



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 43RD MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GREHO (Ghana)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

\* 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-3850, 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.

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

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/37/L.8, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; L.10, Colombia and Liberia; L.16, United Republic of Cameroon; L.26, Liberia; L.27, United Republic of Cameroon; L.31, Saudi Arabia, Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria and Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; L.39/Rev.1, Algeria; L.41, Sweden; L.45, Colombia, Indonesia and Benin; L.48, Bangladesh; L.50, Bangladesh; L.53, Belgium; L.60, Liberia; L.64/Rev.1, Liberia and Sweden; L.65, Australia, Bahamas, Costa Rica, Japan, Kenya, Mali, Norway, Singapore and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: When this morning's meeting ended we were considering draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65, as orally amended.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read the list of the 11 sponsors of this draft resolution.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65 are: Australia, Bahamas, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Mali, Norway, Singapore, United States of America and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: We now have to decide exactly what word in English was the subject of the oral amendment by the Soviet delegation.

Mr. C. LIDGARD (Sweden): I listened with the greatest interest to the dialogue between the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States. Of course, it will be good if they can reach agreement, but this is an extremely sensitive question, on which my delegation has no instructions. Therefore, I suggest that we postpone the decision until our next meeting. Of course, we have no objection to discussion of the subject continuing today.

The CHAIRMAN: The Swedish delegation does not have instructions on the word "truthful". The suggestion, therefore, is that we defer consideration of this matter to a later meeting.

The Chair is entirely in the hands of the Committee and would welcome a truthful statement of the position.

I call first on the United States delegation, which is the author of the draft resolution, to react to the proposal by the Swedish delegation.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): We are a sponsor of the draft resolution, Mr. Chairman, but not its authors. We worked with many other countries which are sponsors. If the Swedish representative feels strongly about the matter, his suggestion would give us time to consult the other sponsors, and therefore we have no strong objections.

The CHAIRMAN: I am grateful for the correction made by the representative of the United States. My notes say that it was the United States delegation that introduced the draft resolution at the Committee's 38th meeting. However, I do not insist on my being right; I take the word of the representative of the United States on the matter.

I understand that the sponsors of the draft resolution do not insist on our considering this matter now. Let us shelve it for the time being and return to it before the end of the meeting, when the sponsors have had an opportunity to consult. I suggest that we deal with some other resolutions now and find out nearer the end of the meeting what the Committee wishes to do. Will that satisfy the United States delegation?

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Then we shall shelve that matter for the time being.

Mr. UCHUNO (Nigeria): Mr. Chairman, now that you have indicated how you intend to proceed with our programme of work, my delegation would like to give notice that a revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.10, "United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament", will be available to the Committee on Friday morning, 26 November, for a decision to be taken at that time.

The slight amendment to that draft resolution consists in the simple addition of a phrase taken from the Concluding Document of the second special session on disarmament at the end of the second preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 2. In other words, the following will be added at the end of the second preambular paragraph:

"... and bearing in mind the savings that can be made within existing budgetary appropriations,"

and the following at the end of operative paragraph 2:

"... bearing in mind the savings that can be made within existing budgetary appropriations;"

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31, under agenda item 56, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament". The draft resolution has 15 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Iraq at the 36th meeting of the Committee on 18 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee, who will read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The 15 sponsors are: Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Mauritania, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Viet Nam, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Somalia, who has asked to make a statement at this stage.

Mr. ADAN (Somalia): Somalia would like to join the sponsors of this draft resolution, contained in document A/C.1/37/L.31.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Iraq, who has asked to be allowed to make a statement at this stage.

Mr. AL-SAHAF (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I have asked to speak at this stage to introduce two oral amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31. These amendments are the result of consultations held with a number of delegations.

The first amendment changes the seventh preambular paragraph to read as follows - and I shall read it out in English in order to facilitate matters: (spoke in English)

"Conscious of the grave consequences which endanger international peace and security as a result of Israel's nuclear-weapon capability, and Israel's collaboration with South Africa to develop nuclear weapons and their delivery systems,".

(continued in Arabic)

The second amendment changes operative paragraph 5 to read as follows: (spoke in English)

"5. Requests the Security Council to consider taking effective action so as to prevent Israel from endangering international peace and security by its nuclear capability and by pursuing its policy of aggression, expansion and annexation of territories;".

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

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): I myself am not sure of the consequences of the proposed amendment but it seems to me that it would not change at all the thrust of the draft resolution, which is one of a series of similar resolutions dating back to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, which we have opposed in each and every year. As we explained last year, it is difficult to see how this particular draft resolution could contribute to arms control and disarmament and the larger goal of peace and stability in the Middle East. The unbalanced way in which it has been drafted is not helpful to our collective non-proliferation efforts, efforts which are very important to my Government. Singling out one State for condemnation in a resolution is particularly objectionable, as the problems in the region are much broader. We can see nothing constructive resulting from the adoption of this draft resolution, including the new amendments which have been proposed here in this Committee, and the United States will therefore vote against it.

Mr. TARI (Israel): Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31, which is before the Committee, is repeatedly discriminatory, as was from its inception the resolution that singled out Israel for investigation. Even according to the criteria chosen by Iraq, there would have been room for several committees of experts to investigate the nuclear activities of a number of Member States. Let me refer the Committee to the annual report of the International Atomic Energy Agency for 1981 (A/37/382, annex) of July 1982. A list of countries can be found there which would provide numerous groups of experts with investigative opportunities for many long years. In addition, the terms of reference given to the group of experts by the initial resolution were clearly prejudicial in that they required the Secretary-General to prepare a study of the 'Israeli nuclear armament'. The very formulation of the terms of reference made any impartial research most difficult.

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

It is sad that we should once again be required to discuss this question and reach the usual foregone distorted conclusions. The draft proposes no solution to the basic problem but, on the contrary, hampers any attempt to understand and grapple with the essential issues involved.

Hostile and biased initiatives such as the Iraqi draft resolution before us do not serve the cause of peace in the Middle East and, indeed, are not intended to do so. The present Iraqi draft serves to introduce an imbalance into the international debate on this question and thereby hampers all efforts to bring global and regional problems under control. The Iraqi persistence in pursuing this course can be understood only if viewed against the background of Iraq's unrelenting hostility towards Israel.

The Iraqi delegation had asked earlier why Israel had refused to sign the non-proliferation Treaty. Again, answers can be found in document A/36/610, page 43.

Israel voted, on 10 June 1968, in favour of resolution 2373 (XXII), adopting the text of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Israel has studied the various aspects of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in reference to the conditions prevailing in the Middle East and has come to the conclusion that a lasting and effective non-proliferation régime can be established in such a volatile area only if each State is contractually assured. Israel has therefore proposed the establishment by negotiation of a nuclear weapon-free zone in the Middle East on the pattern, so generally accepted and valued, of the Treaty of Tlatelolco of Latin America.

The draft resolution takes note of:

“the First Special Report of the Special Committee against apartheid on recent developments concerning relations between Israel and South Africa (A/37/22/Add.1)”

Let me refer the Committee to what the representative of Israel said on 10 November 1982 on this subject:

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

"One of the most misleading sections of the 1982 special report deals with alleged military and nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa. There is not one single item of verified information in this section. Indeed the key words used by the authors of the report seem to be 'reported' and 'possible'. The words 'substantiated' and 'probable', however, continue as in past years to be conspicuous in their absence. Once again it is clear that those who drafted the report have been unable to produce any real evidence for their accusations. In the interests of fair and accurate reporting, therefore, I would once again refer representatives to document S/AC.20/17, dated 14 September 1979 and circulated as a document of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977). In that document my Government reconfirmed its undertakings of 7 December 1977 (S/12475) and 3 April 1978 (S/12475/Add.1), namely:

'... that it will comply with Security Council resolution 418 (1977), and accordingly, Israel will not provide South Africa with arms or related material of all types, including the sale or transfer of weapons and ammunition, military vehicles and equipment.'  
(S/AC.20/17, paragraph 2)

"Those assurances were reconfirmed in our letter of 23 June 1980 to the same Committee. This notwithstanding, there is no mention in the special report of the letters and notes of the representatives of Israel sent in response to inquiries by appropriate organs of the United Nations, including the Special Committee itself."

