantee lies in disarmament itself or, at least, in the beginning of disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.17/Rev.1.

We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.41/Rev.2 on agenda item 41, "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/143 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)". It is sponsored by 21 countries and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 35th meeting of the Committee on 19 November. The sponsors are: Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

As no delegation has asked to explain its vote before the voting, we shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.41/Rev.2.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives,

Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: None.

Abstaining: Cuba, France, Guyana

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.41/Rev.2 was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote after the voting.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation regrets that it had to abstain in the vote that has just been taken on the draft resolution relating to the signature and ratification of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. We did so because our situation has been called into question as regards the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

My delegation is surprised to find that this draft, which identifies France by name, does not appear to take account of the exchanges of view that recently took place on this subject at the highest level between the authorities of my country and those of the depositary State for the Tlatelolco Treaty.

It is regrettable that the spirit of concertation that prevailed at the talks to which I refer should not have been manifested in the preparation of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.41/Rev.2.

* Subsequently, the delegation of Zambia advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

The Committee will recall that on 2 March 1979 the President of the French Republic signed Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco at Mexico City, thus showing that France was as concerned as others with the need to meet the obligations deriving from the Treaty for the territories of Latin America for which it is internationally responsible. However, France cannot accept that its responsibility in the matter be called into question, when the Treaty itself has not been ratified, or even signed, by all the States of the region it covers and that, for some of those States, the implementation of its provisions remain subject to the implementation of all the conditions making possible the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America.

Lastly, the sponsors of the draft resolution are no less respectful than my own country of the procedures which each sovereign State decides to follow with regard to the ratification of international treaties. They will no doubt agree with my delegation that it is not for the General Assembly to interfere in those procedures.

Mr. KARRAN (Guyana): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.41/Rev.2, concerning Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. This abstention does not in any way indicate any reservations on the part of the Government of Guyana with regard to the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, most especially in Latin America.

My delegation abstained in the vote because, as members of the Committee are well aware, the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America contains a clause which discriminates against my country and excludes it from membership. Guyana has constantly affirmed in the Committee, as well as in other forums, its commitment to the noble objectives contemplated by this Treaty. We do find it incomprehensible and contradictory that a Treaty which seeks to make Latin America a nuclear-free zone should arbitrarily exclude one State in the region from its requirements.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): My delegation is pleased to have supported draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.41/Rev.2, dealing with additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

As we have previously informed the Committee, on 13 November of this year the United States Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of Protocol I of that Treaty. I should like at this time to announce that on 23 November Secretary of State Alexander Haig deposited the United States' instrument of ratification of that Protocol with the Government of Mexico in a ceremony held in Mexico City. At that ceremony Secretary Haig said:

"The United States is proud to participate in this pioneering achievement. The Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America speaks to the finest aspirations of the Hemisphere. It embodies our yearning for peace by prohibiting the most terrible instrument of war. It strengthens the cause of nuclear non-proliferation, that must be a priority for all nations. It demonstrates that patient but imaginative diplomacy can indeed advance us towards a more secure future. It testifies to the vision and dedication of the nations that conceived it. Finally, it is a great tribute to the unique role of Mexico that the pact will be known to history as the Treaty of Tlatelolco."

The Treaty of Tlatelolco has a significance that goes beyond our own hemisphere. That is a valuable contribution to our non-proliferation goals and could serve as a possible model for use in other regions of the world exposed to the threat of nuclear proliferation.

Our goal has been and continues to be to see the Treaty in force for all countries of the region. This is a task that remains before us, since there are States in the region which have not adhered to the Treaty. We regret that the sponsors of this draft resolution chose to single out one country for attention in this respect. My delegation would have preferred that this draft resolution call upon all States eligible to adhere to the Treaty, to sign it and to take the necessary steps to bring it into effect. All such nations should adhere to the Treaty and take steps to fulfil its promise.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.41/Rev.2 because we are in agreement with its general aims.

