

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-THIRD SESSION
*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE
54th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 28 November 1978
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 54TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 35: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SECOND CONFERENCE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 36: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/76 CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL I OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLATELOLCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 37: CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 38: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/78: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 39: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/79 CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL II OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TLATELOLCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 40: EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO IMPLEMENT THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DISARMAMENT DECADE: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 41: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE DENUCLEARIZATION OF AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 42: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN THE REGION OF THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 43: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/33/PV.54
30 November 1978

ENGLISH

AGENDA ITEM 44: PROHIBITION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND MANUFACTURE OF NEW TYPES OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND NEW SYSTEMS OF SUCH WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 45: REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 46: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE OF PEACE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 47: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued):

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY;
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 48: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE DEEMED TO BE EXCESSIVELY INJURIOUS OR TO HAVE INDISCRIMINATE EFFECTS: REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42.

43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 AND 49 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: As agreed at this morning's meeting, the Committee this afternoon will proceed to vote on the draft resolutions submitted on agenda items 35 to 49 - at least on those that are ready to be put to the vote.

Before doing so, however, I should like to revert to the matter of substance on which the Committee concluded its morning meeting. I refer to the question of the production of a United Nations film on wars and their consequences; the report of the Secretary-General is contained in document A/33/389.

Through an oversight on my part - for which I wish to extend my apologies to the representative of Saudi Arabia - this matter was not brought to a conclusion.

The Committee heard an explanation and a presentation of the matter, on the basis of the Secretary-General's report, by the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Akatani, and subsequently also heard an additional presentation of the matter by the representative of Saudi Arabia to the one which he had given during the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.

What does not appear in the report of the Secretary-General but was made clear both by the Under-Secretary-General and the representative of Saudi Arabia is that the film, the production of which has been proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia, would cost approximately \$200,000.

(The Chairman)

I would ask the Committee to be good enough to take a decision on this matter. I shall, of course, call on representatives, if they wish to state their views. At the same time, I would refer to the words of the representative of Saudi Arabia who said that his expressed wish was not to delay the voting procedure of this Committee by generating a new debate on a matter which had already been debated.

On this basis then I would ask the Committee whether the Committee wishes to take the decision requested for by the representative of Saudi Arabia and described in the report of the Secretary-General. Do I see any objection to such a decision?

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): Without any prejudice to the interesting suggestion we are not unaware that it was in the wings, but it has come in effect out of the blue in terms of a Committee decision. It would occur to me that it might be better to permit some of us to consult our Governments. I was prepared to consult my own Government on the basis of the order of agenda items. While this is an agenda item, it is a fairly recent arrival among the agenda items. It would occur to me that it might be postponed just to give us a chance to see how our own Governments felt about it. This is not in any way in derogation or with any prejudice to our ultimate decision or to the representative of Saudi Arabia's statement about the horrors of war, which many of us have experienced. But it does occur to me that it is a little premature to "take a decision" right now.

The CHAIRMAN: Do I understand that the representative of the United States is asking for a postponement of the decision under the 24-hour rule?

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): You understand me correctly, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe that under the rules of procedure I have no alternative but to postpone a decision on this matter. If there are other delegations which would wish to consult their Governments, I would urge them to do so so that we may take a decision as early as possible.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to consider the draft resolutions which were mentioned by the Chair this morning. The first of these is draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.28 which has been presented under agenda item 36 "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/76 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 has 21 co-sponsors.