(A/37/PV.61, pp. 38-40 and 41)

I find it necessary to refer also to the singling-out and "famous" document repeatedly quoted by the Iraqis in their statements -- document A/36/431:

"With regard to the question of a possible nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa, it was noted in paragraph 37 of the report that, until specific examples of actual nuclear exchanges or transactions could be cited as clear evidence of such co-operation, the whole question remained in a state of uncertainty." (A/36/431, annex, para. 13)



(Mr. Tari, Israel)

In response to the Iraqi question concerning alleged nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa, let me point out that it is Israel's adamant policy to have no relations with South Africa at the governmental level in the nuclear field.

I cannot but stress once again the bad faith of Iraq by introducing at the last moment changes in a draft resolution already presented a long time ago. This action proves once again Iraq's wish to confuse issues and mislead this Committee.

The draft resolution before us contains unwarranted and unacceptable demands. Israel therefore rejects the draft resolution in its entirety.

Mr. OSMAN (Djibouti) (interpretation from French): I should merely like to add the name of Djibouti to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31.

Mr. LAKHOUIT (Morocco) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Morocco fully endorses draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31 and wishes to become a sponsor.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31 as orally amended by Iraq. A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2 of that draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Finland, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Malawi, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Spain, Thailand, Uruguay

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31, as orally amended was adopted by 87 votes to 17, with 18 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to the voting on the draft resolution as a whole, as orally amended.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,

Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31 as a whole, as orally amended, was adopted by 91 votes to 2, with 30 abstentions.

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

Mr. de LAIGLESIA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): As we did at the last session of the General Assembly, my delegation wishes to point out that it shares the concern of the international community that the situation in the Middle East may be aggravated by the introduction of nuclear weapons into that troubled area. It is out of that same concern that the delegation of Spain voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31, with whose general thrust we associate ourselves. But once again we wish to state the following for the record.

(Mr. de Laiglesia, Spain)

In connection with the sixth preambular paragraph, the Spanish delegation reserves its position regarding the freedom of every State to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

With reference to the operative part, my delegation is particularly concerned over paragraphs 2, 3 and 5. The latter two cause us difficulty in that they refer to actions by the Security Council which only the Security Council can decide upon. As for paragraph 2, we believe it is at variance with the principle of the freedom of all States to acquire nuclear technology for peaceful purposes and to co-operate freely among themselves for that purpose, without discrimination.

For that reason, the Spanish delegation abstained in the voting on that paragraph.

Mr. ESCUDERO (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation joined in the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31, which has just been voted upon. We agree with its general underlying spirit, but we do have reservations on operative paragraph 5. Had there been a separate vote on that paragraph, Ecuador would have abstained, for the paragraph incorporates elements extraneous to the draft resolution and disregards the political prerogatives of other United Nations bodies.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): Ireland abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31 as a whole and voted against operative paragraph 2. Our position is that the question of the application of safeguards to Israel cannot be isolated from other related aspects of the non-proliferation régime in the Middle East. Therefore, we cannot support the inconsistency of the call on Israel to submit its nuclear facilities to safeguards with the call for an end to all forms of co-operation with Israel in the nuclear field, since we support the right of all nations in the Middle East and elsewhere to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): If the sixth preambular paragraph had been voted on separately, my delegation would have abstained in the vote on it.

Mr. TAVARES NUNES (Portugal) (interpretation from French): My delegation has repeatedly expressed my country's support for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones - an important instrument for nuclear non-proliferation, provided certain conditions exist. Our policy in this matter remains unchanged. My Government therefore views with concern any act that might endanger the establishment of such zones.

Israel's acquisition of a nuclear-weapon capability is definitely relevant to this matter. We therefore find it quite unacceptable that any country should be allowed to attack nuclear facilities subject to International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. Those safeguards have so far proved effective in detecting and preventing the diversion of nuclear materials for military use.

We abstained in the vote on this draft resolution because of our objection to some of the terms used in several paragraphs. We find it particularly objectionable that there should be comprehensive condemnation of all nuclear co-operation with Israel. Nuclear co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should not be the subject of condemnation. It was for that reason that my delegation voted against operative paragraph 2. We also question the wisdom of several other operative paragraphs, such as operative paragraphs 3 and 4.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina)(interpretation from Spanish): My delegation's affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31 should be understood as an expression of our support for the general objective of protecting the Middle East against the danger of a nuclear war by keeping that area free of nuclear weapons. However, this does not mean that we support all the concepts contained in the draft resolution, in particular

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5. If those paragraphs had been voted on separately, my delegation would have abstained.

At the same time we wish to reaffirm the position of the Argentine Government - a well-known one - on the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the application of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

Mr. HYLTIENIUS (Sweden): The Swedish Government has on several occasions strongly condemned the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear installation. It constituted a flagrant violation of the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the rules of international law. No circumstances can justify that act, which cannot but adversely affect efforts to reach a lasting peace in the Middle East. The Swedish Government has also expressed its concern with regard to the possible consequences of the attack on the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards system.

Against that background and bearing in mind Sweden's strong commitment to international efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, it is regrettable that the draft resolution is formulated in such a way that my delegation is unable to support it. In the view of my Government it contains, inter alia in operative paragraphs 2 and 3, formulations that cannot be reconciled with the division of responsibilities envisaged in the Charter between the General Assembly and the Security Council. That was the reason why we voted against those two paragraphs. For that reason and because of reservations on other parts of the text, my delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

It is my Government's view that all non-nuclear-weapon States should place all nuclear activities in their countries under IAEA safeguards. We therefore fully agree with what is said in the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. The call for full-scope safeguards should, however, be addressed to all nations that do not yet admit such safeguards on their territories. The Swedish Government hopes that all those nations which have voted in favour of the draft resolution and which have not yet accepted full-scope safeguards will be willing to comply with the same demands that they are making of Israel.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus completed action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31, as orally amended.

Before we proceed to the next draft resolution, I call on the representative of Egypt.

Miss NAGA (Egypt): I should like, on behalf of its sponsors, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1, which contains some changes that its sponsors have agreed to make after intensive consultations with interested delegations. The revision applies to the following paragraphs.

First, in the third preambular paragraph, second line, the words "shall be exclusively for peaceful purposes and" have been deleted. Thus that paragraph as it appears in the revised text reads as follows:

"Reaffirming that exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interest of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development and shall be the province of all mankind".

Secondly, a new fourth preambular paragraph has been added and reads as follows:

"Reaffirming further the will of all States that exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies shall be exclusively for peaceful purposes".

Thirdly, the text of operative paragraph 1 has been replaced by the following:

"Reaffirms the will of all States that outer space shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and that it shall not become an arena for an arms race".



(Miss Nagga, Egypt)

We hope that with that revision this draft resolution will be acceptable to certain delegations. The sponsors would like to note in particular that this revision is the result of intensive consultations with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.8, in the effort to reach common ground that allows us to focus our attention on one draft resolution under the item dealing with the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1 are pleased that this common ground has been reached with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.8, who have indicated their readiness to join in the sponsoring of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1.

In that connection, on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1, I should like to express our thanks and appreciation to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.8 for the spirit of understanding and co-operation which they have shown. We believe that this is a very positive step towards reducing the number of draft resolutions before the Committee under item 57 in relation to the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We hope that that positive step will favour the prospect of a single draft resolution under this item which could be adopted by consensus.

Before concluding, I should like to announce that Sweden has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1.

Mr. S. BOLD (Mongolia): On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.8 on the item entitled "Conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space", the Mongolian delegation is pleased to announce that the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Mongolia join in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1, introduced by the Egyptian delegation.

(Mr. S. Bold, Mongolia)

In doing so, we should first like to express our appreciation and sincere gratitude to the authors of this draft for their spirit of co-operation and accommodation in reaching agreement on the common draft resolution.

We are pleased that the intensive consultations among the delegations concerned have resulted in agreement on a single text on this subject, and in our opinion the aim of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1 is further to intensify the work of the Committee on Disarmament in the preparation of an agreement or agreements, as appropriate, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We also consider that, to put the Committee's work on a practical basis, it is important to set up an ad hoc working group to begin negotiations on substantive issues with a view to the adoption of effective measures to prevent the spread of an arms race in outer space.