However, I wish to express our special reservation in connexion with the third preambular paragraph, since it relates to a question of territorial sovereignty of fundamental importance to my country, a question which, incidentally, we hope will be finally resolved.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the Bahamas has just informed me that he would have joined in the consensus on draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.23 and A/C.1/36/L.27 had he been present.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43/Rev.1. This draft resolution is on agenda item 39, "Second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament: report of the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament", and is entitled "Prevention of nuclear war". It was introduced by the representative of Argentina on 18 November at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43/Rev.1 has 17 sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Ireland, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. The sponsors have expressed the hope that this draft resolution will be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.45/Rev.1. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Cyprus at the 36th meeting of the First Committee on 19 November 1981. It is related to agenda item 55, "General and complete disarmament". This draft

(The Chairman)

resolution has 12 sponsors: Argentina, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Kenya, Niger, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia. A recorded vote has been requested.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): There are three small amendments which I should like to record.

The fifth preambular paragraph now reads as follows:

"Convinced further that the arms race cannot be stopped as long as the concepts of balance of weapons or of deterrence continue to be regarded as the sole means for the security of nations".

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

In the sixth preambular paragraph the words "on the doctrine" are deleted. The paragraph will now read as follows:

"Aware that the best hope for arresting the pernicious spiral of the arms race is by providing alternative means of security for nations rather than through reliance on the balance of armaments or of deterrence,".

In the second line of operative paragraph 2, instead of the words "Article 43" the words "Chapter VII" will appear. Operative paragraph 2 will now read as follows:

"Deems it necessary, as a first step in this direction, that the Security Council take the required measures towards the implementation of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, which would reinforce the foundations of peace, security and order through the United Nations, and avert the growing threat of nuclear conflagration."

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Canada for an explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. MENZIES (Canada): The Canadian delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.45/Rev.1 under agenda item 55 (i), regarding general and complete disarmament, focusing on implementation of the security system set out in the United Nations Charter. We are in general agreement with the over-all thrust of the draft resolution. However, before registering a favourable vote I wish to put on record our reservations concerning some of the language employed, despite efforts to make the language more acceptable. We do not accept the view expressed in the fifth preambular paragraph that the concepts of deterrence and of strategic balance prevent progress in arms control and disarmament negotiations. While maintaining prudent deterrent capability we believe it quite possible to enter into realistic negotiations aimed at the conclusion of balanced and verifiable agreements on arms reductions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.45/Rev.1, as orally amended by the representative of Cyprus.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.45/Rev.1, as orally amended, was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.*

* Subsequently, the delegation of Senegal advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. DE MOHR (Italy): My delegation abstained on the draft resolution entitled "General and Complete Disarmament" contained in document A/C.1/36/L.45/Rev.1. While we are in agreement with the basic aim and the substance of the draft resolution, in particular the importance of an effective United Nations peace-keeping system, we cannot agree with the way in which some concepts contained on the preambular part of the draft resolution, specifically in the fifth preambular paragraph, have been formulated.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Japan): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.45/Rev.1. However, my delegation wishes to state for the record that we have reservations on the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up document A/36/29, which is related to agenda item 49, Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. The draft resolution is contained in document A/36/29, pages 9, 10, and 11. It was introduced in the Committee by the delegation of Sri Lanka on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee who has a statement on the financial implications.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to inform the Committee that the financial implications are contained in document A/C.1/36/L.56.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of the draft resolution have suggested that it be adopted without a vote.

I now call on the representatives who wish to explain their position.

Mr. RASOLONDRALIBE (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Madagascar would like to indicate its agreement with adoption by consensus of the draft resolution calling for implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, but at the same time we cannot conceal our disappointment at the postponement of the Colombo Conference scheduled for this year or the difficulties we have in accepting the terms of the draft resolution which is about to be adopted. We recognize that, despite the polemics which have characterized these debates, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean this year expanded consensus among its members.

This happened, first of all, with the very principle of the Colombo Conference, which is now considered by all parties as a necessary stage towards the implementation of the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. It happened, too, with the mandate of the Committee, which is maintained and renewed on the basis of the relevant resolutions, that is, resolution 2992 (XXVII)

(Mr. Rasolondraibe, Madagascar)

creating the Committee and resolutions 34/80 A and B, which entrusted it with the preparations for the Colombo Conference.

The draft resolution calls for a date not later than June 1983 for convening the Colombo Conference. Unfortunately, a group of countries opposed inclusion in the draft of a paragraph which would have assured that no preliminary conditions would stand in the way of meeting that deadline, which we personally would have preferred to be earlier. By virtue of that paragraph, which was designed to prevent the clearly expressed desire of practically all of the countries in the area from being thwarted once again in 1983, the General Assembly would have recognized that the harmonization of the views of the different parties is a continuous process and that complete agreement need not be achieved before the opening of the Conference which, after all, could be held in several stages.