I understand that the representative of Mexico wishes formally to introduce this draft resolution to the Committee and I call on him for that purpose.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Before making this introduction, I wish to report to the Committee a number of changes which we have agreed upon in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.27 concerning Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the representative of Mexico, but we are proceeding in the order of the items and we are therefore on item 36 which concerns Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and the relevant draft resolution, A/C.1/33/L.28. The Chair is sorry if I did not make this clear enough.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to referring to A/C.1/33/L.28 first. I hope, however, that in the same statement I will be allowed also to refer to the changes which the co-sponsors, after our brief meeting, which you announced this morning, have agreed upon in document A/C.1/33/L.27.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

I think if I did that, we could save time. I wish to add that in order to avoid duplicating statements, I would like to make the presentation, after describing these changes, of both documents together, though they would obviously be voted upon separately when the time comes.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is pleased to agree with that suggestion by the representative of Mexico.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): As for document A/C.1/33/L.28, there is a very small drafting change of which my delegation has not yet been able to inform even the co-sponsors. I shall therefore take advantage of the fact that I have the floor to inform them of it in the hope that, given the nature of the change in question, none of them will have the slightest objection to it.

The change is as follows: in the last preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 2, we should say "by the President of the French Republic" instead of "by the President of France". We have been told by those versed in the subject, that this is the official title of the President. We should say "President of the French Republic" instead of "President of France" in those two places.

As regards document A/C.1/33/L.27, the co-sponsors, including myself, had an exchange of views this morning, and we came to the conclusion that, in the light of the announcement made yesterday afternoon in this Committee by the representative of the Soviet Union pursuant to the instructions of his Government, it is felt that it would be suitable to amend operative paragraph 1 of document A/C.1/33/L.27. So that after the words "of that country" in the last line of the paragraph, we would change the subsequent text which now reads "has decided", and so on, by the following language: "has officially announced that it intends to ratify that Protocol in the nearest future".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The paragraph would now read as follows:

(spoke in English)

"Takes note with satisfaction that Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) was signed in 1978 by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and that the Government of that country" -

up to that point it is exactly the same text. Now comes the change.

"has officially announced that it intends to ratify that Protocol in the nearest future".

(continued in Spanish)

Besides this change and pursuant to it, the present operative paragraph 2 would be deleted. Consequently, operative paragraph 3 would become paragraph 2.

I think that the explanations which I have just given will make it possible for delegations to make these notes in draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.27 and A/C.1/33/L.28 and put them in final form.

As I said a moment ago, I now wish to introduce the two drafts. As the representative of the depository Government of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, usually known as the Treaty of Tlatelolco, it is my privilege to present to the Committee draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.27 and A/C.1/33/L.28, as amended. These two drafts deal respectively with Additional Protocol II and Additional Protocol I of that Treaty. The first of them was co-sponsored by 21 Latin American States parties to the Treaty, and the second by 20 of those States. It is axiomatic therefore to say that the content of the two drafts is self-explanatory, particularly if one takes into account the fact that all the representatives would doubtless have familiarized themselves with similar drafts considered and adopted in past years.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

I shall do no more, therefore, than point out that the events referred to in the draft resolutions are all most auspicious. As far as Additional Protocol II is concerned, the only nuclear-weapon State which was still not a party to it signed it in May this year, during the visit of the President of Mexico to the Soviet Union, and yesterday the Soviet representative, Mr. Issraelyan, announced here the Soviet Government's intention to ratify the Protocol "in the nearest future".

Concerning Additional Protocol I, the President of the United States, who signed it last year, has brought it before the United States Senate with a clear, favourable recommendation that it be ratified. The President of the French Republic in May of this year made a statement at a plenary meeting of the tenth special session of the General Assembly from which it appears that France's accession to the instrument is merely a few months away.

The sponsors of both draft resolutions, among them my delegation, trust that the Committee will adopt them by consensus and that the inclusion of the two items on the agenda of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly will make it possible for us next year merely to endorse by acclamation a draft resolution in which we shall express our pleasure at the entry into force of both Additional Protocols for all States, to which they are open, including the terms of article 28 of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which seemed to be the most difficult, so that the Treaty could be applied fully and its zone of application be as described in its article 4 for all of Latin America.