In view of what I have just said, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.8 have decided to withdraw that draft resolution and to associate themselves with the newly introduced draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1. Therefore, may I request the Secretariat kindly to add the names of the following delegations on the list of sponsors of that draft resolution: Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and Mongolia.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Disarmament and international security", under agenda item 133, dealing with the Review and Implementation of the Concluding Document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly.

This draft resolution has 15 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Cyprus at the 38th meeting of the First Committee on 19 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors are: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Colombia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, India, Kenya, Malta, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia.

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

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With regard to the forthcoming vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.39/Rev.1, the Soviet delegation would like to point out that in the conditions obtaining today, with the current escalation of the arms race and the rapid and profound changes in the development of military technology, the cessation of the stockpiling of weapons and disarmament are the primary objectives of any efforts to strengthen peace and international security. At the same time, the Soviet Union does not in any sense reduce all the problems of international security to the question of halting the nuclear arms race. The Soviet Union considers that every possible means should be employed in the maintenance of peace and the prevention of a third world war. It is ready to resolve any international problem through negotiations on a sound basis acceptable to all parties.

We share the conclusions of the group of experts of the United Nations who carried out an analysis of the interrelationship of disarmament and international security, to the effect that:

"Progress in disarmament and in the strengthening of international security must be looked upon as parallel means in the effort to preserve peace and prevent war." (A/36/597, para. 43)

However, unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.39 contains provisions which are not in keeping with this approach which, as pointed out in the study which I mentioned,

"... lies at the very root of many of the problems concerning progress in disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security."  
(ibid, para. 226)

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The sixth and seventh paragraphs of the preamble contain provisions which in substance link the attainment of agreement on disarmament to the prior implementation of steps for the strengthening of international security. Life itself and the whole experience of general international practice shows that diplomacy requires not ties or links but a loosening of ties; not a demand for prior conditions in various fields but a quest for mutually acceptable solutions of the most complex problems. Above all, there is of course the problem of curbing the arms race in both conventional and nuclear weapons.

For those reasons, the Soviet delegation will abstain from voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. GAYAME (Congo) (interpretation from French): I wish merely to say that the delegation of Congo would like to join in sponsoring this draft resolution.

Mr. ABDELWAHAB (Sudan): It is my intention to convey to the Committee the desire of the delegation of Sudan to be included in the list of sponsors.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): Costa Rica would also like to join the list of co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.39/Rev.1 on disarmament and international security.

The CHAIRMAN: The voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.39/Rev.1 will now begin.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.39/Rev.1 was adopted by 103 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.

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

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish very briefly to state that my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.39/Rev.1 because, although we completely agree with the sentiments of the sponsors who wished to strengthen the close link between disarmament and international security, the draft resolution contains certain concepts which require further consideration on our part. The only approach that we feel should be taken towards disarmament is to accelerate negotiations in this area to end and reverse the arms race and to adopt concrete disarmament measures, in particular in the nuclear field.

We agree also that disarmament efforts and efforts for international security should be made in a parallel way and with a sense of mutual interrelationship.

Mr. ALBECI (Italy) (interpretation from French): While broadly endorsing the concerns and intentions of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.39/Rev.1, the Italian delegation had to abstain in the vote, as it did last year on resolution 36/97 K, because we felt that some of the elements contained in this text are not in keeping with the required precise and balanced approach to the question of the relationship between disarmament and international security.

I take this opportunity to stress the importance my delegation attaches to this subject. We feel that the relationship between disarmament and international

(Mr. Albeci, Italy)

security is crucial to our debates and is the cornerstone of any real progress in disarmament. This is a point made in the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution which emphasizes the need to apply to the whole disarmament question a new and more positive approach based on rendering operable the security system provided by the Charter, in conjunction with efforts towards disarmament agreements.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like to explain why my delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.39/Rev.1.

First of all, it reaffirms a resolution on which we abstained last year. Secondly, the text contains a good deal of language which causes my delegation problems, but I do not propose to go into detail here.

We attach great importance to the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization. We are aware, however, that constructive work is currently under way to deal effectively with this valuable document in another more appropriate forum.

Finally, my delegation has more specific reservations about operative paragraph 2. We are not convinced that it is either appropriate or necessary, in particular in view of the inclusion of a new item in the General Assembly's agenda proposed by the Republic of Cyprus and entitled "Implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations". We consider it would be more appropriate to take up under this item the issues raised in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution before us.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.39/Rev.1.

Members of the Committee will recall that a little while ago I suggested that we defer consideration to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65, as orally amended by the delegation of the Soviet Union, until later during the course of this afternoon's meeting. Since we deferred the matter I have received the amendment proposed by the Soviet delegation in written form and I have consulted the Secretariat's language services on the matter as to which word is to be used in the proposal. The advice given me by the Secretariat is that, although both "truthful" and "authentic" are acceptable translations of the Russian original, the more acceptable of the two is "authentic".

I shall therefore leave it to the Committee to decide on which word it wants to use, after which I intend to put the draft resolution to the decision-making process.

Mr. IJEWERE (Nigeria): I was going to suggest that we use the word "accurate" instead of "authentic" or "truthful". I do not know how we intend to use the words "authentic" or "truthful", but I think "accurate" would be more appropriate. What we want about the activities of those people is accurate information.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation finds this discussion highly important because its purpose is nothing less than the guarantee of the freedom of information. We feel that the original text was acceptable. As for saying that we are going to describe information as "truthful", which would be "véridiques" perhaps in French, we obviously hope that information would be truthful. But if we put "authentique" instead of "véridiques" in French, we would give an entirely different slant to it. Authentic information is information which has a certified origin, that is what "authentique" means in French, information bearing the seal of an authority, in other words, official information. It is a little difficult for us to limit the flow of information which we are dealing with here to such information. I think it would be a good thing to acknowledge that information which may be exchanged during the campaign should perhaps come from other sources, institutes of research, private, independent research, and then it is up to everyone to judge the merits of such information. But it seems to us that after the expressions "to facilitate the flow of a broad range of information on disarmament matters, both governmental and non-governmental ..." does this not take us into a rather pointless discussion as to what "authentic" really means in connection with sources that could be governmental or non-governmental?

This is the question that my delegation would like to raise while stressing the importance of finding a solution that we can all agree to.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): I fully agree with what the representative of France has just said. The word "autentico" seems to be a reference to the origin of the information; but what we are really saying is that we want the information to be accurate. I think "accurate" is really the right word. Even "veraz" in Spanish means something different. I think "exacta" would be the right word.



(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

I should like to say that we are always concerned about this principle of the freedom of information, which we support.

Mr. ADAN (Somalia): If my memory serves me correctly, before we recessed for lunch I think that the two delegations principally concerned with this matter had come to an agreement on a particular word. Therefore I do not understand why this matter is being debated further. While the two delegations which are principally concerned are agreed on one word, let us have that word and put it in. It would not make all the difference in the world whether we had "truthful", "authentic" or "accurate". We all know what we mean here. Therefore I think that the two delegations agreed on one word; let us have that word and finish with this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: In the light of your intervention, I should like to provide an explanation since I am partially responsible for the continued consideration of the matter.

I am aware that the two delegations were about to agree on the word "truthful", but, as I pointed out then - and as I still believe - the import of the draft resolution goes beyond the two delegations and those who are being asked to agree to the draft resolution must also have a fair chance of considering the words that are being used. That is why we are still considering the matter.

A formal proposal has been made by the Soviet delegation in Russian and I shall leave it to the language services to translate as faithfully as possible and as far as their professionalism will allow the meaning of the proposal in Russian. I have taken advantage of this meeting to inform the Committee of what the language services think, largely because the proposal was an oral one and there was a need for all of us to agree on the understanding that we have. As far as I am concerned, I have listened very carefully to the comments on this, but I shall need a formal proposal for another proposal other than the one which has been made by the Soviet delegation. As far as the Chair is concerned, there is only one amendment before us and that is the one of the Soviet delegation which I am inclined to believe will be translated by the language services into English as "authentic" and into the other official languages of the United Nations as appropriate.