For reasons known to them the delegations which do not share that view have made the deletion of the paragraph a condition of their future participation in the work of the Committee. We acceded to the demand of these delegations, not because we were convinced by the logic of their position, but because we want to make it easier for the Committee to discharge its mandate. In this respect we would like to present the following observations.

The delegation of Madagascar's decision to join in the consensus on the draft resolution in no way implies its approval or acceptance of resort to the controversial question of Afghanistan as justification for the postponement of the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean. The political and security conditions in the Indian Ocean region and around it, not to speak of the whole world, were not ideal when the notion of a zone of peace was first conceived and resolution 2832 (XXVI) was adopted. One has only to recall that the war was at its height in Indo-China and that the wars of national liberation in Africa had reached their peak. Thus, we cannot logically defend the idea that ideal conditions of peace and security should be present before thinking of seriously implementing the 1971 Declaration.

(Mr. Rasolondraibe, Madagascar)

The members of the Committee from the non-aligned countries were thus justified in rejecting those arguments of convenience and in maintaining that the deterioration of political and security conditions in the region, which was admitted by everyone, militated in favour of an early convening of the Conference, not of its postponement. Our joining in the consensus in no way implies acceptance or approval of ideas which deviate from or are at variance with the letter and spirit of the Declaration contained in resolution 2832 (XXVI). (At the heart of the concept of a zone of peace we find the will of the non-aligned countries, both in and outside the region, to remove the area from the unsolicited attentions of the major Powers and the super-Powers.) This idea should not be thwarted by any interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter based on the curious notion of legitimate preventive self-defence, which in this case embraces a desire to legitimize the extension of the East-West military confrontation to the world at large.

In the same connexion, we feel that the renunciation by treaty of the military use of the Indian Ocean, should it limit freedom of navigation of commercial and research vessels alone, would help to give international law the image of a true law of peace. The precedents created by treaties on the renunciation of the military use of the sea bed, the Antarctic, the moon, and other celestial bodies, are examples to be imitated and sources of inspiration.

Thus, one must object to the concept of a zone of peace by adducing the argument that international law is immutable or by using its shortcomings as an excuse. Certain circles have taken it upon themselves to tell the coastal and hinterland countries what are the principal, if not exclusive, threats to their security. This concern is touching but, unfortunately, the thesis presented is not in agreement with the statistics for the years 1945 to 1980 relating to the number of conflicts, affecting the third world countries, in which the forces of the developed countries were involved. These statistics have been published in a pamphlet entitled "World Military and Social Expenditures".

Nothing said in the Ad Hoc Committee and repeated in the First Committee could justify any revision of the position of the countries of that region as to the implementation of resolution 2832 (XXVI),

(Mr. Rasolondraibe, Madagascar)

or their demand for the demilitarization and denuclearization of the Indian Ocean, as well as for the elimination of the foreign military facilities and bases present in that zone. It would be to ignore the aspirations and interests of the countries of the region to view their security problems as merely incidental to the world's strategic balance. It would surely be against their interests to advocate a military solution to those problems and to promote a further militarization of the region.

(Mr. Rasolondraibe, Madagascar)

The Ad Hoc Committee's difficulties do not derive from the fact that a given group of countries is any less interested than any other in the harmonization of views; that is not the case. They derive rather from the fact that some countries which are opposed to the idea of a zone of peace and thus making it harder to achieve such harmonization. That is why certain substantive observations seem to us to be necessary in this explanation of vote.

In deference to the rules of procedure, my delegation will not discuss today the proposal put forward by the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar with regard to the summit conference which was originally to have taken place in 1981-1982 at Antananarivo, but which has now been delayed as a result of the postponement of the Colombo Conference.

The considerations which formed the basis of that proposal were set forth by my delegation at the 11th plenary meeting of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly on 25 September 1980 and at the 36th meeting of the First Committee, at the same session, on 20 November 1980. We would ask delegations which are interested to refer to the records of those meetings, and we thank those that have expressed their support for the proposal, both in the General Assembly and in the First Committee.

I cannot conclude without associating my delegation with the tributes paid to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, Ambassador Fonseka of Sri Lanka, because his tact and patience greatly assisted the Committee in a delicate phase of its deliberations this year.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): Before the draft resolution in document A/36/29, the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, is acted upon I should like to make some comments on behalf of the ten member States of the European Community in explanation of our votes.

