



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 38TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 35 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (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-3998.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/34/PV.38
23 November 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 35 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: Before we take action on the draft resolutions on our agenda for today, I would like to change our programme of work since this afternoon the First Committee will not be able to use conference room 3 for the purpose of voting. Rather than hearing representatives who have inscribed their names to introduce draft resolutions or to speak on resolutions that have already been introduced, we will leave those for the meeting this afternoon and go directly to taking action on the draft resolutions before us. Those are: A/C.1/34/L.2, A/C.1/34/L.13, A/C.1/34/L.16, A/C.1/34/L.17, A/C.1/34/L.19/Rev.1 and A/C.1/34/L.24. Consideration of resolutions A/C.1/34/L.4 and A/C.1/34/L.15, which was on today's agenda, will be deferred possibly until Friday.

At this time, it is my intention to put to a vote the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/34/L.16, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". The sponsors of this resolution are: Algeria, Angola, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Republic of Cameroon, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zaire. Rule 128 of the rules of procedure provides that after the voting process has begun, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting. Does any delegation have any objection to beginning the voting procedure, or any comment to make before that procedure begins?

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): We request a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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 Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16 was adopted by 85 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.*

* Subsequently the delegations of Benin, Bolivia, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Gabon, Gambia, the Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lesotho, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, the Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Turkey, the United Republic of Cameroon, Yemen and Zaire advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

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

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The abstention of the United States on this draft resolution should not be interpreted as any lessening of our support in principle for the creation of an African nuclear-weapon-free zone consistent with the well-known United States position on the principles for establishing such zones. The Organization of African Unity deserves great credit for its early recognition of the importance of denuclearizing the African continent. The United States also welcomes the substantial support for non-proliferation among African States as reflected by almost 30 of those States having become party to the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

United States abstention on this draft resolution also does not reflect any lessening of our concern about South Africa's nuclear programme. Its operation of an unsafeguarded uranium enrichment facility and the absence of a treaty obligation not to develop or acquire nuclear explosives are of serious concern to the United States. The United States has not licensed any exports of nuclear materials or equipment to South Africa for the past four years.

Operative paragraph 8 of this draft resolution recognizes the importance of the application of full-scope safeguards by the International Atomic Energy Agency - a principle which the United States strongly supports and is pressing the South African Government and other Governments to adopt. South African acceptance of such safeguards and adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty would be important in reassuring the international community that its nuclear programme is peaceful.

The United States believes that nuclear co-operation for appropriate peaceful uses, under suitable international safeguards and controls, need not contribute to the proliferation of nuclear explosives. It is the judgement of the United States that implementation of the actions called for by operative paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 7 of this draft resolution could prevent

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

co-operation of a kind that offers the best prospect for encouraging South Africa to accept appropriate non-proliferation controls; hence it is our view that these paragraphs would not effectively serve the purpose of non-proliferation.

With regard to the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2, as we reported to the arms embargo Committee and to the Secretary-General, the United States has had an indication of the possibility - and I emphasize possibility - of a low-yield nuclear explosion in an area encompassing portions of the Indian and South Atlantic Oceans. However, it is important to stress that we have to date obtained no corroborative evidence and hence are not able to confirm whether any nuclear explosion took place. The United States is continuing to investigate all available information on this matter and has also expressed its willingness to co-operate to the fullest possible extent in assisting the Secretary-General in the inquiry requested by the General Assembly. Accordingly, the United States believes that the statements in the paragraphs to which I have referred are inappropriate, and for this reason we could not support this draft resolution.

Additionally, as noted earlier, we believe that efforts to gain South African acceptance of safeguards would not be helped through the implementation of the actions called for in operative paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 7. It is for this reason that the United States has abstained.

Mr. R. HANSEN (Denmark): The Danish delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16 because we agree to the objectives concerning the prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons to Africa and because we share the concern over all forms of nuclear co-operation with South Africa.

We have, however, serious reservations about certain features of the draft resolution, such as the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 in which reference is made to unverified information, and the inappropriate singling out of certain countries in the text.

Mr. RUDOFISKY (Austria): The Austrian delegation has supported draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. That position was taken on the basis of considerations of principle which as in the past have led Austria to support similar draft resolutions on this matter.

Like the other States represented here, Austria is deeply concerned about the prospects of South Africa acquiring a nuclear-weapon capability. However, I have to point out that we have reservations as to certain formulations in both the preambular and the operative parts of this draft resolution. I should like in this connexion to point out the singling out of certain Western countries and certain activities and also mention that, as long as the reports on a possible nuclear-weapon test in the South Atlantic have not been adequately verified, and as long as it has not been established whether South Africa has indeed exploded a nuclear device, we must also express reservation with regard to operative paragraph 2. We hope that the study to be entrusted to the Secretary-General, pursuant to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.39/Rev.1, will shed further light on this matter.

Mr. NOLAN (Australia): Because of the importance Australia places on the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and our growing concern about the negative attitude of some States on this question, the Australian delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". It has been Australia's long-standing view that South Africa should adhere to the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty or, at least, accept full-scope safeguards on its nuclear industry.

There are, however, some aspects of the draft resolution which cause the Australian delegation some misgivings. We strongly object to the tendentious naming of States in the draft resolution. We also see little point in vigorously condemning reports of a nuclear explosion. It is surely unproductive to condemn events which might have happened.

In addition, we consider the draft resolution deficient in that it fails to make the general distinction between peaceful and military applications of nuclear energy. In saying that, however, the Australian delegation wishes

(Mr. Nolan, Australia)

to make perfectly clear that Australia opposes the transfer of nuclear material between Australia and South Africa as well as any collaboration whatever in the nuclear field with South Africa. We shall not co-operate with South Africa in any nuclear activity.

Mr. KOLBY (Norway): The Norwegian delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution that has just been adopted. We did so because we support the objective of preventing nuclear weapons from being introduced into the continent of Africa.

My delegation supports the call in the draft resolution for an end to all collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear field. However, for the time being it does not seem possible to rally the necessary support to attain such an objective. In the meantime, my delegation would favour the introduction of appropriate international safeguards in relation to South Africa.

For its part Norway has never had and does not now have any dealing with South Africa in the nuclear field.

While supporting the purposes and objectives of the draft resolution my delegation has reservations on some of its elements. In particular, we regret the inappropriate singling out of certain countries in the text.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation has on several occasions stated that its Government supported the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We did so in particular in the case of the African continent. Accordingly, in 1977 we voted in favour of resolution 32/87 relating to the creation of such a zone in Africa.

Furthermore, in accordance with its positions on the problem of South Africa and the problem of non-proliferation, my delegation is firmly attached to the principle that Member States should refrain from all co-operation with South Africa which might enable that country to acquire nuclear weapons. It therefore believes that corporations, institutions and individuals coming under their jurisdiction should be discouraged from carrying out with South Africa any operations of this kind. Also, we associate ourselves with those who demand that South Africa submit all its nuclear facilities to the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

Thus, on these points of vital importance the French Government is in agreement with the objectives of the draft resolution which has today just been put to the vote in the Committee.

The French delegation deems it all the more regrettable that it was compelled to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16.

My delegation had to take this stand because of its very serious objections to certain provisions of the text. These objections relate in particular to two points to which we attach fundamental importance.