(The Chairman)

If any delegation is not happy with this then it should please submit a formal proposal.

Mr. IJEWERE (Nigeria): We are very pleased indeed that at least on this occasion there seems to be an understanding between the super-Powers. But the fact that they are in agreement on a solution does not necessarily serve the interests of the rest of us. We should therefore like to propose that the word "accurate" should be used instead of the word "authentic". Authentic is acceptable to us but we think that the word "accurate" is more acceptable.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): I should just like to make the point that I think not many representatives in this room speak Russian as their native tongue and that therefore we should decide what word we shall use in the English version of this in order to know what we are voting upon, rather than leaving it to any language service or whatever. I think that is only fair to delegations.

Our preference was to have come in with the draft resolution as it was a week ago. We saw no need to change it or we would have changed it; our sponsors saw no need to change it or they would have come to us and we would have worked out changes. Obviously we had this language - it was consensus language - this summer at the first special session on disarmament and we took the same consensus language on that, without any additional words and our feeling was that this consensus language that all delegations had agreed to would be agreed to again by all delegations and that is still very much our preference, to leave it in the consensus language of the summer.

The CHAIRMAN We have the Soviet proposal before us, the translation into English of which will, I believe, be "truthful", since that is more acceptable to the authors of the original draft resolution. There is also the proposal of the Nigerian delegation to use the word "accurate". I have no alternative at this time but to put the two proposals to the Committee. I shall therefore ask all those in favour of "truthful" to please indicate their preference.

Mr. IJEWERE (Nigeria): What are we voting on, Sir? Is it "truthful" information? I have not heard that said very often. I have heard of "correct" information, "accurate" information and "authentic" information. I have never heard of "truthful" information. The expression is very loose; it is not English.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not conducting an exercise in grammar.

Ms. BOYD (Australia): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think that as a matter of correct order the last amendment presented should be put first. We have before us a formal amendment by Nigeria that the word should be "accurate". I request you to put that amendment to the vote first.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Australia has made a justifiable suggestion that the Nigerian amendment, being the latest, should be put to the vote first. I therefore ask representatives to indicate whether they agree with using the word "accurate".

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico): Perhaps we could instead reach agreement on a procedure which will satisfy everybody. I think that in these cases it is good to adopt a procedure which has previously received a consensus.

We all know - at least, I think we try to know - the idea behind the use of the word, whether it be "truthful", "accurate" or whatever. However, that matter was covered in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, paragraph 99 of which contemplated the dissemination of information about the armaments race and so on. In the following paragraphs there were specific provisions on how information should be disseminated. Paragraph 105 stated:

"Member States should be encouraged to ensure a better flow of information with regard to the various aspects of disarmament to avoid dissemination of false and tendentious information concerning armaments, and to concentrate on the danger of escalation of the armaments race and on the need for general and complete disarmament under effective international control." (S-10/2, para. 105)

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Consequently, instead of using adjectives which naturally involve an unavoidable element of subjectivity, I suggest that we simply refer to paragraph 105 of the Final Document. The relevant part of operative paragraph 1 would then read:

"the flow of a broad range of information in conformity with the provisions of paragraph 105 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly".

That would solve the problem.

The CHAIRMAN: I appeal to representatives to let us inject a certain amount of discipline into the conduct of the meeting. I listened very carefully to the statement made by the representative of Mexico. I did not feel like interrupting, because of the great wisdom of the Ambassador of Mexico in these matters. But I shall insist on following the correct procedure. I have already announced that we are to vote on the matter, and any point of order raised can relate only to the conduct of the voting and no longer to the substance of the issue.

Therefore, we shall proceed to vote on whether to use the word "accurate".

Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to raise a point of order concerning the Arabic language. I do not know the difference between the Russian and English terms. The interpreter into Arabic continues to use English words: "accurate", "truthful" or "authentic". Through you, Sir, I appeal to the interpreter not to repeat the words in English but to tell us in Arabic the meaning intended.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the interpreters to take note.

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

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico): Mr. Chairman, I shall follow your advice. My point of order relates to the question of voting. I move formally that my suggestion be put to the vote first.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I cannot accept that interpretation of the rules of procedure. Once a vote has been announced, another motion cannot be entertained. We shall now conduct the voting. After the vote, any delegation is free to move another proposal or to appeal my ruling.

The Nigerian oral amendment was adopted by 42 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65, as just amended, before the vote, I should like to inform the Committee that the sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): I should like formally to request a vote on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65, as amended, will now begin.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, 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, 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 Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Brazil, Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65, as orally amended, was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.\*

---

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

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

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): For us, operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution before us deals with the question of freedom of information. While we do not of course favour the flow of inaccurate information or, for that matter, untruthful information, it is our view that any qualification of the word "information" in the context of operative paragraph 1 is inappropriate.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation decided not to take part in the vote because we shared the views expressed by the sponsors of the draft resolution, as well as of the amendment, that the text should be adopted by consensus.

We should like to put on record that on various occasion I was tempted to put forward an amendment to the effect that we should not only promote internal public opinion but that negotiations on disarmament should be conducted in keeping with that public opinion. Hence, my delegation's future action on this item will depend on the Secretary-General's indications in his report as to how Governments supporting this draft resolution take into account public opinion in their countries regarding negotiations on disarmament.

Mr. HYLTIENIUS (Sweden): Sweden voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65, as amended. For Sweden, the importance of the free flow of information is a matter which is close to our hearts.

However, we would have preferred the text of operative paragraph 1 as it appeared in the original draft resolution before it was amended.

The Swedish delegation shares the main objective of stressing the importance of the free flow of information, and that is why my delegation voted in favour. But I wish to put on record our doubts about the qualification on the free flow of information which has now been introduced into the text of operative paragraph 1.

Mr. BEESLEY (Canada): My delegation strongly supports the thrust of this draft resolution but we are troubled about the insertion of any adjective here because, first, there is no way in which we could attempt to censor information to and from non-governmental agencies and if we could we would not do it and we should not. That is not the intent of the draft resolution or the amendment but it does give us difficulty because of the text as now agreed upon. We wish to make it clear that our interpretation is that there would be no interruption whatsoever of a free flow of information, with no governmental or non-governmental organization attempting to sift true from false and both from opinions.

Mr. VAGELIERS (Netherlands): I wish on behalf of the Netherlands delegation to reiterate that we would have preferred that paragraph 1, dealing with "a broad range of information", had had no adjective before the word "information". In that respect we fully endorse the reservations expressed by the delegations of Sweden and Canada. However, having to choose between the greater good and the lesser evil, we voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America) I should like to join my colleagues from the Netherlands, Canada and Sweden, and others, to say that, as I explained not five minutes ago, our preference and the preference of all the sponsors was to leave the original draft as it was, in the consensus language, for the same reasons as they have so well outlined.

Mr. KONIVES (Hungary): My delegation is a little amazed by this kind of explanation of vote. What we have accepted here is the text of a draft resolution, not the interpretation of a draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65, as orally amended has now been completed.



(The Chairman)

The Committee will now turn its attention to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.45 under agenda item 50 (f), Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the General Assembly at its tenth special session, and the topic is the prevention of nuclear war. The draft resolution has 18 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the 36th meeting of the First Committee on 18 November 1982.

The Secretary of the Committee will read the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of the draft resolution are: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Qatar, Romania, Sri Lanka, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.45. There are no requests to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda,

Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,  
Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan,  
Suriname, 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,  
United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela,  
Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany,  
Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg,  
Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Turkey,  
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,  
United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 111 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

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

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Belgium regrets that the consultations which could have led to a consensus on the basis of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.45 were not successful. In its present form, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.45 is untimely and for that reason we abstained in the vote. Even in the Committee on Disarmament consideration of this question has not led to agreement. We believe, however that the Committee on Disarmament should continue its exchange of views on the whole of the question of nuclear disarmament and in particular on the question of the prevention of nuclear war, the practical aspects of which should be considered more thoroughly.