The CHAIRMAN: In his statement the representative of Mexico was good enough to suggest that the two draft resolutions should be adopted by consensus by the Committee. We shall now proceed to take a decision first on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.28, presented under agenda item 36, "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/76 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

(The Chairman)

As the representative of Mexico explained, there are two slight technical changes to the text. In the fifth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 1 the title of the President of France should read "the President of the French Republic".

Is there any objection to the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus?

Mr. PEREZ HERNANDEZ (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish):

It seems, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretariat did not inform you in time that the delegation of Cuba wished to make a statement before the adoption of the draft resolution now before the Committee.

Cuba does not in any way wish to dissociate itself from the consensus which may exist on the draft resolutions under consideration. The Committee is familiar with the position of my country on this item. The Cuban Government and people have feelings of full solidarity with the States mentioned in and with the substance of paragraph 60 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, in the sense that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is an important disarmament measure. For that reason, we sincerely thank all those, and particularly our sister republic of Mexico, who have worked so hard towards that end, pursuing their activities throughout Latin America with that purpose in mind.

My delegation also fully supports paragraph 61 of the Final Document in the sense that these zones should actually be free of nuclear weapons. It is no secret to anyone that in Latin America, notwithstanding the decision of the States of the region to live in peace within a nuclear-weapon-free-zone there are some military bases belonging to a nuclear Power. That is at variance with the existence of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.28 recognizes that territories lying within the zone of application of the Treaty which are not sovereign political entities and I emphasize that are nevertheless in a position to receive the benefits deriving from the Treaty. Everyone knows that in Puerto Rico the colonial status of which has been recognized by the decolonization Committee there are military bases on which nuclear weapons are stationed.

(Mr. Perez Hernandez, Cuba)

Cuba reiterates its position which is that in order for nuclear-weapon-free zones to be real and effective all foreign military bases in the zone must be dismantled, and the nuclear-weapon Powers must strictly undertake not to subject any country of the region to acts of aggression of a political, military or economic kind. Cuba has had to endure the existence of a foreign military base on its territory. It has had to suffer atomic blackmail, as well as the invasion with which everyone is familiar and the economic blockade which has been going on for 20-odd years now.

In the special session of the General Assembly, our position was supported by the non-aligned countries. This point has not found its way into the Final Document because consensus was denied by countries with interests in the area. Mr. Rodriguez of Cuba emphasized that

"... 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."

He went on to say that

".... 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 acceptance and voluntary renunciation." (A/S-10/PV.8; p.72)

Having said this, Cuba will not dissociate itself from the consensus, but wishes this statement to be duly recorded. For the sake of brevity, since we are also going to take document A/C.1/33/L.27, which deals with the same problem, we wish to make it clear that the statement we have just made applies to both.

The CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, the delegation of Cuba does not oppose the adoption by consensus of draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.28 and A/C.1/33/L.27. I therefore propose to the Committee that it adopt draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.28 by consensus. It is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.28 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the consideration by the Committee of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.28. As the Committee will have heard, the representative of Mexico was good enough to introduce during his statement the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.27, which has been submitted under General Assembly item 39, implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/79 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco). This draft resolution has 22 sponsors. Before putting it to the Committee, I will repeat the changes to the text suggested by the representative of Mexico. In operative paragraph 1 in the fourth line of the English text, after the words "of that country", the present text would be deleted and replaced by the words: "as officially announced that it intends to ratify this Protocol in the near future".

The second change is to delete operative paragraph 2. The third change is to renumber operative paragraph 3, which becomes paragraph 2. I now put draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.27 with those changes, to the Committee for adoption by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.27 was adopted.

Mr. GUERREIRO (Brazil): Before we conclude the consideration of item 39 of the General Assembly agenda, I wish to make a brief comment on the draft resolution that has just been adopted on the subject of the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. We join in the consensus on the text as a consequence of the importance we attach to the Treaty, and of our hope that all necessary conditions for its full entry into force will soon be met. Nevertheless, our delegation cannot fail to express its preoccupation with the possible implications for the effectiveness of the Treaty of some of the declarations made by certain States when signing or ratifying the Additional Protocol. This statement also applies to the draft resolution adopted under item 26.