I refer first to the provisions in operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6, whereby all forms of nuclear co-operation with South Africa - including co-operation for purely peaceful purposes - is to be condemned and stopped. These provisions seem to us dangerous for two reasons.

First, by refusing to draw the necessary distinction between civilian uses and military applications of nuclear energy, the draft resolution appears to preclude all possibility of reconciling co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy with the imperatives of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

On the other hand, the interruption of all nuclear co-operation with South Africa that is directed to peaceful ends could be exploited by the South Africans in a way that we could only deplore. Such a course of action would carry the risk that South Africa could claim to be released from all its existing international obligations, especially those concerning the International Atomic Energy Agency, and thus claim a freedom of action to be used in a way we can only guess at.

France, for its part, has always refrained and will continue to refrain from providing South Africa, in the nuclear field, with any goods or services not under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency, or which might facilitate in any way the acquisition by South Africa of nuclear weapons. The nuclear-power plant which a French firm is building in Koeberg meets these two criteria. The technology used is the same as that employed in a hundred or so facilities of this type that can be found throughout the world, particularly in developing countries.

Our second principal objection relates to the requests addressed to the Security Council in operative paragraphs 6 and 7. The Council is already seized of various aspects of the situation in South Africa, and we do not feel that there is any reason for the General Assembly to address requests or recommendations to it. Our position on this is based on Article 12 of the Charter.

We note furthermore that in paragraph 7, the Council is requested to institute enforcement action against South Africa. This provision implies recourse to Chapter VII of the Charter. In our view, it is for the Security Council itself to consider any action of this type. That is why, if there had been a separate vote, the French delegation would have been obliged to vote against operative paragraphs 6 and 7.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16, which calls for the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

In previous years, my Government has supported the resolutions on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa which endorsed the concept of such a zone.

We continue to favour the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones wherever this is possible and feasible, because we believe that they can contribute usefully and positively to the cause of strengthening the international non-proliferation régime for nuclear weapons. They reduce the risk of nuclear war and thus help to

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal
Republic of Germany)

increase international trust and security. My Government will continue to support initiatives to this end.

As to this year's draft resolution, my delegation was not in a position to support it. Compared to last year's resolution, this draft resolution contains modifications which we feel are not designed to serve the established end which we continue to support.

Mr. ELLIOT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16, on the denuclearization of Africa, which our Committee has just voted upon, has been given our close attention. My country has on many occasions supported the principle of denuclearization, a principle to which it still attaches the same importance. That is why we voted in favour of the previous resolution on the same subject at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

This year, however, the draft resolution before us was in our view, weakened by a number of considerations that are alien to the very concept of denuclearization. In addition, the absence of any distinction between co-operation for civilian or military purposes would create a dangerous precedent which, because of its generalization, could well lead, if taken to extremes, to the condemnation of all commercial transactions. For this reason, my delegation was compelled to abstain on that draft resolution.

Mr. NONOYAMA (Japan): My delegation wishes to state for the record that our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16 should not be construed as meaning that we are in agreement with assertions contained in some of the paragraphs of the draft resolution, since there is a lack of evidence to show that these are based on fact.

Mr. DE ANDRADE (Portugal): I should also like to present an explanation of the Portuguese position on this matter. Portugal supports the draft resolution as a whole bearing in mind the importance for peace of the existence of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, and

(Mr. de Andrade, Portugal)

especially taking into account the unstable situation prevailing in southern Africa. We wish, however, to place on record some reservations concerning the wording of the draft resolution. In the first place, we think that it should not be based on uncertain information concerning the explosion of a South African nuclear device. Moreover, we are of the opinion that the prohibition of all co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field should not include collaboration for peaceful purposes, and we have doubts whether the referral of the matter to the Security Council at the present stage is timely. We entirely adhere, however, to the objective of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16, which is to adopt means to ensure that Africa shall be a nuclear-free zone. This is why we supported the measure.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): My delegation abstained on the draft resolution just voted on. The United Kingdom supports the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, but as we see it, the text in this draft resolution has changed drastically since 1977, when we voted in support of the resolution of that year. It now bears little resemblance to other nuclear-weapon-free-zone resolutions, in that it is less concerned with the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone than with condemning South Africa.

We fully share the concerns that have been expressed about the report that the South Africans may possibly have detonated a nuclear device. As a depositary Power of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, we believe that South Africa should sign the Treaty and accept the consequential safeguards. We would strongly oppose the provision of any assistance to South Africa in the manufacture or the acquisition by other means of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. It is unthinkable that we ourselves should provide any such assistance, and we have not done so.

This is a far cry, however, from saying that there should be no normal civil trade in the nuclear field. We therefore particularly oppose those paragraphs in this draft resolution which seek to condemn nuclear collaboration in the civil field. The right of all States to apply and develop programmes for the peaceful use of nuclear energy is internationally recognized and is enshrined in a number

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

of international instruments. We cannot support a draft resolution which contradicts this right.

I should add that our vote on this draft resolution in no way prejudices our position on any subsequent draft resolution concerning the nuclear intentions of South Africa.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): Sweden has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16 since we entirely share the concern expressed therein, namely, to save the continent of Africa from the threat of nuclear war and to establish a mechanism which would prevent the spread of nuclear explosive capacity to any African State.

We must, however, register our misgivings about some of the language of the draft resolution which seems inappropriate in a serious effort to persuade South African Government to take the measure of submitting its nuclear installations to international inspection and thereby give satisfactory assurance that it has no plans to achieve nuclear explosive capability.

In particular we consider that, in spite of certain indications that a nuclear explosion might have taken place in the South Atlantic, it is still too early to state that this actually happened and that South Africa was the State carrying out such an explosion.

We have welcomed the decision by the General Assembly to request the Secretary-General to make an inquiry into the reports concerning a nuclear explosion by South Africa. We are also going to vote in favour of the draft resolution in which the Secretary-General is requested to prepare a comprehensive report on South Africa's plans and capability in the nuclear field. The Swedish Government is itself actively engaged in trying to establish the facts behind the reported nuclear explosion.

Mr. BLOMBERG (Finland): The delegation of Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16 just adopted. My delegation has consistently supported the efforts to strengthen the security of States on a regional basis, in particular by the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Equally consistently, it has tried to combat the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons by assuming an active role in promoting the non-proliferation Treaty. We have done so because we believe that the emergence of any additional nuclear-weapon States runs counter to the security of all States, both in the region concerned and outside it. Together with the other Nordic States, the delegation of Finland has expressed its concern at the developments affecting non-proliferation in document A/C.1/34/4, which has been circulated in this Committee.

(Mr. Blomberg, Finland)

The reports, whether true or false, that the Government of South Africa might have tested a nuclear weapon serve to underline the danger and the mere suspicion of the danger of nuclear proliferation whenever and wherever it might occur.

My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution, but we did so with some misgivings concerning the language of the draft. In particular, some of its operative paragraphs do not, in our view, accurately reflect the respective areas of competence of the General Assembly and the Security Council as provided for in the Charter.

Mr. PEARSON (Canada): Canada abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16 despite the fact that we share the concern of its sponsors that Africa remain a nuclear-weapon-free zone, a concept that my Government supports in principle and in its application to other areas of the world in addition to Africa. We have consistently voted for such resolutions in the past.