Mr. de LA CORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.45. We believe that the Committee on Disarmament cannot really engage in negotiations with a view to agreements on appropriate practical measures to prevent nuclear war. We believe on the one hand that the prevention of nuclear war, while it does have special features, is also part of the task of preventing conflicts and the use of force, and here we have the Charter provisions on the non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes. But also, in the circumstances of today the prevention of nuclear war depends also on negotiations between the two major Powers, because it is from the reduction of nuclear arsenals that the best measures for preventing nuclear war will mainly emerge, after balance has been attained at the lowest possible level between arsenals of the two major Powers. Certain confidence-building measures between the nuclear Powers could also lead to prevention of nuclear war but we do not believe that the Committee on Disarmament should, in the present circumstances, negotiate those arrangements. On the other hand we entirely favour the continuation of negotiations on the nuclear aspects of disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: Action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.45 has thus been completed.

The Committee will now proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.48, under agenda item 55 (e), "General and complete disarmament", entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". The draft resolution has 16 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Canada at the thirty-seventh meeting of the First Committee, on 19 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the First Committee): The sponsors are: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Canada, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Singapore, Sweden, Romania and Bangladesh.

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

Mr. SARAN (India): Paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament has set forth the various stages of the process of nuclear disarmament. One of the stages in that process consists of the:

"Cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, and of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". (Resolution S-10/2, para. 50 (b))

India has consistently abstained on proposals which seek to separate the question of the cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes, precisely because such a one-sided and partial approach is inconsistent with the approach agreed upon by consensus in the Final Document of the First Special Session on Disarmament.

(Mr. Saran, India)

In our view, there ought to be a simultaneous stoppage of the production of nuclear weapons and of all fissionable material for weapons purposes. In that event, all States, including the nuclear-weapon States, would have no valid reasons not to accept the same system of equitable and non-discriminatory safeguards on all their nuclear facilities.

India will therefore continue to abstain in the voting on that proposal.

Mr. THIELICKE (German Democratic Republic): The German Democratic Republic attaches the highest priority to measures to stop the nuclear arms race and to reduce nuclear-weapon stockpiles until they have been fully eliminated.

On that basis, in 1979 the German Democratic Republic, together with other socialist countries, submitted in the Committee on Disarmament working paper CD/4, containing specific proposals in this regard and aimed at implementing paragraph 50 of the Final Document.

Furthermore, we favour the beginning of multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament in the Committee on Disarmament and the establishment of a corresponding working group. Part and parcel of the nuclear disarmament process must be the cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. However, this measure cannot be singled out but should be dealt with in the context of negotiations on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament. Since this basic concept is not adequately reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.48, my delegation will abstain.

The relationship between nuclear disarmament and the cut-off of fissionable material for weapons purposes is appropriately dealt with in other draft resolutions before this Committee - for example, in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.21/Rev.1, submitted by the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, and draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.1/Rev.1, submitted by India and sponsored by my delegation.

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As my delegation has repeatedly emphasized the Soviet Union proposes that we undertake in a business-like manner the elaboration, adoption and phased implementation of a programme of nuclear disarmament leading to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. As one of the first steps in such a programme, consideration could be given to the question of the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for the manufacture of various types of nuclear weapons.

Of course, this question must be resolved within the context of questions of the curtailment and cessation of the nuclear arms race, and not in isolation from them. However, the draft contained in document A/C.1/37/L.48 deals with the question of fissionable nuclear materials for weapons purposes in isolation from the question of nuclear disarmament, as has previously been the case.

We do not consider that this approach is in the interests of progress towards the cessation of the nuclear arms race or towards nuclear disarmament. Consequently, the Soviet delegation will abstain in the voting on that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.48 will now begin.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia,

Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Panama, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.48 was adopted by 104 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

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

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.48 because we believe that the correct approach to the question is that set forth in paragraph 50 (b) of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly - that is, joint consideration of the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

That is why in the draft resolution on a nuclear-weapons freeze, of which my delegation had the honour to be a sponsor and which was adopted by an overwhelming majority of votes yesterday, joint reference is made to those two elements - cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and of the production of fissionable materials.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has completed action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.48.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.21/Rev.1. under agenda item 50 (d), entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session", on the topic of nuclear weapons in all aspects. This draft resolution has 13 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the Committee's 33rd meeting on 15 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the names of the sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors are Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Brazil, who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.21/Rev.1 on the understanding, I wish to make clear, that the reference to the elaboration of a nuclear disarmament programme contained in operative paragraph 1 relates to the comprehensive, phased programme referred to in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament. The negotiation of such a programme should not be considered as a condition or prerequisite for the negotiations on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament, which the Committee on Disarmament is called upon to pursue without delay.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.21/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.



A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, 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, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Angola, Greece, Guatemala, Israel, Morocco,  
Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Uruguay, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.21/Rev.1 was adopted by 94 votes to 18,  
with 10 abstentions.\*

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

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.21/Rev.1 which was just adopted. We do so because, in our view, nuclear weapons pose the gravest danger to mankind and we believe that the ongoing efforts to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race should be intensified. We also believe that further aspects of the nuclear arms build-up should be brought within the scope of negotiations, including in particular the nuclear arms build-up in Europe. The nuclear arms race seems to be assuming new dimensions technologically, conceptually and geographically, which my delegation views with particularly grave concern.

With regard to the point dealt with in the sixth to ninth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution, Finland rejects all concepts of limited nuclear war. Our positive vote should be considered as an expression of the serious concern of my delegation on all doctrines which might bring nearer the possibility of a nuclear war. That is why we would have preferred more general formulations in the sixth to ninth preambular paragraphs.

Mr. GLEISSNER (Austria): The Austrian delegation finds itself in agreement with the basic thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.21/Rev.1. Austria has consistently stressed the great importance and urgency of nuclear disarmament. In view of the present acceleration of the nuclear arms race and the growing threat of destabilization, all approaches need to be explored that could lead to progress in this area.

---

\* Subsequently, the delegations of Angola and Sudan advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Gleissner, Austria)

The Committee on Disarmament, as the single multilateral negotiating body on disarmament matters, is the logical forum for negotiations on nuclear disarmament. We would therefore welcome the establishment of a working group of the Committee on Disarmament to begin multilateral deliberations on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament.

However, the preambular part of the draft resolution contains some elements with which we do not find ourselves in agreement. It is in view of our support for the main content of the operative part of the draft resolution that we have cast an affirmative vote.

Mr. MEGALOKONOMOS (Greece): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.21/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear weapons in all aspects". Although this document contains many commendable principles the fact is that we consider that priority should be given to nuclear-weapon disarmament but that should not, in our opinion, be done at the expense of conventional-weapon disarmament. We should not lose from sight the fact that people die every day from conventional weapons or that expenses for that same weaponry are one of the main factors for the lack of social development in many of our countries.

I should like to mention one more reason that caused my delegation to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution, that is, the creation of yet another ad hoc working group to work on cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament. Frankly, it is not that we lack sub-committees and working groups for obtaining effective disarmament; what we lack is the political will required for it.

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Belgium voted against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.21/Rev.1, the preambular part of which refers to the question of nuclear weapons in all their aspects in a unilateral and polemical manner. As in the past, the draft fails to condemn the threat or the use of force in international relations and to recall the right to legitimate self-defence of States, essential principles of the United Nations Charter.

On the contrary, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.21/Rev.1 contains many references to doctrines regarding the use of nuclear weapons which are inappropriate. The Belgian delegation has no objection to the Committee on Disarmament considering the preparation of a nuclear disarmament programme in accordance with the appropriate procedures. In fact, the comprehensive programme of disarmament which we would like to see completed should cover this question, but we continue to believe that it would be more useful in this field, as in others, to allow the Committee on Disarmament to be the sole judge of what procedure should be followed to carry out this endeavour successfully.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now completed its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.21/Rev.1.

We shall now consider draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51, which comes under agenda item 41, entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 36/83 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)." This draft resolution has 21 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 39th meeting of the First Committee.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The 21 sponsors are: Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Netherlands to make a statement.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation wishes to propose an amendment of a purely legal nature to the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51, which recalls that the Netherlands has been a party to Additional Protocol I of the Tlatelolco Treaty since 1971.