The CHAIRMAN: With that statement, the Committee has concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.27. We shall take next draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.23, under item 40, which concerns effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade. This draft resolution has 21 sponsors. It was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 46th meeting of the First Committee on 21 November 1978. The co-sponsors have expressed the wish that its resolution be adopted by consensus. If there are no comments and no objections, I suggest that the Committee proceed to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.23 by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.23 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the consideration by the Committee of draft resolution No. A/C.1/33/L.23.

(The Chairman)

The next draft resolution on the list is contained in document A/C.1/33/L.30/Rev.1. It is presented under item 41 and concerns the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. This draft resolution has 40 co-sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 50th meeting of the First Committee on 24 November 1978. Furthermore, the co-sponsors have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus.

Sir Derek ASHE (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I must question whether there is a consensus on this resolution. I would prefer a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the United Kingdom has expressed the wish that a vote be taken on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.30/Rev.1

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist

Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining. France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.30/Rev.1 was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

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

Mr. de PONTON d'AMECOURT (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation joined other delegations in requesting that draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.30/Rev.1 just adopted be modified in several respects. Since these modifications were refused, my delegation, which I would recall remains favourable to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and voted last year in favour of the draft resolution on the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, to its very great regret found itself compelled to abstain this year.

France strongly supports the view that Member States should refrain from providing South Africa with co-operation in the nuclear field which would permit it to acquire nuclear weapons, and should discourage companies, institutions and individuals under their jurisdiction from co-operating with South Africa in this area. However, we cannot associate ourselves with the idea contained in operative paragraph 7 of this draft resolution to the effect that all co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field should be suspended. This idea, indeed, is incompatible with France's policy on nuclear co-operation for peaceful purposes.

* Subsequently the delegations of Costa Rica and Liberia advised the Secretariat that had they been present they would have voted in favour.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I would like to associate the United States with the explanation of vote given by the representative of France. As has been noted, a group of countries had sought changes in this draft resolution which were not acceptable to the co-sponsors. We abstained from our support of the resolution as drafted because it would rule out co-operation with South Africa in the safeguarded uses of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

My delegation believes that continuation of such safeguarded co-operation will encourage adherence by South Africa to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and that the discontinuation of such co-operation could serve to frustrate this objective. But, in conclusion, I would like to reaffirm our support for the broader objectives in principle of an African nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Mr. PAQUI (Benin) (interpretation from French): My delegation listened with intense interest to the explanation of vote of the French delegation and also that of the United States. However, we would venture to express our surprise at such a statement....

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the representative of Benin. However, I would draw his attention to the fact that he is a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.30/Rev.1 and under the rules of procedure, therefore, is not entitled to explain his vote. If, however, it is his intention to use his right of reply, the rules of procedure prescribe that rights of reply are given to delegations at the end of the meeting under certain prescribed rules. I am sorry, therefore, that I cannot allow him to continue his statement.

(The Chairman)

We have thus concluded our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.30/Rev.1.

The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.31, under agenda item 42, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East."

This draft resolution has four sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Iran at the 46th meeting of the First Committee on 21 November 1978. I should like to announce that the delegation of Oman has indicated its desire to become a sponsor of this draft resolution.

The representative of India had requested that the Committee take a separate vote on operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of the draft resolution. The delegation of Iran has requested recorded votes on those two operative paragraphs and on the draft resolution as a whole.

I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): My delegation has studied with great interest the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, contained in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.31. The Government of Israel wishes to reiterate its support in principle of the establishment of such a zone in our region. However, as we already noted last year, the "Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects", issued as a special report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which remains the most authoritative and comprehensive study on the subject, has demonstrated the considerable disagreement that still exists concerning the practical meaning and implications of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. It confirmed that what might have appeared at first sight to be a clearly defined concept in fact contains several controversial elements.