Unfortunately, our support for the objectives of the draft resolution does not extend to all of its parts. We do not think that a Member State should be condemned in advance for acts of which there is no proof and which, indeed, the Secretary-General has been unable to confirm. We also regret that the draft resolution should make general and unsubstantiated statements about the practices of certain countries in regard to nuclear collaboration with South Africa. Finally, we do not believe it is appropriate for the Assembly to ask the Security Council to take enforcement action against South Africa in this regard. It is of vital importance that South Africa, just as other countries which are now reluctant to do so, be persuaded to co-operate with the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), in particular, to help prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. We do not think that the best way of achieving this goal is necessarily to prohibit all forms of co-operation with that country on questions of nuclear energy.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): Last year Israel supported the draft resolution on the denuclearization of Africa because, as we have often stated, we support the idea of regional denuclearization.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

We abstained this year because in the penultimate paragraph of the preamble Israel is accused of collaborating with South Africa in nuclear matters. Israel has repeatedly and recently denied allegations of such collaboration. It has occurred to us that this unwarranted allegation was inserted in a draft resolution in order to prevent Israel from expressing its support of the denuclearization of Africa. However, our friends in Africa very well know that we are very much in favour of this idea.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): Ireland has voted for draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16 on the denuclearization of Africa because we wished to give expression to our traditional and long-term support for the fundamental principle of the denuclearization of Africa. At the same time Ireland, in casting its positive vote, has reservations on a number of elements in the draft which we do not feel to be either justified or necessary. Ireland is thinking in particular of the contentious singling out of Western States in the ninth preambular paragraph, something which we cannot accept; the condemnation of an explosion which pre-empts the conclusions of the study being undertaken by the Secretary-General, and the failure above all to distinguish in operative paragraph 4 and elsewhere between co-operation for peaceful purposes and co-operation for weapons production. Finally, we have reservations about the reference to the Security Council's role in operative paragraph 6.

Mr. MORENO (Italy): Italy has consistently supported the principle of the non-introduction of nuclear weapons in the African continent and favours the general objectives of the draft resolution just adopted.

We continue to favour the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa on the condition that it could play a positive role in strengthening the security of the region and the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The text voted on this year, however, contains allegations and formulations that in our view are not necessary or relevant to the basic purpose of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa. Therefore, we abstained on this draft resolution.

Mr. KAY (New Zealand): New Zealand has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16, although there are several aspects of the text about which we have misgivings.

We are not happy with those aspects of the draft resolution which appear to pronounce on the question of the possibility of a test explosion before the Secretary-General has had an opportunity to comply with the General Assembly's request that he gather information on the reported detonation.

In addition, since we are not opposed to co-operation in the civil nuclear field under adequate safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), we have had some difficulty with the formulation of operative paragraph 4, and elsewhere.

Finally, in relation to operative paragraph 7, New Zealand regards it as the sole prerogative of the Security Council to decide on enforcement action. Nevertheless, our concern about the possibilities of proliferation is such that it outweighs our difficulties with these and some other aspects of the text.

Mr. VELISSAROPOULOS (Greece) (interpretation from French): We entirely agree with the idea of the denuclearization of Africa, and also with the idea of the banning of the introduction of nuclear weapons into South Africa.

Last year, we voted in favour of the draft resolution adopted on the subject. However, certain reservations we had with regard to operative paragraphs 2, 4, 5 and 6 have prompted us to abstain on this year's draft resolution, while maintaining our position on the principle. In particular, we were prompted to abstain because the draft resolution this year condemns co-operation in the field of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. We believe this constitutes a dangerous precedent, particularly with regard to our justified and legitimate efforts to prevent any acquisition of nuclear weapons by South Africa. It is in this spirit and out of respect for the principle contained in draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16, not to mention the reservations we have expressed, that we abstained in the vote.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The delegation of Cyprus has voted in favour of this draft resolution as it would have voted in favour of the denuclearization of any part of our planet, because of the dangers inherent in the spread of nuclear weapons throughout the earth - and a fortiori in this instance because there are sufficient indications that the danger of South Africa acquiring nuclear weapons exists, along with the great peril such a situation entails. I believe, however, that in any case this draft resolution deserves adoption.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Nigeria, who wishes to raise a point of order.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I attempted to attract the Chairman's attention prior to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16, but obviously I was not seen and I did not want to interrupt the voting process once it had begun.

It was the understanding of my delegation at our last meeting that this morning the Committee was going to consider draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.2, L.4, L.12, L.13, L.14, L.15, L.16, L.17, L.19 and L.24. I understood that this morning this was reconfirmed. My delegation would therefore like to know why we began our voting this morning with draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16; I almost missed the vote on that draft resolution, even though I was present. I had thought we were going to take the draft resolutions in the order in which they had been indicated to us earlier. There are several delegations that would have made a specific effort to be here, in view of the importance of this draft resolution to them, had they known it was going to be voted upon at this time.

My point of order is to find out if there was any specific reason why draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16 was voted on at the beginning of our meeting this morning, notwithstanding the fact that it was the fourth or fifth draft resolution listed.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to say that the Chair made a number of statements with respect to the draft resolutions that would be voted on today. I did not specifically say that they would be presented in that order.

(The Chairmen)

While I wholeheartedly agree with the representative of Nigeria that draft resolutions should be taken in the order in which they are submitted, this morning when we came in two or three delegations made the same kind of comment to me that the representative of Nigeria has just made with respect to why a particular draft resolution could not be taken at that time.

Since I was interested in beginning the meeting on time, draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16, according to our records, was the first one that could be taken at that time. Draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.4 and L.15 have been withdrawn or postponed to a later date, and L.16 was the next one in line to be voted on.

I agree that it is inconvenient, especially when we have a list of resolutions in chronological order, to have to call for one that might be the third or fourth on the list, but I hope members will understand that the Chair does not want to delay a meeting merely to cope with the wishes of many delegations that are sometimes not really justified.

I hope the representative of Nigeria would accept this as an answer to his question on point of order.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I am happy that the representative of Nigeria has raised this question. On behalf of my delegation, I appreciate the Chairman's explanation.

I would like to add that my own delegation was somewhat late and arrived after the vote had been taken. I have indicated to the Secretariat how my delegation would have voted had it been present. I am sure that other members who were late will do the same.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to repeat once again that, in order to save time, all representatives who arrive late should merely hand their names to the Secretariat with an indication - which will be reproduced in the record - of how they would have voted on a specific draft resolution had they been present.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): The representative of Nigeria has anticipated what I intended to say. I simply wish to point out that the voting ended about eight minutes after the beginning of the meeting, and we have a long list of explanations of vote after the vote. If such cases arise in the future, it might perhaps be wiser to ask delegations to give their explanations of vote, in so far as possible, before the vote in order to give those delegations which have to attend other meetings in the morning time to prepare for the vote, as well as giving them the possibility of participating in that vote.

Mr. YANGO (Philippines): Mr. Chairman, would you be able to tell us at this point whether you have already decided on an order of voting for the draft resolutions to be voted on this morning and this afternoon, for the convenience of delegations?