While not wishing to elaborate on the subject at this stage of the Committee's work, my delegation should explain that whenever the Netherlands is being referred to in its capacity as a party to an international agreement, the internationally recognized, legally correct nomenclature is "the Kingdom of the Netherlands". My delegation therefore proposes that the words "the Kingdom of" be inserted before the words "the Netherlands" in the third preambular paragraph, so that that part would read "the Kingdom of the Netherlands".

We sincerely hope that this minor amendment will not create difficulties for any delegation to this Committee.

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

Mr. CHADERTON MATOS (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): On a strictly legal basis, I should point out that my country's correct title is the "Republic of Venezuela".

The delegation of the Republic of Venezuela shares the motivations, concerns and interests of the countries sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51. Moreover, my country supports the efforts of the other signatories of the Treaty of Tlatelolco to free our country of the dangers of a nuclear arms build-up. Apart from the fact that the Republic of Venezuela has ratified and signed that Treaty, from the very beginning it has taken part in the establishment of the first inhabited nuclear-weapon-free zone in the world.

I feel obliged to abstain from voting on the draft resolution before us, for reasons which carry great weight with the Republic of Venezuela.

We recognize the sponsors' efforts to embody and interpret in this draft the concerns and observations made by my delegation, the purpose of which was only to help to strengthen the Treaty of Tlatelolco, a monumental Latin American legal instrument, which to a very great extent was inspired by the faith, the will, the dedication and the commitment to peace of a representative of Mexico, Ambassador Garcia Robles, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize and the pride of Latin America.

(Mr. Chaderton Matos, Venezuela)

However, the text could have been more explicit on certain details, to which I should now like to turn. In the third preambular paragraph, in terms almost identical to those of previous years, reference is made to the question of the ratification of Additional Protocol I by certain Powers, members of the Group of Western European and Other Countries. We feel that the text should have been widened to include the violation not only of the spirit of the Treaty but also of article I of the Treaty, which firmly prohibits the deployment of nuclear weapons on the part of extra-continental Powers. During the conflict in the South Atlantic, either nuclear-propelled or nuclear-weapon-carrying warships belonging to a Power signatory of Additional Protocol I went to that area and remained there throughout the hostilities. Their precise activities are now under investigation.

(Mr. Chaderton Matos, Venezuela)

We should also like to recall that that Power had certain support which we cannot ignore when casting our vote on this draft resolution. In operative paragraphs 1 and 2 the text, we believe, fails to strike a proper balance, when another extracontinental Power which possesses territories in the denuclearized zone is vigorously reproached for failing to ratify Additional Protocol I although in actual fact that Power has not violated the spirit of the Protocol, whereas no charge is levelled at those responsible for actual violations of the Protocol which occurred in the South Atlantic,

This is the position of the Republic of Venezuela expressed without any desire to enter into or persist in polemics with any State, but simply with the intention of placing on record its own position on this matter.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine Republic has in the past expressed its support for the objectives of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and for the general thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51 and similar resolutions adopted in past years. The purpose of this draft resolution is, on the other hand, very precise and limited. In the past we have stated that, for reasons of sovereignty, we have had reservations regarding the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. To this we would now add the fact that the Additional Protocol I of the Treaty has been violated in the recent conflict in the South Atlantic, as stated by the representative of Argentina on 21 October past in the general debate in the First Committee. So as not to prolong this explanation of vote, I would refer members to that statement.

That is why the delegation of Argentina will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): The Netherlands will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51, as amended, concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. This is not to say that we consider this draft resolution to be an ideal one. We do not see any reason why this point on the agenda should be limited to Protocol I of the Tlatelolco Treaty. We are of the opinion that it should be changed so as to comprise the Treaty as a whole.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

A future draft resolution should be adapted accordingly. In this vein we appeal to all countries in the region which have not yet done so to ratify the Treaty as soon as possible.

Mr. CISSE (Mali) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, my delegation wishes to congratulate you and will do so again. We are very pleased to see how competently you have been conducting our work.

My delegation attaches much importance to the problem of denuclearization. It sees the full value of the appeal that has been addressed to the States of the region and to other States to make Latin America a denuclearized zone. I shall not repeat the profound sentiments that link Mali to Latin America. However, my delegation wonders whether internal measures, such as ratification of a treaty, can properly ensue from the adoption of a draft resolution. I refer in particular to operative paragraph 1. In light of that I will have to abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51 as orally amended.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia,



Maldives, 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, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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 Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Cuba, France, Ivory Coast, Malawi, Mali, Venezuela

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51, as orally amended, was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.\*

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

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): I am pleased to say that my delegation has just voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51, on implementation of the General Assembly resolution concerning signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. I was pleased to report to this Committee last year that the United States had become a party to this Additional Protocol I. The significance of the Treaty of Tlatelolco goes far beyond our own hemisphere. It provides a valuable contribution to non-proliferation goals and could, as others have mentioned

---

\* Subsequently the delegation of Ethiopia advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour and the delegation of Guyana advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

during this session, serve as a model for other regions of the world exposed to the threat of proliferation of nuclear weapons.

As last year, we continue to feel that it is regrettable that the sponsors of this draft resolution have chosen to single out one country for not ratifying this Protocol. Fairness and candour require us to point out that there are other countries - indeed, important countries - within the region which have not yet signed or ratified the treaty. The United States earnestly hopes to see the Treaty enforced for all countries of the region. Therefore we would urge all eligible States to adhere to the Treaty and thus make this noble initiative an effective force in the cause of non-proliferation.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation was obliged to abstain in the vote just taken on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. My delegation cannot accept thus being called into question while certain countries in the area of application of the Treaty have not signed it, ratified it or made use of the clause which allows for the entry into force of the Treaty as far as they are concerned until all countries in the region become parties to the Treaty.

In due course the French Government will take the appropriate decision concerning ratification of Additional Protocol I, taking into account the status of ratifications of the Treaty itself.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): With all due respect for the representative of the United States, I do not know whether he spoke as representative of a colonial Power in the western hemisphere or as representative of the heir to former colonial possessions, nor do I know whether he was referring to Cuba or Puerto Rico when he spoke of States that had not adhered to the Treaty.

Be that as it may, just in case he was referring to Cuba let me in turn refer to what was said by the Vice-President of the Council of State of Cuba, Mr. Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, on the occasion of the holding in New York of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

"It is not that Cuba fails to recognize the need to put a stop to nuclear proliferation as a condition precedent to the final elimination of those weapons. We believe that the Government of Mexico, in proposing the Treaty of Tlatelolco, made an outstanding contribution in the regional sphere. But, for reasons you will all understand, Cuba was not able to accept passively the unilateral renunciation of its right to possess any type of arms while a part of its national territory continues to be illegally occupied, in Guantanamo, by a United States base which was, and still is, imposed on us. This is precisely the situation which should be remedied now." (A/S-10/PV.8, p. 72)

This is the reply we could give to Ambassador Fields. But there is more.

"Additionally, as long as the nuclear Power of this hemisphere maintains an aggressive policy towards Cuba and resorts to ill-disguised threats even today, no one in all fairness can ask our country to respond with meek acceptance and voluntary renunciation." (Ibid.)

Recent events in the South Atlantic reaffirm the position of Cuba as regards the Tlatelolco Treaty.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to clarify, for the information of all members of the Committee that under our rules of procedure there is time designated at the end of each day's meetings for exercise of rights of reply. When I am calling on representatives in explanation of vote after the vote I would kindly request delegations to restrict themselves to an explanation of vote. If the request is for exercise of the right of reply then that should be made clear so that I can arrange for that particular delegation to speak at the appropriate time.

(The Chairman)

The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51.

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have just received the table of the results of the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65, where it says that this draft resolution was adopted with the amendment of Nigeria. I should like to clarify this matter. The Soviet delegation submitted an official amendment in Russian, which is an official language of the United Nations, to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65. We had not withdrawn our amendment from voting. We officially transmitted it to the Secretariat for reproduction. As we understand it, the delegation of Nigeria submitted its own version of a translation of our amendment. We have no objection to our amendment being translated by the word "accurate", as proposed by the delegation of Nigeria. However, I request you, Sir, to have our amendment reflected in the records of the First Committee and in official documentation as an amendment of the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN: The copy of the results of the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65, as I have it in front of me, nowhere mentions Nigeria, except in recording the vote that Nigeria cast. The understanding is that the oral amendment referred to is the one submitted to the Committee by the Soviet Union. Although the amendment was given to me in writing at a slightly later stage, since it was not issued as an official document it still remains an oral amendment and therefore the reference to an oral amendment is to none other than the Soviet amendment.