Yet, with all those divergencies, that report indicates clearly that such zones should be established through negotiations among the States concerned. This is brought out in section (n) of paragraph 90, which enumerates the principles for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, and again in paragraph 96, which deals with the procedures for the establishment of such zones, from which I should like to quote the following:

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

"The view was expressed that once an initiative to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone had been taken, consultations to that end should be held among the States concerned. The view was also expressed that prior consultations" - I repeat, prior consultations - "should be undertaken with the countries concerned" - and again I repeat, with the countries concerned - "regarding the implications, feasibility and acceptability of the proposed zone, in order that an initiative for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone could elicit the necessary support ..."

Israel's position was restated by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Moshe Dayan, in his statement during the general debate on 10 October 1977, when he said:

"Israel is ready to enter into an agreement on arms limitations with all the States in the Middle East.

"With regard to another crucial aspect of disarmament, Israel has frequently called on its Arab neighbours to join it in direct negotiations with a view to establishing a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. ... Israel firmly believes that such negotiations should lead to the conclusion of a formal, contractual, multilateral convention between all the States of the region, on the lines of such notable precedents as the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America ..."

(A/32/PV.27, pp. 68-71)

However, no response has yet been given to this particular offer and the Arab refusal to take part in any such consultations with Israel unfortunately still persists.

By way of contrast, we have noted with interest in this respect the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, and in particular its fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 2, which reads as follows:

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

"Urges once again the States of South Asia and such other neighbouring non-nuclear-weapon States as may be interested to continue to make all possible efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia ..." (A/C.1/33/L.25)

We do not believe in unilateral depositions of declaratory statements of intent. If a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East is ever to materialize, it will be as the result of a common and binding agreement of all States of the region, arrived at through direct multilateral negotiations.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.31.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cape Verde, Cuba, France, Guyana, India, Israel, Mozambique, Spain, United Republic of Tanzania.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 103 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.31. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Angola, Bhutan, Brazil, India, Israel, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.31, as a whole, to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.31 was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

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

Mr. DUBEY (India): While we are in full sympathy with the objectives which motivated the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.31, India asked for separate votes on operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of the draft resolution, in accordance with India's well-known position of principle on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to which reference is made in operative paragraph 1. Similarly, India's position on the need for non-discriminatory and universal safeguards on all nuclear activities of all States is not adequately reflected in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

India has, however, voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the Committee's consideration of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.31.

(The Chairman)

As members of the Committee will recall, this morning when the Chair outlined the programme of voting for this afternoon, that programme was concluded with the draft resolution which the Committee has just adopted. I could, therefore, say that the Committee has very efficiently, and with more dispatch than the Chair perhaps a bit pessimistically dared to expect, adopted nine draft resolutions today and has come to the end of the programme which would have been very adequate as a working performance for this afternoon. The Chair would, therefore, consult the preferences of the members of the Committee at this point. Shall we proceed to vote on the draft resolutions which still remain to be decided upon, or shall we adjourn at this point? The Chair is not proposing to take a vote on this particular ruling. It would, of course, be ex officio of the duty and also the preference of the Chair to suggest that we go on voting, but this is one of the rulings in which the Chair would not mind being overruled.

So I would ask representatives what their preferences are? I would point out that the next item we would take up, should the Committee decide to continue to work this afternoon, is item 44, the question of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons - report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Under that item we would have to consider two draft resolutions, A/C.1/33/L.22 and L.24.

Mr. MADADHA (Jordan): I think that we deserve a reward. I propose that we adjourn, unless, Mr. Chairman, you have some other business.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have no objection to the proposal of the delegation of Jordan. But I should like to remind, you, Mr. Chairman, that the Soviet delegation wanted to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38 before you adjourned the meeting. So I would request an opportunity to speak.

The CHAIRMAN: Indeed, that was the intention of the Chair.