We are delighted to see that the Ad Hoc Committee has once again achieved consensus upon the text of a draft resolution. We are very aware of the difficult, indeed strenuous, negotiations which led to this achievement, and would like to put on record our recognition of the efforts made by many delegations in the direction of consensus. That the Committee managed successfully to conclude its work must to a large extent be due to the qualities of its Chairman, Ambassador Ben Fonseka of Sri Lanka. We owe him a great debt of gratitude for his patience

and determination in circumstances which were on many occasions trying to say the least.

In his concluding comments the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee himself remarked that the consensus text represents something which is not entirely satisfactory to any of the delegations involved in its negotiation. This is certainly true, but we must accept that this reflects the realities of the situation.

The Ten approached the 1981 sessions of the Ad Hoc Committee on the basis of the mandate set out in General Assembly resolution 35/150, the draft of which was adopted by consensus in this Committee last year. Among other things, in that resolution the General Assembly asked the Ad Hoc Committee to continue its efforts to secure the necessary harmonization of views on the issues related to the convening of the Conference and to make every effort, in consideration of the political and security climate in the Indian Ocean area, to finalize all preparations for the Conference, including the dates of its convening.

It is essentially to these questions that the Ad Hoc Committee addressed itself during the course of its 1981 sessions. Serious attempts were made to make progress on the harmonization of views on the issues related to the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean. The Ten maintain the view that there remains a lot of work to be done before it would be either wise or appropriate to convene such a conference.

We were forced to conclude that there had been no improvement in the security situation in the Indian Ocean region. It is self-evident that a committee dealing with the question of peace in the Indian Ocean region cannot simply ignore the presence in Afghanistan of large numbers of Soviet troops. In these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that the Committee was unable to agree upon the dates for a conference in 1981. It remains our view that it would be inappropriate to convene a conference on the Declaration of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean area while a non-aligned State of the region continues to be occupied by foreign troops and in the absence of any real progress in the harmonization of views on the many fundamental issues which remain to be resolved.

The draft resolution contained in the Ad Hoc Committee's report, which appears in document A/36/29, calls upon the Committee to continue its work on the harmonization of views, taking into account the political and security climate,

with a view to considering the date for a conference on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. As in the past, those members of the Ten which are represented in the Committee will endeavour to make a constructive contribution to the work of the Committee. But the difficulties which we have encountered during this last year, and indeed during previous years, cause us to question the way in which the Ad Hoc Committee approaches its task. We believe that the lack of any real progress is due to a large extent to the limitations imposed upon the Committee by the insistence of some that we should not stray beyond the very limited definition of the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace contained in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI). That resolution dates back to 1971 and, as we are all aware, things have changed since then. We would not wish to suggest that resolution 2832 (XXVI), which spawned the Ad Hoc Committee, should be ignored, but the Ten feel strongly that the Ad Hoc Committee should be prepared to face up to reality and consider whether more progress might not be made if the mandate of the Committee were developed.

We are convinced that all those concerned in the Ad Hoc Committee wish to see progress. In our view, the best way of achieving this would be to broaden the present focus of attention in the Committee. In our view, the approach suggested in resolution 2832 (XXVI) does not adequately reflect the realities of the current geo-political situation in the Indian Ocean region. We think, therefore, that it will next year be necessary for the Ad Hoc Committee to look closely at its mandate with a view to considering how its elaboration might contribute to the furtherance of our over-all objective, which remains the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region.

Mr. SEZAKI (Japan): My delegation is very pleased to note that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean adopted by consensus the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The adoption of the draft resolution by consensus would have been impossible without the perseverance and guidance of Ambassador Fonseka of Sri Lanka, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, throughout the entire course of the Committee's work. In this regard, my delegation wishes to pay him its highest tribute.

(Mr. Sezaki, Japan)

My delegation is in full sympathy with the sincere desire of the regional States to establish a zone of peace so that peace and prosperity may prevail in the entire region. However, in order to ensure the success of the Conference, adequate preparations must be made prior to its convening. The failure of the Ad Hoc Committee to reach a decision on a firm date for the Conference reflects the lack of harmonization of views on the basic issues related to its convening. We believe that further time and effort are needed before an agreement on these matters can be reached. That failure also reflects the fact that the political and security climate of the region is not suitable for the holding of a conference. My delegation must regretfully point out that the Soviet military invasion of Afghanistan and its continued military presence in that country, one of the hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, constitute a major obstacle to progress towards holding a conference.