Mr. ADAN (Somalia): With respect to the latest intervention by the Soviet Union, I was given to understand that the proposal made by Nigeria was an amendment by Nigeria itself and that it was the latest amendment in a series of amendments that were made - first the Soviet amendment, then the United States amendment and then the Nigerian amendment - and according to the rules of procedure we took a vote on the Nigerian amendment as the most recent one. Now we are being told that the amendment that has been accepted is the very first one that was submitted by the Soviet delegation. There is some confusion here.

That is why the Nigerian proposal was put to the vote first, because it was the latest amendment to be submitted.

If in fact the Nigerian proposal is synonymous with the Soviet proposal, then it should not have been voted upon in the first place, before the other amendments. Could you please, Sir, clarify this point for me?

The CHAIRMAN: I shall gladly provide clarification. The Committee will recollect that the Soviet amendment was a whole sentence, part of which referred to the existing text and part of which referred to a word that should replace something in the existing text. A translation was offered which was inadequate. It was that translation that the Nigerian delegation tackled by suggesting that instead of either the use of "truthful" or "authentic", we should use the word "accurate". I put the matter to the vote and the word "accurate" was accepted. It was accepted as replacing the word suggested by the Soviet Union in the Soviet oral amendment. With that amendment the Soviet amendment fitted into the oral amendment that was put before the Committee. This is why it is so recorded. It does not mean that we have rejected the Nigerian amendment.

(The Chairman)

The amendment as proposed by the Soviet Union was as follows - and I am reading the translation:

"In paragraph 1 of the operative part of resolution A/C.1/37/L.65, add after the words 'the flow of a broad range of' the word 'authentic'."

The Nigerian amendment therefore amends that amendment now to read:

"In paragraph 1 of the operative part of resolution A/C.1/37/L.65, add after the words 'the flow of a broad range of' the word 'accurate'."

That is the amendment which we agreed upon and which was acceptable to the United States delegation.

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation submitted its amendment not in English but in Russian, which is one of the official languages of the United Nations. The amendment was to insert the word "pravdivy" before the word "information" in paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

Of course, the amendment can be translated by various synonyms in English and other languages. We have no objection to its being translated by the word "accurate" in English, but we request you, Mr. Chairman, to see to it that in Russian the amendment appears in the form in which we submitted it - that is, "pravdivy informatsii".

The CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, I do not speak Russian, but I said that I was reading the translation.

Furthermore, let me make it clear that there is no question that the Russian word for either "authentic" or "truthful" will remain in the text. The Committee has considered both the original and the two translations, and has decided against them in favour of the Nigerian proposal to use the word "accurate". That is how the text will be amended.

(The Chairman)

The Committee will now deal with draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.53, under agenda item 55, entitled "General and complete disarmament", dealing with "Measures to provide objective information on military capabilities". The draft resolution, which has 14 co-sponsors, was introduced by the representative of Austria at the 38th meeting of the First Committee on 19 November 1982.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.53 are: Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Colombia, Ecuador, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Sweden, Ghana and Belgium.

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

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to make the following points about its forthcoming vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.53.

We share a number of views in the draft resolution, which expresses deep concern about the continuing escalation of the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race, and its extremely harmful effects on international peace and security, and which also points out that disarmament, the relaxation of international tensions, respect for the right of self-determination and national independence, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the strengthening of international peace and security are directly related to each other.

At the same time, we regard certain conclusions in the draft resolution as being extremely doubtful. For example, it notes that misperceptions of the military capabilities of States, which could be caused particularly by the lack of objective information, could induce States to undertake armament programmes, and on the other hand that the dissemination of objective information on military capabilities could contribute to the creation of an atmosphere of trust.

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

In our view, the reasons for the unsatisfactory state of affairs in disarmament matters lie not in the absence of information about military potential, but, rather, in the fact that in recent years the leading Western countries - primarily the United States - have once again adopted the course of accelerating the pace of the arms race in an attempt to achieve military supremacy over the socialist countries. We believe that the lack of political will to bring about a cessation of the arms race, the absence of readiness to seek mutually acceptable understandings on the basis of equality and equal security, cannot be compensated for by anything to do with the flow of information about armaments or armed forces or by any studies of comparative information and so on.

It is, of course, another matter to have an exchange of information about armaments and armed forces and the process of disarmament on the basis of appropriate agreements. Not only is such an exchange of information not excluded, but it is in fact desirable and feasible, as is shown by experience in the implementation of earlier disarmament agreements. However, this is indissolubly linked with concrete disarmament measures. It is not isolated from them, and it cannot be a separate, preliminary measure. Otherwise, the question of presenting information can be exploited by opponents of disarmament as an excuse to continue to fail to consider the substance of the existing problems and to fail to participate in the search for mutually acceptable solutions to them.



(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.53 in the provision of information on military capabilities is not connected with concrete disarmament measures. Therefore, we are unable to support it and we shall be compelled to abstain in the voting.

The CHAIRMAN: The voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.53 will now begin.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxemburg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Sierra Leone, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.53 was adopted by 103 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.\*

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of India, who wishes to explain his vote after the vote.

Mr. SARAN (India): India abstained in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.53, in view of its consistent position that progress in disarmament is a matter of the exercise of political will by the major Powers and not attributable to the lack of information or prior agreement on appropriate verification procedures.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the Committee's action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.53.

The Committee will next take up draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.56, under agenda item 55, "General and complete disarmament", dealing with the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof. It has 11 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Denmark at the 37th meeting of the Committee on 19 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee, who will give the Committee the list of sponsors.

---

\* Subsequently the delegation of Brazil informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.56 are Australia, Belgium, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, India, Japan, Norway and Romania.

The CHAIRMAN: I call again on the Secretary of the Committee to give the financial implications of the draft resolution.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): I have been asked to read out the following statement, on behalf of the Secretary-General, with regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.56, concerning the holding of a further review conference of the parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof.

By that draft resolution the General Assembly would note that, following appropriate consultations, a preparatory committee of parties to the Treaty is to be arranged prior to holding a further review conference in 1983. In addition, the Secretary-General would be requested to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the review conference and its preparation.

It should be noted that the review conference is a conference of States parties to the Treaty. The first review conference, held in 1977, like other review conferences of multilateral disarmament treaties - for example, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Biological Weapons Convention - included in its rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the review conference, including the session of the Preparatory Committee.

The wording of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.56 is identical to the wording of resolution 3484 E (XXX), which preceded the convening of the first review conference. Consequently, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under the draft resolution to provide the necessary assistance and services for the preparation and holding of the review conference has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that, as in the case of the first review conference, the associated costs will be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the review conference.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.56 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.56 without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.56 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to explain his delegation's position after the adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With regard to the draft resolution just adopted in document A/C.1/37/L.56, the Soviet delegation would like to state that the Soviet Union, as one of the depositary States of the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof, attaches great importance to its further strengthening and to the effective implementation of its provisions.

One of the important elements of this Treaty is, in our view, what is contained in article V, containing the obligation of the State Parties

"to continue negotiations in good faith concerning further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed, the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof."

(resolution 2660 (XXV), annex)

This obligation was confirmed at the first review conference of the Treaty in 1977 and in General Assembly resolution 32/87. That resolution contained a request to the Committee on Disarmament to undertake appropriate action. This question was specially considered also in the course of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, paragraph 79 of whose Final Document contains an appeal to the Committee on Disarmament:

"... to proceed promptly with the consideration of further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race ... on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof ...". (S-10/2, para. 79)

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

In this regard the Soviet delegation would have preferred the draft resolution to have included an appeal to all States, particularly the nuclear States, to continue with negotiations with a view to further measures for the purpose of preventing the arms race on the sea-bed and the ocean floor, as provided for in the Treaty. However, since in the course of consultations the wish was expressed for this draft resolution to be of a procedural nature, we did not insist on the inclusion of such a provision, considering that what is contained in the fourth preambular paragraph, namely, the reference to resolution 32/87 A, and in the fifth preambular paragraph the reference to the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, as reflecting the points I have mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.56.