The CHAIRMAN: I have the information here, which I had planned to give later, but it seems that now might be an appropriate time to tell you once more what our situation is. I would point out that once the information is given, the draft resolutions will be taken in that order. I must emphasize that we are having some difficulty with the availability of a voting room. As I mentioned earlier this morning, we are not even able to have this room this afternoon in order to vote, and we are to terminate our work, in terms of voting, on 27 November. The draft resolutions remaining to be dealt with today are: A/C.1/34/L.12, L.13, L.17, L.19/Rev.1 and L.24. Once we have listed the draft resolutions in chronological order - except for some problems for technical reasons or otherwise - rather than using the flexibility that I discussed earlier in the first part of our meeting, we shall continue to deal with the draft resolutions in that order, as they are presented. On Friday - I call on the representative of Mexico on a point of order.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): When the Chairman, at the beginning of the meeting, announced the order of voting on the draft resolutions, I did not think it necessary to have anything clarified because, in my view, the decision announced at the last meeting of the Committee was still valid, namely, that immediately after the draft resolutions, the draft decision submitted by the Mexican delegation which appears in document A/C.1/34/L.40 would be put to the vote. I should like now to have that point clarified. Is this still the position?

The CHAIRMAN: The draft decision in document A/C.1/34/L.40 could not be taken because there are some financial implications to be requested. It is possible that we can deal with it this afternoon, rather than this morning.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): It was my understanding that the financial implications are already spelled out in the report submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/34/588.

The CHAIRMAN: That draft decision, I hope, will be taken this afternoon. As I mentioned earlier this morning, we are trying to deal first with all the draft resolutions that might need the voting board, since we cannot use this room this afternoon. As that draft decision need not be put to the vote, that is another reason why it can be delayed until this afternoon. I hope the representative of Mexico will go along with this point of view.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I would agree with its being taken in the afternoon, provided this is indeed done in the afternoon, even if a vote is required, because it is not indispensable to have the electronic machine for the vote. For many years the United Nations has voted in other rooms. If that draft decision is brought up for consideration this afternoon, whether a vote is needed or not, my delegation would agree to that procedure.

MLG/

MLG/dmt/sc

A/C.1/34/PV.38

33-35

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to return now to the question raised by the representative of the Philippines, and to continue to give the list of the draft resolutions that we propose to deal with for the remaining part of our work on disarmament items.

On Friday we shall deal with draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.6, L.12/Rev.1, L.14/Rev.1, L.20, L.21, L.22, L.27 and L.31; on Monday draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.3/Rev.1, L.9, L.23, L.25, L.26, L.33, L.35, L.38, the draft resolution contained in document A/34/29, and draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.29 and L.28; then on Tuesday, draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.30, L.32, L.34, L.36, L.37 and L.39/Rev.1.

(The Chairman)

Members will recall that draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.25 to L.39 have not been formally introduced. Some of them will be introduced this afternoon, and I should like once again to urge that all draft resolutions should be introduced as soon as possible so that the Committee can consider them.

I shall continue the practice of announcing which draft resolutions are to be dealt with the following day so that members will be informed.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation, which will have the privilege of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.38, will not be able to do so until Monday, and I would therefore be grateful, if there is no objection, if consideration of it could be postponed until Tuesday.

The CHAIRMAN: That will be done.

We have completed our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.16, and we shall now turn our attention to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.17, under agenda item 42 (f), entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". This draft resolution has 17 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 34th meeting of the First Committee on 14 November 1979. The sponsors are: Bangladesh, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Mali, Mauritius, Nigeria, the Philippines, Sweden, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): On behalf of the sponsors, I should like to request that this draft resolution be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Nigeria has requested that draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.17 be adopted without a vote.

As there is no objection, it is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.17 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.17.

The Committee will now turn its attention to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.2, under agenda item 37, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". This draft resolution has one sponsor and was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 31st meeting of the First Committee on 6 November 1979.

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

Mr. SINGH (India): The general question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the various regions of the world has been the subject of a comprehensive study by an ad hoc group of qualified governmental experts under the auspices of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which is available in document A/10027/Add.1. The experts unanimously agreed on certain basic principles which should be taken into account wherever appropriate conditions for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones exist. The Indian delegation has consistently supported the conclusions of the group of experts. Indeed, we believe that the report of the expert group, which was taken note of by the General Assembly at its thirtieth session, reflects the general consensus on the subject among all delegations.

One of the basic principles enunciated in the report of the expert group is that the initiative for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should come from the States within the region concerned and that participation must be voluntary. My Government attaches great importance to this principle, not for any doctrinaire reasons but for very practical considerations. We believe that for a zone to be viable it should come into being as a result of the initiatives taken by the States concerned because of common security concerns, common perception of the threat to security and the common desire to help each other in meeting such threats. It cannot be imposed from outside of the region nor can it be imposed within the region by one or more States. Voluntariness of participation is the essence of the concept.

(Mr. Singh, India)

My delegation does not oppose the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones as such. Indeed, we have supported in the past, and shall continue to do so in future, all proposals for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in well-defined and distinct geographical regions of the world provided, of course, that the initiative for the establishment of such zones comes on an entirely voluntary basis from all the States of the region concerned.

Accordingly, we ourselves took the initiative at the twenty-ninth and thirtieth session of the General Assembly and proposed a draft resolution on the declaration and establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in an appropriate region of Asia. In its two resolutions, namely, 3265 A (XXIX) and 3476 (XXX), the General Assembly decided to give due consideration to any proposal for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in an appropriate region of Asia - I repeat, in an appropriate region of Asia - after it has been developed and matured among the interested States within the region concerned.

Our initiative at the twenty-ninth and thirtieth session of the General Assembly shows that our opposition to the Pakistani draft resolution was not due to any objection to the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones, but was necessitated by the obvious and insurmountable deficiencies in the Pakistani draft.

(Mr. Singh, India)

Any resolution on the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should avoid prejudgement concerning the concept, features and delineation of the zone. These are matters best left for discussion, and eventual agreement, among the interested countries. No consultations regarding the implications, feasibility and acceptability of the proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia took place before the item was inscribed on the agenda of the General Assembly for the first time at its twenty-ninth session.

South Asia cannot be treated in isolation. It is a subregion and an integral part of the region of Asia and the Pacific. It is necessary to take into account the security environment of that region as a whole. A genuine nuclear-weapon-free zone in that region can only be established in the total absence of nuclear weapons. The existence of nuclear weapons in the region of Asia and the Pacific and the presence of foreign military bases in the Indian Ocean complicate the security environment of that region and make the situation inappropriate for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the subregion of South Asia.

If Pakistan is sincere about this proposal, the appropriate procedure for it to follow is not to raise the matter in the United Nations, thereby trying to impose outside influences in the area, but to let the matter develop and mature within the region concerned. Since the proposal of Pakistan as contained in draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.2 does not conform to these generally accepted principles governing the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, my delegation as in the past remains firmly opposed to it and will vote against it.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation favours in principle the idea of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and it will consequently vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.2. I would like to reiterate, however, my delegation's belief that the establishment of such a zone, which would result in strengthening the security of the countries in the region, would depend upon the following conditions being satisfied: first, that the establishment of such a zone is agreed upon by all the countries concerned, including the nuclear-weapon States and, in particular, that it is based on

(Mr. Okawa, Japan)

the initiative of the countries in South Asia; secondly, that it will not undermine the peace and security of the region and of the world as a whole; thirdly, that it is accompanied by effective safeguard measures embracing national and international inspection and verification; fourthly, that it is consistent with the principles of international law, including the principle of freedom of navigation on the high seas.