In 1971, at the time when the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace was adopted, my delegation stated that the Declaration would need further elaboration. We believe that it might be desirable next year for the Ad Hoc Committee to study ways and means to develop and broaden the present concept by including provisions which would respond in a more balanced way to actual conditions in the region.

In closing, I should like to reaffirm my delegation's willingness to co-operate in any consultations which seek to achieve the final objective of the Declaration.

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution in document A/36/29 without a vote.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position.

Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania): My delegation has already made known its position and views on the problem of declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace in its statement of 20 November 1981. In that statement we pointed out that we disapproved of the concept of so-called zones of peace.

We also tried to explain what we considered to be right and what we consequently supported in the efforts of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. Likewise, we have pointed out and explained those factors which make us have strong reservations or which are unacceptable to us.

In paragraph 25 of its report the Ad Hoc Committee recommends the adoption of a draft resolution, which has been the common practice in previous sessions, and that draft resolution has been adopted without a vote. In order not to repeat what we have already said, we refrain from making any further explanations, but, in accordance with the positions and views expressed in our statement of 20 November, we simply state that we dissociate ourselves from the consensus that has just been announced.

Mr. MOHAMMADI (Iran): My delegation joined in the consensus on the draft resolution in document A/36/29 on a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region with the understanding that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean would continue its preparatory work for the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean, as called for in General Assembly resolution 34/80 B and in conformity with the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

My delegation regrets that the Ad Hoc Committee was prevented by a small minority of Member States from completing in 1981 its preparatory work for the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean. We witness a growing tendency by that minority to interpret the rule of consensus as a right of veto which could be used to prevent the Ad Hoc Committee carrying out its mandate. Such an interpretation has created serious doubts on the part of my delegation with regard to the usefulness of the rule of consensus in the Ad Hoc Committee.

(Mr. Mohammadi, Iran)

Efforts are also being made by the same minority of members to undermine the Ad Hoc Committee's mandate by arguing that they were not members when the mandate was agreed upon. My delegation's understanding is that those States were aware of the Committee's mandate when they decided to join it, and if they did not fully agree with it they should not have joined in the first place.

My delegation is committed to the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee as it stands, and will remain committed to it until the Committee can reach an agreement by consensus or by a majority to recommend to the General Assembly an alteration of its present mandate.

Mr. YANG Hushan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I should like first on behalf of the Chinese delegation to pay a tribute to Ambassador Fonseka of Sri Lanka, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. Under his chairmanship a great deal of consultation was carried out, and after many difficulties had been overcome a consensus was finally reached on that Committee's report and on the draft resolution annexed to it for submission to the General Assembly. I should like to express our appreciation of the patient efforts of Ambassador Fonseka.

China has all along supported the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean at the earliest possible date. In order to implement the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and promote the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean, it was thought that the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly this year could point out in a down-to-earth way the difficulties and obstacles in the way of convening the Conference and could strongly reflect the legitimate desire for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. But, for well-known reasons, the draft resolution that has been adopted has many serious deficiencies.

The Conference on the Indian Ocean could not be convened at an early date and the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace could not be implemented mainly because of the hegemonism and the policies of aggression and expansion practised by the super-Powers in the Indian Ocean. Their rivalry in that region is daily becoming more acute and their military presence is constantly increasing.

(Mr. Yang Hushan, China)

In particular, the armed aggression against and military occupation of a hinterland State of the Indian Ocean has seriously breached the peace and security of the region and undermined the climate of trust necessary for the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean.

The general wish of the States of the region is that the super-Powers cease aggression and expansion in the Indian Ocean region, that all their military presence be eliminated, and in particular that foreign occupation and aggressor troops be withdrawn. However, the draft resolution which has been adopted inadequately reflects those points. The Chinese delegation agrees with the adoption of the draft resolution, but we could not do other than frankly point out its deficiencies.

Mr. SALLAM (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): We have joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/36/29, being fully confident that continuous dialogue as well as good intentions would make it possible to hold the Conference on the Indian Ocean. However, we wish to affirm the following: First, the Indian Ocean and its natural extensions form a sensitive and very important area for the countries of the region as well as the whole world. Keeping that area free from any foreign military presence is a guarantee of the stability and security of the countries of the area.