The Committee has heard a suggestion from the representative of Jordan. In that case we shall end the voting for today. But before adjourning the meeting I should like to call on the representative of the Soviet Union who wishes to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.38.

Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union has the honour, on behalf of Afghanistan, Benin, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Romania and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to present the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.38.

The draft contains an appeal on the part of the General Assembly to all nuclear-weapon States to refrain from stationing nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present; and to all non-nuclear weapon States to refrain from any steps which would directly or indirectly result in the stationing of such weapons on their territories.

The Soviet Union attaches very great significance to this kind of appeal on the part of the General Assembly. And if the political will of States, both nuclear and non-nuclear, exists, the will to put an end to the process of transferring nuclear weapons to new regions and territories and thus forging an additional instrument for blocking the channels of the possible spread of nuclear weapons throughout the world, then the practical realization of the proposal, which is the subject of the draft resolution, will not give rise to major difficulties.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Certain States, on whose territories there are no nuclear weapons, have already made statements to the effect that they will not permit the stationing of nuclear weapons on their territory. Of course a great deal depends on nuclear States too. The Soviet Union has already stated that it is ready to assume the obligation not to station nuclear weapons in those countries where they are not to be found at present. We consider it to be extremely important for other nuclear States to follow this example.

The Soviet delegation has held consultations with a broad range of delegations with regard to the content of the draft resolution and has taken into account the viewpoints which have been expressed and has reflected them in the draft resolution. Most of the comments related to the question of reflecting in the draft resolution the link of the proposition which it contains for the non-stationing of nuclear weapons in the territory of States where they do not exist at present with the subsequent total withdrawal of nuclear weapons from all foreign territories. In this regard an appropriate paragraph was included in the preamble.

Other comments, too, were borne in mind which clarify various provisions of the draft resolution, in particular the second and sixth paragraphs of the preamble and also operative paragraph 1. The significance of solving the problem of the renunciation of the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where they are not to be found at present was most energetically stressed a few days ago in the Declaration adopted at the Conference in Moscow of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty.

In conclusion, the delegation of the Soviet Union wishes to express the hope that the draft resolution will, when it is put to the vote, receive the widest possible support.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of Benin, who has expressed a wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. PAQUI (Benin) (interpretation from French): My delegation noted the votes cast by the three nuclear Powers and also the explanations of votes of the delegations of France and the United States. In the view of my delegation, if the explanation of the delegation of France seemed understandable, inasmuch as it fell within the framework of France's traditional policy, the explanation of the delegation of the United States does surprise us a little because, if our information is correct, it would appear that it was precisely the Government of the United States that was the first to react when a certain number of States began to divert to military purposes the nuclear co-operation offered to them for peaceful purposes. That was precisely our approach to the problem of South Africa. Every one here is aware of the aggressiveness of the South African régime, and as long as Africa does not have the certainty, the guarantee, that pressure will be exerted on that régime and that the co-operation extended to it for peaceful purposes will not be diverted to military purposes, we had to insist on retaining paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.30/Rev.1.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: Before we adjourn perhaps it would be well for me to give the Committee an indication of which draft resolutions we shall take up tomorrow, and in what order.

We shall take up first item 44, "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament; and draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.22 and A/C.1/33/L.24. Next we will consider item 45, "Reduction of military budgets", and draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.18; and item 46: "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, the draft resolution on which appears in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

(The Chairman)

We will then consider the major item, 47, "General and complete disarmament", which comprises the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the report of the Disarmament Commission. Under that item we have draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.19, L.21, L.29, L.32, L.35, L.38, L.42 and L.43.

Next we will take up item 49, "United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects: report of the Preparatory Conference" and the draft resolution under that item in document A/C.1/33/L.26.

I hope that, as we have already agreed, we shall also take up tomorrow morning - although perhaps not as the first item of business - item 43, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia: report of the Secretary-General", and draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.25.

Finally, I would inform the Committee that Zaire has become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.18, L.21/Rev.1, L.28, L.35 and L.39.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.