My delegation also considers it essential for the security of the region that the countries in South Asia refrain from taking any action contrary to the objectives of nuclear non-proliferation.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): In voting again this year for the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, the United States is aware of the greater sense of urgency which now underscores efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation in that important region. Our decision has been taken against a background of disturbing developments which, in our view, constitute a serious danger to the goal which this resolution is designed to help to achieve.

These developments make effective initiatives to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to South Asia even more important than before.

The United States vote in favour of this draft resolution also reflects our continuing support for the principle of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in South Asia and other regions of the world, under conditions that would ensure their effectiveness. We believe that effective nuclear-weapon-free zones, negotiated and supported by the appropriate parties, can enhance the security of the participants in such agreements and reinforce the goals of non-proliferation on a regional basis.

The criteria by which the United States Government judges the effectiveness of any nuclear-weapon-free zone have been stated by the delegation of the United States many times in the past. I would only mention here that for any nuclear-weapon-free zone arrangement to accomplish its objectives, must effectively preclude the conduct of any nuclear explosions, whatever their declared purpose. This is not an arbitrary requirement. It is based on the scientific reality that it is simply not possible to distinguish

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

between the technology for making nuclear weapons and the technology for making nuclear devices for peaceful purposes.

While our affirmative vote on the draft resolution reflects the continuing policy of the United States towards nuclear-weapon-free zones, we would not wish to imply by our vote that we regard the creation of such a zone as the only - or even necessarily the most promising - means of averting nuclear-arms competition in South Asia. A variety of agreed arrangements, voluntarily concluded by the States most directly concerned, might well effectively serve the same objective. Such arrangements need not, in our view, be limited strictly to measures affecting the region of South Asia.

Indeed, in supporting the present draft resolution we should like to express our hope that the States of South Asia and other interested States will explore, in a flexible and co-operative manner, arrangements that would be capable of providing effective and reliable assurances against nuclear-arms competition.

I would like to take particular note of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution which contains an admonition urging all States in the region to refrain from any action contrary to the objectives of the draft resolution. For the reasons which I indicated earlier, the conduct of any nuclear explosion would constitute such an action.

In the light of the disturbing developments to which I referred moments ago, my Government attaches special importance this year to that provision in operative paragraph 2. The decision of the United States to vote for this draft resolution is based on our expectation that its sponsor, and others supporting it, will demonstrate that they too take that provision with the utmost seriousness. We believe that all States, whether or not they are able to vote for this particular draft resolution, should abide by the important injunction contained in operative paragraph 2.

In conclusion, it is the belief of my Government that the adoption of this draft resolution at the present session of the General Assembly should serve as a clear statement of concern by the world community regarding the prospect of nuclear-arms competition in South Asia and should stimulate determined efforts to avert that grave danger.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): France is in principle favourable to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The creation of such zones can contribute both to the security of States in the region and to the reduction of the risks of proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world. This observation may be applied particularly to South Asia. However, the French Government considers that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones cannot be carried out against the will of States in the region concerned.

Thus, when such an objection is expressed, it is the view of the French Government that the international community, represented by the General Assembly, cannot take a position on a proposal to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone. From this point of view, we note that the situation in South Asia has registered no change in the past year.

Hence, the French delegation is compelled to abstain on the draft resolution before us, as it did at the thirty-third session on resolution 33/65.

Mr. AL-HAMZAH (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation has consistently supported the idea of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We consider that the realization of this objective will contribute in large measure to general and complete disarmament and help to strengthen world peace and security. Thus we support any statement which promotes the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and will vote in favour of the draft resolution before us.

Despite this, we feel that the views expressed by the countries concerned in South Asia are of special importance and that mutual understanding among the countries in the region will play an important part in the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): In the opinion of the Swedish Government, all approaches which clearly contribute to initiating a process which would lead to disarmament should be explored. In particular, we support all efforts to decrease tension in the various regions of the world.

In our answer to the Note by the Secretary-General of 4 January 1978 concerning regional aspects of disarmament, we declared that regional initiatives, including nuclear-weapon-free zones, are important parts of such efforts. Conditions in different regions of the world vary, and consequently formulas for nuclear-weapon-free zones should be adapted to the specific political, geographic, military and other characteristics of a given region and of the countries concerned.

The representative of India has already referred to to the Ad Hoc Group of Governmental Experts which made a comprehensive study, under the auspices of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, of the general question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the various regions of the world. The Swedish Government presented its views on the report in document A/31/189.

In our view, a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be based upon a number of fundamental conditions. First, and most fundamental, in order to create an effective nuclear-weapon-free zone, general agreement thereon must be present among all States concerned. The second condition is the non-possession of nuclear weapons by zonal States. The third is the non-development or non-presence of nuclear weapons in the zone and the withdrawal of such nuclear weapons as could only be used against targets in the nuclear-weapon-free zone, thus establishing a safety area or security belt adjacent to the zone. The fourth condition would be the commitment by the nuclear-weapon Powers not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against targets within the zone.

In explaining our vote on last year's resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, we declared that the Swedish Government would welcome the submission of a draft resolution

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

supported by all States of this particular region. It seems to be a fact that insufficient consultations have taken place among the countries of the South Asian region on this matter. The draft resolution submitted this year does not enjoy regional support, but is of the same kind as last year.

Although my Government supports in principle the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region in question, the Swedish delegation will for the aforementioned reasons not vote differently from last year and consequently abstained in today's vote.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Swedish Government cannot vote in favour of the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, we urge the States concerned to continue to pursue all avenues which could facilitate the attainment of the objectives contained in the draft resolution. In the meantime, all States should act to reduce tension in the South Asian region and to promote disarmament and confidence-building measures and should refrain from actions contrary to these objectives.

Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Over the past several years this Committee has been dealing with the questions of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and we have been assiduously working on them. It is the view of my delegation, however, that these problems have not yet been really faced seriously or addressed in a manner to solve the predicament in which we find ourselves.

In a statement I made earlier in the deliberations of this Committee, I mentioned a new state of affairs represented by the existence of a pre-nuclear - as distinct from post-nuclear - situation, such as is the case in Israel and South Africa. We must inevitably come to the conclusion that the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in South Asia and elsewhere must be given complete and fool-proof guarantees, such as collective guarantees by the super-Powers, effective international inspection and other safeguards.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

It is hardly comforting to hear an already nuclear country in the region state that it would not be the first to use such weapons, having admitted that it had acquired them. We know too much about human frailty, weaknesses and ambition to accept such a statement. This has hardly any credence in practical terms. Solemn, practical renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons and ratification of the instruments of non-proliferation and the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones by all non-nuclear-weapon States is an essential first step. Anything less is simply a pious hope and an exercise in futility. I can hardly emphasize this point sufficiently.

I think that this Committee should address itself seriously to the next step rather than continuing in the annual exercise of preaching the virtues of nuclear-weapon-free zones while we know that there can never be a nuclear-weapon-free zone where one of the members has already been nuclearized.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

That does not mean that the Jordan delegation does not or will not whole-heartedly support the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, just as we support the creation of such zones in other regions of the world. But I must in all solemnity appeal to the States members of this Committee to bear in mind that we have to put teeth into these pious hopes and make them effective if we are to avoid the kind of nuclear havoc that might be wrought upon our universe by the proliferation of nuclear capability.

Hence, our vote will be in support of the draft resolution as a first step.

Mr. MORENO (Italy): Italy has generally supported the concept of the establishment, under appropriate circumstances, of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We believe that there are political and geographical situations where effective nuclear-free zones negotiated and agreed upon among all the States of a region can make a useful and positive contribution to the strengthening of security and the cause of non-proliferation on a regional basis.