Secondly, our delegation places certain responsibility on some of the Western countries in hindering the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, which is seeking to hold the Conference on the Indian Ocean in accordance with the General Assembly resolution on this question. We hope that these countries will change their attitude in view of the great importance of the area with regard to the international economy and international peace and security.

Mr. VO ANH TUAN (Viet Nam) (interpretation from French): Viet Nam, a country located in a region contiguous to the Indian Ocean, attaches great importance to the question of the creation of a zone of peace in that region. In the present complex international situation, efforts to implement the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace should be intensified in order to curb the arms race, decrease tension in the region and meet the profound aspirations of the peoples of the littoral and hinterland countries to live in peace and tranquillity in order to be able to concentrate their efforts and resources on their economic and social development.

The resolution contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee in document A/36/29 by and large serves those objectives. Therefore, my delegation joined in the consensus, although we would have preferred a more specific and precise text reflecting the position of the non-aligned countries.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

However, my delegation regrets the fact that 10 years after the adoption by the General Assembly of this important Declaration, no tangible progress has been made towards the realization of its objectives. The United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean, which was to take place in Colombo, Sri Lanka this year, was not held. The exact date at which it may be convened in 1983 has not yet been determined. This is due to the dilatory and obstructionist attitude of the United States of America and its close allies, who have sought to impose prior conditions related to what they call the harmonization of views on the determination of the objectives for the Conference. That attitude reflects the desire of the United States to oppose the creation of a zone of peace in the region. Thus, the representative of the United States unambiguously stated, on 19 November last, in the First Committee, that the United States:

"never accepted the 1971 Declaration, nor have we supported the goal of a conference in order to implement that Declaration."

(A/C.1/36/PV.35, p.42)

Concrete actions have clearly shown that, since the adoption of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, the United States has unceasingly increased its military presence in the region, in the context of its strategy of world hegemony and the pursuit of military supremacy over the oceans, to the detriment of the interests of international peace and security. Several regions bordering on the Indian Ocean have been declared "zones of vital interest for the United States". Rapid deployment forces have been sent there. Joint military manoeuvres have been organized, the most recent of which took place in the Red Sea area and off the coast of the Horn of Africa. The United States has modernized its existing military bases and is attempting to set up new ones. It has unilaterally ended

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union on the limitation and reduction of military activities in the Indian Ocean. According to an article published in the International Herald Tribune of 21 March last, at the beginning of this year the American naval presence in the Indian Ocean rose to 32 combat and supply vessels, against only three destroyers during the 1970s. The Diego Garcia base, which not long ago was a modest military installation, has now been turned into a huge centre for applying American strategy throughout the region. Runways for strategic B-52 bombers are being constructed, as are harbour installations capable of simultaneously receiving vessels with crews totalling 12,000 men. B-52 planes have begun to carry out regular flights over the Indian Ocean from American bases in Guam and Australia.

American strategy, developed in November 1979 by Mr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, national-security adviser to President Carter, and by the joint chiefs of staff, provides for the modernization of the Diego Garcia base and the acquisition of rear and forward installations and depots all along the coasts of Africa and Asia.

One must add to this that the United States, in collusion with the expansionists of other large nations, is pursuing an undeclared war against Afghanistan, one of the hinterland countries of the Indian Ocean, and is providing support in various forms to the racist régimes of South Africa and Israel.

In joining in the consensus on the draft resolution contained in document A/36/29, my delegation would like to appeal to the Ad Hoc Committee to spare no effort to ensure that the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean be convened as soon as possible at Colombo, before the middle of 1983.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan Viet Nam)

I should also like to reaffirm the whole-hearted support of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam for the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of the littoral and hinterland countries to turn the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, where foreign military bases would be eliminated, where the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and peace and security of the countries of the region would be assured and where the norms of international law and the provisions of the United Nations Charter would be strictly observed.

The CHAIRMAN: We have completed action on item 49, concerning the Indian Ocean.

(The Chairman)

I now call on the representative of New Zealand to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.54 on agenda item 42, "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". The report of the Secretary-General is in document A/36/613.

Mr. MARTIN (New Zealand): I am introducing draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.54 on behalf of the delegations of Australia, Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Turkey -- whose name should have appeared on the original list of sponsors -- and my own delegation, New Zealand.