The Committee will now direct its attention to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.55, as orally amended, under agenda item 50: Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session. The subject is the monitoring of international disarmament agreements and the strengthening of international security, and is a proposal for the establishment of an international satellite monitoring agency.

The draft resolution has 35 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of France at the 40th meeting of the First Committee on 22 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The following are the sponsors of the draft resolution: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Italy, Malta, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.55 as orally amended. I call upon the representative of the Philippines to make a statement.

Mr. BELISARIO (Philippines): I will confess that initially the Philippines delegation harboured grave reservations about the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.55, not because of its stated aims and objectives, which are notable, but because of the heavy financial implications of the project. Indeed, in its proposed third phase the agency's budget would run into hundreds of millions of dollars. However, after weighing all the elements involved my delegation came to the conclusion that there is an imperative need for the agency and its role in any successful disarmament process will be a critical one. We are convinced that with the rapid advances in space science and technology the agency would possess the technical means of carrying out its mission with unquestioned competence and that given man's rapid exploitation of outer space for both peaceful and other purposes a world instrumentality is truly needed to monitor and report all activities in that zone which have a bearing on international peace and security.

None the less my delegation expresses the hope that in his study the Secretary General will devise a formula whereby the developing States will contribute to the proposed agency's establishment and maintenance in a manner that is not only equitable but also commensurate with their means and their responsibilities for the problems which the agency is designed to handle. After all, the main problems here relate principally to the big Powers, especially the super-Powers, for it is they who created that monster which now threatens us with the holocaust of a nuclear war; thus it is but just that the greater burden of supporting the agency founded precisely to deal with the problems those Powers created should rest on their shoulders.

Further, it is my delegation's hope that the agency's advances from phase one to phase two to phase three will be gradual and as fiscally painless as possible for the developing countries. We therefore trust that the present draft resolution will receive the support of delegations.

(Mr. Belisario, Philippines)

Yes, the satellite monitoring agency will be expensive, very expensive, but in this day and age the consequences of nuclear war are so terrible, so catastrophic, that peace has become a commodity so precious that we must be ready to pay for it no matter how high the cost.

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

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union has always started from the premise that the question of the control and monitoring of agreements concluded in the field of disarmament must be considered and resolved in the context of measures relating to disarmament and not independently of those measures. The proposal for the establishment of an international satellite monitoring agency, with which the present draft resolution deals, represents an attempt to establish a monitoring or control procedure without any link to actual disarmament measures. For that reason we have from the very outset had serious doubts as to the desirability of establishing an agency of this kind.

The results of the study carried out on the subject by the group of experts (A/AC.206/14) not only have not dispelled those doubts but have in fact increased them. That study has not demonstrated the desirability of establishing a monitoring agency in terms of agreements on disarmament and strengthening international security.

No answer is given as to the legal nature of the agency envisaged. In fact, a perusal of document A/AC.206/14 has led us to the conclusion that we are proposing that first an international satellite monitoring agency should be created and then that, through a review, existing agreements already concluded as well as any measures subsequently adopted in the field of disarmament, should be adapted thereto.

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

In that connection, my delegation must point out that it opposes in principle the recently emerging trend to bring about a review of agreements concluded in the past. That can only be harmful to the cause of disarmament.

Consequently, we cannot share the view of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.55 concerning the need to consider practical means and disarmament agreements in terms of the conclusions of the report of the Secretary-General.

For all those reasons, the Soviet delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.55.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): Costa Rica wishes to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.55, which we regard as a very important one.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The idea of establishing an international satellite monitoring agency aroused serious doubts in my delegation from the very moment of its introduction at the first special session of the Assembly on disarmament. My delegation's reservations were set out in the note sent by the Government of Cuba to the Secretary-General on the subject. Consistent with our position as set forth in that note my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.55.

The CHAIRMAN: The voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.55, as orally amended, will now begin.

A recorded vote has been requested.



A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatamala, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahirya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Cuba, Cyprus, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mozambique, United States of America, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.55, as orally amended, was adopted by 109 votes to 9, with 8 abstentions.\*

---

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

The CHAIRMAN: Action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.55 has thus been completed.

I understand that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.57 do not wish it to be voted upon today; I have therefore agreed to a postponement of decision on that draft resolution until our next meeting.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make some announcements.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the First Committee): The Committee will be taking action on the following draft resolutions at its next meeting: A/C.1/37/L.67, L.26/Rev.1, L.37, L.38, L.40, L.41, L.42, L.44, L.46, L.49, L.61, L.63, L.64/Rev.1, L.10/Rev.1, L.22/Rev.2, L.28, L.52, L.54, L.62, L.50 and L.57.

Those draft resolutions will be the remaining part of the agenda, on the understanding that as soon as the financial implications are available they will be acted upon in accordance with the implementation of the decision just taken by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the usual procedures established by the General Assembly, rights of reply may be exercised at the end of each day's meeting. The first intervention shall be limited to 10 minutes.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to exercise that right.

Mr. AL-SAHAF (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): In his statement in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.31 the representative of Israel alleged that Israel was observing Security Council resolution 418 (1977), which decided that all States should cease, forthwith any provision to South Africa of arms and related matériel of all types.

Apparently the Israeli representative was trying to hoodwink the Committee, because he failed to mention that according to a United Press International (UPI) report from occupied Jerusalem on 17 August 1981 the Zionist Minister of Finance had appealed to the United States of America to stop competing with Israel in the export of arms to South Africa.

(Mr. Al-Sahaf, Iraq)

Also, as usual, the Israeli representative disregarded the United Nations resolutions and he tried to fool the Committee by omitting what was mentioned in paragraph 8 of the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid, which mentions a visit by Israel's Minister of Defence, Mr. Sharon, to the scene of operations in Namibia in December 1981. Moreover, the Israeli representative seemed to forget that Mr. Sharon had addressed an appeal to the United States and other countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to step up their supply of arms to South Africa. He also seems to have forgotten what was mentioned by The New York Times on 14 September 1981, when that newspaper mentioned the existence of military and economic co-operation between South Africa and Israel.

The report of the Special Committee against Apartheid also mentions a statement from an Israeli source that Israel is co-operating with South Africa to produce nuclear weapons and also delivery vehicles with a range of 1,500 miles.

As for the United States representative, he expressed surprise at the fact that this draft resolution singled out Israel. I should like to remind him that the report of the Group of Experts on Israeli Nuclear Armament, contained in document A/36/431, states the following:

"All the known nuclear facilities in the territories of the Middle East States are subject to international safeguards. The exceptions are ... the Israeli research reactor ..." (A/36/431, para. 73)

It seems that the representative of the United States wanted to put the victim and the aggressor on the same footing.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like to exercise my delegation's right of reply to suggestions made by two representatives, during the discussion of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51, that the United Kingdom had violated Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

I should like to assure the Committee once again that these suggestions are without foundation. Like the representative of Argentina, I have no wish to prolong the discussion of this subject, and I would refer the Committee to the fuller statement I made on 21 October during the general debate.

Mr. TARI (Israel) (interpretation from French): Once again we see that the majority of the initiatives by Iraq in this Committee are not based on the wish to contribute to the solution of the fundamental and complex problems of the Middle East or anywhere else. They are part of the ritual hostility of Iraq towards the very existence of the State of Israel ever since its creation. This is shown in an amalgam of half-truths and lies, a systematic sabotaging of the peace efforts in the Middle East and also an attempt to upset the serenity and the effectiveness of this Committee's work. Israel, for its part, will always be ready to promote and encourage any positive initiative, particularly in the Middle East.

Ms. BOYD (Australia): My delegation this afternoon lodged with the Secretariat an amended text of the draft resolution on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty, which was originally issued as document A/C.1/37/L.40. We are informed that the new text will be available to delegations on Friday as document A/C.1/37/L.40/Rev.1. The revised text contains two additional operative paragraphs relating to the mandate of the relevant working group in the Committee on Disarmament.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.