Accordingly, we have whenever possible endorsed and supported resolutions concerning regional arrangements freely arrived at by all the parties directly concerned.

Having heard the statement and the arguments of the representative of India, we note that an important State of the South Asian region is not in a position to accept the draft resolution before us concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that area. In line with our basic approach that initiatives and decisions on nuclear-weapon-free zones cannot be taken against the will of the States directly concerned but must be freely and voluntarily pursued by all of them, we shall therefore have to abstain again this year in the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): Ever since the item under consideration, that is, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, was first considered in the First Committee at the twenty-ninth regular session, my delegation has consistently abstained whenever a draft resolution on the subject has been put to the vote.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

My delegation's views on this question are well known. Briefly, while we are fully in favour of the establishment of regional nuclear-free zones, we believe that nations of a particular region should first agree, perhaps at a regional conference if not as a result of extensive bilateral consultations. We are also not quite sure what is actually meant by "South Asia". I have made suggestions on this item in the past, but my views have not been heeded. I look forward to the next session when I hope that a draft resolution on this subject will, after full consultations and after having been agreed upon by all the nations of the region, be proposed to this Committee and adopted by consensus.

In the meantime, I have no alternative this year but to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.2.

Mr. TSHERING (Bhutan): I should like to explain my delegation's vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.2.

My delegation believes that, prior to reaching the final goal of general and complete disarmament, the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones could contribute to the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is for that reason that we have been able to support in general draft resolutions in this Committee for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, particularly when they enjoyed the support of all the States concerned. This Committee has been considering the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia for the last six years, but it has not been able to achieve the first prerequisite, which, we believe, is agreement among the countries directly concerned.

We are convinced that the subject is complex, and there are differences of view which still remain unresolved. My delegation therefore believes that it is indeed not realistic or practical to rush into the process of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia until a suitable condition for its creation has gone through consultations and been agreed upon by all the States concerned. In the light of this, my delegation is once again obliged to maintain its opposition to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.2.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.2.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Bhutan, India, Mauritius

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.2 was adopted by 86 votes to 3, with 38 abstentions.

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

Mr. NOLAN (Australia): The delegation of Australia has abstained on this draft resolution concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

The Australian reservation centres around the evidence that developments since the last session of this Assembly make it clear that the approach envisaged in this draft resolution cannot meet the requirements of the South Asian situation.

Our vote should not be interpreted as implying a lack of concern by Australia over the need for appropriate arrangements to contain the risk of proliferation in the South Asian region. We have made clear our deep concern on this issue on several occasions during the present session of the Assembly. It is the belief of the Australian Government that the countries of the region should accept a binding and verifiable commitment to non-proliferation. The possibility of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in any region must be regarded as one of the greatest threats to the future of mankind.

In the view of the Australian delegation, the achievement of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty and its acceptance by all States in the region offers one of the best prospects of preventing proliferation and a nuclear arms race in the region.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation deems it necessary to place on record the reasons for which it abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.2.

The Brazilian Government has stated on several occasions its support for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Brazil has signed and ratified the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which forbids nuclear weapons in the Latin American continent.

Nevertheless, my delegation wishes to point out that the establishment of such zones should necessarily take into account some important requirements. In the view of the Brazilian Government, a nuclear-weapon-free zone with clear geographical delimitations should reflect a general consensus of the States directly concerned and its establishment should be the result of a free agreement among them, without external influences.

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

Furthermore, nuclear-weapon Powers should unequivocally undertake to respect the nuclear-weapon-free status of such zones. In the light of the above considerations, the Brazilian delegation did not find itself in a position to cast an affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.2.

Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): In voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.2, my delegation proceeded from the conviction that the statements made at the highest level by the Governments of the States of South Asia, in which they affirmed their willingness to undertake not to acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons and to devote their nuclear programmes exclusively to the social and economic progress of their populations, reflected the sense of reality and the spirit of good neighbourliness and responsibility which characterizes the peoples of that region.

My delegation supports the principle of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, convinced as it is that the existence of such zones undoubtedly contributes to the strengthening of the security of States in a region, at the same time assisting them to devote their efforts to the economic and social development while using their nuclear capability for peaceful purposes.

It is on the basis of this principle, to which my delegation is firmly attached, that we voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): The Federal Republic of Germany has voted in favour of the draft resolution calling for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

We consider that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones can, in the right circumstances, make a useful contribution to international non-proliferation efforts and to improving national and regional security. In this connexion, I should like to point out, however, that in the view of my Government, nuclear-weapon-free zones should include all countries of a region and that the establishment of such zones can only be undertaken with the free consent and the voluntary participation of all States concerned.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal
Republic of Germany)

This view was expressed, in particular by the representative of India.

The text of the draft resolution just does not prejudge these important specific points. We therefore supported it.

In concluding, I should like to stress my Government's hope that all States in the region will refrain in the meantime from action that might be contrary to the objective of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): I wish to explain why my delegation abstained on the draft resolution just adopted. The United Kingdom generally welcomes and, when possible, supports initiatives leading to regional arms control measures. Britain was the first nuclear-weapon State to ratify both of the protocols to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, and has in the past supported proposals for nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East, Africa and South Asia.

In 1977 and 1978 we supported the Pakistani resolution on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia which endorsed the concept of such a zone. But we made it clear at that time that we would not support its implementation against the wishes of one of the major Powers in the area.

Britain continues to support the concept of effective nuclear-weapon-free zones because we believe such zones can make a positive contribution to national and regional security, to the cause of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to the reduction of the risk of nuclear war.

But we have regretfully concluded that the prospects for establishing such a zone in South Asia have receded somewhat over the past year. There are fundamental differences of opinion about the proposal. In the present circumstances, the proposal does not appear to us to be feasible, and does not offer any prospect of removing the dangers of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the sub-continent.

Our objective remains practical progress to that end, and in this connexion we welcomed the statement by the representative of Pakistan on 6 November that Pakistan would also be

"ready to explore other ways and means of mutually reassuring each other in South Asia against the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons".

(A/C.1/34/PV.31, p. 16)

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

It was against this background that my Government decided to abstain on the draft resolution this year. In doing so, I emphasize that our abstention should be seen as evidence of our desire to maintain an open mind and an impartial and helpful stance.

Mr. PATRICIO (Mozambique): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.2.

In this regard, we should like to say that in arriving at our position we have been guided by our support for the principle of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

However, we consider that the achievement of this goal requires the widest measure of agreement on a regional basis for this important step.

Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): The Ethiopian delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution just adopted.

Last year, at the 84th plenary meeting of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, we indicated our views regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. We believe those views are as valid now as they were last year, and we wish our abstention to be interpreted in that light.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.2.

(The Chairman)

It is now my intention to turn to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.13 under agenda item 42, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". This draft resolution has 29 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee on 9 November. The sponsors are Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burma, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Kenya, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, the United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have asked that it be adopted without a vote.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): We would request a vote, sir.

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

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I wish to take this occasion to state that the United States shares the hope of others that rapid progress will be made in arms control and disarmament. However, we do not think that this purpose is served by a draft resolution that is often accusatory in its tone and unrealistic in its request.