I should perhaps first sketch in the background to the resolution that was adopted by the General Assembly on the subject last year. It will be recalled that there had been reports of the alleged use of chemical weapons in certain parts of the world. The delegations which initiated last year's resolution considered that the international community had an obligation to look into those reports and to try to ascertain the facts. We believed, too, that such an inquiry was essential if the continued authority of the 1925 Protocol was to be upheld. And because that Protocol is not supported by any formal system of control and makes no provision for investigating allegations of use, we proposed that the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a small group of experts, should be requested to undertake the investigation.

The initiators of resolution 35/144 C thus had two objectives: to uphold the authority of the 1925 Protocol and, to that end, to provide for an impartial investigation of reports on the alleged use of chemical weapons. The report of the Group of Experts appointed for this purpose by the Secretary-General has now been transmitted to the General Assembly in document A/36/613. I am sure that all who read the report will be impressed by the systematic way in which the Experts went about their task, by their objectivity and by the integrity of their conclusions. We are all in their debt. And we with them can also draw satisfaction from the knowledge that the report is, in its own way, a landmark in the history of this Organization, a precedent for the further involvement of the United Nations in inquiries of this sort, should any be necessary, and a pattern for the future.

(Mr. Martin, New Zealand)

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.5⁴ calls attention to two aspects of the report of the Group of Experts: first, the importance of timely investigation of charges that chemical weapons have been used and the related need to devise appropriate procedures for impartial collection and analysis of samples and, secondly, the need for an extension of the Group's mandate to enable it to complete its investigations.

On the first of these I shall note simply that in several places in its report, for example, paragraphs 43 and 49, the Group refers to the importance of prompt on-site investigation of alleged chemical-weapon attacks and the need, as the experts put it in their concluding chapter, to devise appropriate procedures for the impartial collection and analysis of samples that might be obtained in the course of any such investigations. Without that, the Experts observed, it would always be difficult to ascertain whether a chemical warfare agent had or had not been used.

As will be evident from the text of the draft resolution, we are not proposing that the Group should itself be invited to consider this matter further; that is something for the future - a task that would be better undertaken as a separate exercise rather than in the context of a particular investigation. Today, therefore, we wish simply to record our belief that it may be appropriate for the Assembly, at a later date, to consider the advisability of establishing arrangements and devising procedures for the speedy and impartial investigation of allegations of chemical weapons use.

On the second matter, delegations will have noted that the report refers to certain aspects of the investigation which could not be completed in the time available. For example, paragraph 77 of the report records the fact that the Group was unable, because of time constraints, to visit a country that had declared its willingness to accord the necessary co-operation for the purpose of on-site investigations. Paragraphs 82 and 97 refer to samples which have been handed over for analysis by qualified and impartial laboratories, the results of which are not yet available. There are of course other areas too in which the report indicates that additional work needs to be done.

(Mr. Martin, New Zealand)

It is clearly desirable that the Group of Experts should be given the additional time needed to permit them to complete their investigations and to report the results of their work to the Secretary-General for submission to the next session of the General Assembly. That, accordingly, is what draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.54 proposes. It is essentially a procedural text and we commend it to delegations for their favourable consideration.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: This morning I suggested that we should proceed on Friday morning with agenda items 57 and 58, concerning the strengthening of international security, and that, upon completing the debate and the deliberations on these items, we should take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.54 and the report to which it is related and draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.42. As I hear no objection, we shall proceed on that basis.

I should like to remind the members of the Committee that at the beginning of our deliberations we decided that we would hold the general debate on agenda items 57 and 58 together.

For Friday afternoon, 27 November, we do not have any speakers on the list. However, I have been approached by the Ambassador of Guyana, Mr. Scotland, who indicated that he would like to have a meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the First Committee on Friday afternoon, 27 November. I believe that the members of the Committee will find this suggestion very useful, because the Ad Hoc Working Group should meet, since members have for some days had before them document A/C.1/36/WG/CRP.1, that is, a draft resolution and draft declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States, and the Ambassador of Guyana suggested that possible amendments to these draft texts be submitted no later than Wednesday, that is, today. He will formally introduce the draft resolution and the draft declaration on Friday morning.

The officers of the Committee met early this morning and they suggest that the deadline for closing the list of speakers on items 57 and 58 should be Friday, 27 November, at 6 p.m. I therefore ask all members intending to take part in the debate to inscribe their names on the list before the deadline.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.