We do not see how the Committee on Disarmament can be expected to negotiate on all the priority questions of disarmament on its agenda and simultaneously elaborate a comprehensive programme of disarmament before the second special session devoted to disarmament of the General Assembly. The United States will not join in criticism of the Committee on Disarmament when it does not achieve the impossible.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation intends to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.13, and I should like to explain the reasons for our abstention.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The Soviet Union, as is known, is in favour of world-wide activization of the work of the Committee on Disarmament and of enhancing its effectiveness. It is precisely from this standpoint that our delegation acts in the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. Nevertheless, in assessing this draft resolution we cannot fail to see that it reflects an extremely subjective approach on the part of the Committee on Disarmament, and this has been reflected in the language of the first and sixth preambular paragraphs, which are not in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Furthermore, the draft resolution contains provisions relating to the links between the work of the Committee on Disarmament and the talks that are going on outside it, and the language is such that we cannot agree with it. We do not share the view that the talks carried on outside the Committee are an obstacle to its work, and this is precisely the impression that one might obtain from the language of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

In the process of consultations with the sponsors of the draft resolution, the Soviet delegation has set forth in detail its views on these provisions and an attempt was made to find a mutually acceptable constructive solution. However, our proposals were not taken into account, and this makes it impossible for our delegation to support this draft resolution.

Mr. HLAING (Burma): As is well known, disarmament is a matter of universal concern. In recognition of this fact, the Committee on Disarmament and its predecessor bodies were established as the only multilateral negotiating forums on disarmament. The composition of those bodies, based on a certain political and geographic balance, reflects their universal representative character.

The central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament and the imperative necessity for the revitalized negotiating body to undertake negotiations on all disarmament and arms control questions have been reaffirmed by the special session devoted to disarmament held in 1978.

(Mr. Hlaing, Burma)

We consider it to be a matter of paramount importance that the progress and results of negotiations on certain specific issues conducted outside the framework of the Committee on Disarmament should be fully and regularly reported to the Committee on Disarmament. Only thus would that negotiating body be able to keep abreast of the progress of the negotiations and at the appropriate stage involve itself in substantive negotiations on a multilateral scale.

It is a well-known fact that the results achieved in the field of disarmament to date, when viewed against the great magnitude of the disarmament problem, remain minimal owing primarily to a lack of political will on the part of major armed Powers.

It is a fact that the major armed Powers do not, in many instances, put into effect the resolutions on disarmament issues adopted by the General Assembly on the recommendations of the United Nations negotiating body on disarmament if they do not meet the requirements of those Powers.

With full knowledge of that fact, Burma will none the less, in co-operation with the other members of the Committee on Disarmament, persevere in its efforts to search for generally acceptable solutions to the various disarmament problems, keeping in mind the need to strike a realistic balance between what is desirable and what is possible.

In this spirit our delegation has cosponsored the draft resolution and earnestly hopes that, after due consideration by this Committee, the draft resolution will be adopted with full support.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.13 to the vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.13 was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on speakers who wish to speak in explanation of their votes.

Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): My delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.13 because it stresses the universal dimensions of the aim of complete and total disarmament with which, I believe, we are all in agreement. Were it not a problem of universal concern, there would have been no special session of the General Assembly to debate and discuss and air the concern of the whole world over the accelerating arms race.

I do not see in the draft resolution anything accusatory, as one member has said. It simply states the banal fact upon which we are all agreed - and one has only to watch television and read the newspapers - that so far, achievements have been limited, commendable as they have been up to now.

The role assigned to the Committee on Disarmament is not intended to be exclusive, but rather, complementary to the bilateral talks that are going on between various countries, and particularly the super Powers, in this vast field of disarmament. Why should we as the United Nations be excluded from at least being briefed and from having a say in what is going on, if we are to be requested to meet in special session in 1980 to discuss this very same problem? It seems to me that it is an anticlimax and a contradiction in our position to have had a special session in which almost all States, without exception, expressed their deep concern over what is going on in the world and over the world's survival, and then to limit the involvement on the problem of the Committee that represents the world community, in its limited and circumscribed way, and exclude it from the picture.

If journalists are in the picture, if the media are in the picture, if other responsible people are in the picture, why should Member States be excluded? It is for this reason that I feel that, no matter how limited and modest the contribution of the Committee on Disarmament established by the General Assembly might be, it is definitely a contribution that enlightens us all on the outcome of the efforts being made towards total disarmament.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.13 because, in our view, some of the language of this document does not properly reflect the consensus on the constitution and status of the Committee on Disarmament that was achieved during the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

We regret that the sponsors did not find it possible to accept several suggestions aimed at removing the difficulties for my delegation and for many others. We submit that a resolution of this nature has to be adopted by consensus, and not by vote, because the attempt to impose the views of one group of States upon another group does not serve the purpose of promoting negotiations on disarmament items.

Our misgivings are related to the preambular paragraphs 2 and 6 and to operative paragraph 2. The requirement in operative paragraph 2 that participants in bilateral or regional negotiations outside the Committee should submit to the Committee a full report at any stage on their negotiations is not of a nature to facilitate the course of those negotiations themselves. Instead of trying to subordinate the efforts outside the Committee to the authority of the Committee, it is more appropriate to complement our efforts and to orient them in the same direction, namely, the direction of the achievement of real disarmament measures.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I seem to have been the victim of an electrical fault. I did press the green button when the vote was taken, but apparently it did not light up. My neighbours' buttons activate their lights when they are pressed, but mine does not. I should like the record to reflect my vote, which was in favour of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: It will be so recorded.

We shall turn next to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "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". This draft resolution now has 24 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at our thirty-fourth meeting on 14 November 1979.

The sponsors are: Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea-Bissau, India, Ireland, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Romania, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sweden, Uruguay and Yugoslavia. This draft resolution has financial implications, which are set forth in document A/C.1/34/L.41. The sponsors have asked that this draft resolution be adopted without a vote. As there is no objection, it is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.19/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.19/Rev.1.

The Committee will now turn its attention to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.24, under agenda item 42, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session".

This draft resolution has 11 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 35th meeting of the First Committee on 15 November. The sponsors are: Austria, Indonesia, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sweden, Ireland, Niger and Uruguay.

Mr. CHEBELEU (Romania): My delegation, together with the other delegations sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.24, have been conducting extensive consultations, practically since the very beginning of this session, on the text of this draft resolution. We came to the present text after we had done our best to accommodate the interests of the greatest possible number of delegations and groups of delegations, it is to be hoped all of them.

We believe we are near to a well-balanced text which should command broad support. In their desire to pursue this objective further and thus serve the cause of the reduction of military expenditures, the sponsors agreed to make a slight change in the text which I have the honour to bring to the Committee's attention. The slight change to which I am referring, concerns operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. In the third line we are willing to change the words "and to reallocate" to the words "with a view to reallocating". The paragraph would then read:

"Appeals to all States, and in particular the most heavily armed States, pending the conclusion of agreements on the reduction of military expenditures, to exercise self-restraint in their military expenditures with a view to reallocating the funds thus saved to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries;"

We have made this change in the draft resolution in order to bring it more into line with the letter and spirit of the Final Document of the special session. It is my hope that this modification in the draft resolution will enjoy the general support of this Committee.

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

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As is known, as far back as 1973, on the proposal of the Soviet Union, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the reduction of military budgets. I would venture to remind the Committee that at that time it was a matter primarily of the reduction of military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council, by a percentage which would be the same for all the States concerned. This still remains unimplemented inasmuch as a number of States, including certain permanent members of the Security Council, have refused to translate the matter into terms of practical agreement, referring particularly to the incomparability of the military budgets of States.

Later on, in 1978, at the special session on disarmament, the Soviet Union, in a search for a mutually acceptable solution, supplemented its original proposal. We stated our readiness to come to an agreement on tackling the task of reducing military budgets by an equal percentage or in absolute terms by amounts of the same order of magnitude. We note with satisfaction that this approach of ours met with support and understanding at the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

On the basis of our position of principle, we categorically support a reduction of military budgets. At the same time, speaking specifically about draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.24, we cannot fail to note that this draft is not a step forward in developing the provisions which the General Assembly adopted in 1973. Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.24 contains elements which actually weaken the resolutions of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly. Specifically, I have in mind the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1. The fourth preambular paragraph speaks of "standardized reporting on the military expenditures" which in our view only diverts attention from the completely specific and tangible task of reducing military budgets, in regard to which the General Assembly, at its special session, has distinctly formulated its position.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Furthermore, the question is raised in operative paragraph 1 of measures of verification for the limitation of military expenditures. In our view, such control can and must be carried out by each State, on its own, on the basis of published data. Therefore, to raise the question of some special measures of verification would be wrong. In addition, it would turn out to be a complicating factor in efforts aimed at resolving a truly urgent and topical problem, namely, that of reducing military budgets.

In the light of the points I have just made, we would request a separate vote on the fourth paragraph of the preamble and operative paragraph 1.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I have not asked to speak in explanation of vote, but rather to inquire whether Mauritius is included among the sponsors of the draft resolution. I did not hear the name of Mauritius mentioned in the list of sponsors which the Chairman read out. I should like to request that the name of Mauritius be included among the sponsors.

The CHAIRMAN: If the sponsors will so agree, that will be done.

The representative of the Soviet Union has requested a separate vote on the fourth paragraph of the preamble and operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.24. I now put those paragraphs to the vote.

The fourth paragraph of the preamble and operative paragraph 1 were adopted by 109 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.24, as amended.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark,

Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: India

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.24, as amended, was adopted by 123 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

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

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.24. Brazil has consistently supported the view

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

that the main responsibility for effective measures of general and complete disarmament, including the reduction of military budgets, is incumbent upon nuclear-weapon Powers. In supporting the draft resolution which this Committee has just adopted, the Brazilian delegation wishes to reiterate its hope that such Powers take the necessary measures effectively to reduce their military expenditures in the production, research and development of weapons of mass destruction so that savings generated by this process could be used for the economic and social development of less developed areas.

Mr. ELLIOT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): My delegation associates itself with the vote which has just taken place in the Committee in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.24, concerning the freezing and reduction of military budgets. My country considers this approach to be a practical way of trying to determine more closely certain aspects of disarmament. Logic indicates, however, that first it is indispensable for the international community to have a useful instrument for the standardized presentation of military expenditures. In fact, with no means of comparison to start from, any idea of reduction following a possible freeze would lose its significance.

It is therefore with satisfaction that we note that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.24 are aware of this need, since they have recalled in the text the need for the availability of an instrument for standardized reporting on the military expenditures of Member States. Moreover, they request the United Nations Disarmament Commission to undertake to examine and identify ways and means of achieving agreement to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain, in a balanced manner, military expenditures, including adequate measures of verification. The reference to these considerations which, in our view, constitute a prior condition has enabled my delegation to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): The Committee has just adopted the draft resolution on "Freezing and reduction of military budgets" contained in document A/C.1/34/L.24. My delegation voted in favour of that draft resolution and welcomes the wide support that this initiative has received. The draft resolution is based on paragraphs 89 and 90 of the Final Document of the special session on disarmament and also on last year's General Assembly resolution 33/67.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal Republic
of Germany)

We welcome the initiative taken by Romania. The resolution now adopted recognizes the need for agreed balanced measures and for steps to be taken in order to bring about a lower level of military expenditure. For my delegation, these measures require the existence of a satisfactory instrument for standardized reporting of the military expenditure of the participating States, such as the one which has been developed with the active participation of my Government and which is now ready for a practical test.

We continue to be convinced that a reliable system of comparing military expenditure has to be the basis for measures agreed to among States, such as a freeze and reductions.

We fully support the conclusion in operative paragraph 1 that agreements should be achieved to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain, in a balanced manner, military expenditures, including adequate measures of verification satisfactory to all parties concerned.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal
Republic of Germany)

In this context, the request contained in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution that the United Nations Disarmament Commission examine and identify effective ways and means of achieving such agreements is a positive step. This corresponds with the recommendation contained in operative paragraph 2 (b) of the resolution adopted last year as General Assembly resolution 33/71 H II. Since it was not possible for the Disarmament Commission to fulfil that particular task during its session this year, my delegation is confident that the Disarmament Commission will take up the matter during its next session in 1980.

My delegation considers the subject of verifiable reduction of military expenditure a very important measure in the field of disarmament and is ready to contribute actively to the achievement of that end.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States has long sought to bring about the conditions and develop the means whereby agreements effectively to limit military expenditures can be reached. Several years ago we proposed to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that it or the General Assembly pursue a systematic approach to all the problems involved in any such limitation. My country continues to support such efforts of which the practical test of the standard military expenditure reporting instrument, currently under way, is a most important one. We will actively support further efforts, including those set in motion by the present draft resolution.

It would be remiss, however, for the delegation of the United States not to point out that the United States Government considers that any form of agreed limitation on its military expenditures - whether a ceiling, a freeze, a reduction, or otherwise - would vitally affect its security. At this time, and under the present circumstances, no limitation is practicable as far as my Government is concerned. That is all the more reason why my Government, and I hope all Governments, will rededicate our efforts to the creation of conditions in which it would be possible to halt and reverse the disturbing continuous rise in world military expenditures which deprives our peoples of economic and social progress.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.24 which has just been adopted. It considers, however, that we should take a step-by-step approach to this question by considering such matters as, for instance, a fair comparison of the military expenditures of Member States on the basis of a standardized reporting system which would be indispensable for the consideration of the problem of the freezing and reduction of military budgets.

It also goes without saying that the need for ensuring the security of Member States should be fully taken into account in considering this question.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): First, if the normal procedure of voting separately on individual paragraphs had been followed in the case of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.24, my delegation might have voted differently on preambular paragraph 4 and operative paragraph 1.

Secondly, my delegation believes that the call contained in the draft resolution on the reduction and freezing of military budgets should properly be addressed to the five or six States which make the largest expenditures on military budgets.

Thirdly, the draft resolution envisages that more than one agreement will have to be concluded on this subject, and we have very serious doubts whether the United Nations Disarmament Commission is the proper organ to identify ways and means of achieving such diverse agreements as are envisaged in the draft resolution. For these reasons, my delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we adjourn, I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become additional sponsors of draft resolutions: Guinea, A/C.1/34/L.21; Grenada, A/C.1/34/L.32; Qatar, A/C.1/34/L.32 and A/C.1/34/L.26; Madagascar, A/C.1/34/L.15; Denmark and Finland, A/C.1/34/L.34; Ethiopia, Mauritius and Morocco, A/C.1/34/L.31; and Argentina, Mauritius and the Philippines, A/C.1/34/L.40.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.