



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 41ST MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 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-3508.

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.41
26 November 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40,
42, 43, 44, 45 120 AND 121 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.6, which has the following nine sponsors: Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6 was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.*

* Subsequently the delegations of Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guinea, India, the Ivory Coast, Maldives and Mongolia advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

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

Mr. STRUCKA (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): As can be seen from its text, the draft resolution which we have just adopted pursues a noble aim, namely, the prevention of the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles and progress. The purpose of the draft resolution, therefore, is to promote the prevention of a qualitative arms race and simultaneously to make sure that scientific and technological accomplishments will be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. The draft resolution takes account of the corresponding conclusion of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, namely, that to end the arms race both quantitative and qualitative disarmament measures must be adopted. There can be no doubt that measures for that purpose must prevent the further development of qualitative improvements of weapons, particularly of weapons of mass destruction, and the elaboration of new methods of waging war.

The Committee on Disarmament in Geneva has already done useful work this year in its consideration of new types of weapons of mass destruction. We believe that the Committee on Disarmament should actively continue those negotiations at its forthcoming session with a view to the elaboration of a draft of a comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, as set forth in the draft resolution just adopted. As can be seen from operative paragraph 1, the authors of the draft resolution have provided for specific agreements on particular types of such weapons, where necessary. The need for such specific agreements was referred to at this morning's meeting by the representatives of several countries.

The Czechoslovak delegation is convinced that the draft resolution which we have just adopted will play a useful role in intensifying our efforts to put a prompt end to the arms race and to bring about concrete disarmament measures. For that reason, we voted in favour of it.

Mr. RUDOFISKY (Austria): The Austrian delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6 on the question of the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction. This should in no way be interpreted as indicating a lack of interest on our part in the problem of the effective prohibition of the production of any new weapons of mass destruction. On the contrary, Austria attaches the utmost importance to this item.

However, we would have preferred a text which took into account the need to develop an agreed approach acceptable to all countries immediately concerned on how to proceed further with regard to the issue. In particular, we consider that the kind of comprehensive agreement envisaged in this draft resolution will not meet the requirement of adequate verification, a requirement which Austria deems indispensable for all disarmament and arms control measures.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): The Swedish delegation has abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6, and I wish to explain the reasons for this position.

Sweden is deeply convinced of the importance of preventing at an early stage the use of scientific and technological achievements for the development of new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction. We are therefore strongly in favour of the main objective of the draft resolution, which is to take effective measures to ensure that new major scientific discoveries be used solely for peaceful purposes.

The main reason for our abstention is operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. I wish in this context to reiterate the doubt we have expressed on numerous occasions about the idea of a general agreement in this field. In our view, a generally accepted and clear definition of the scope and content in this field must be reached before starting negotiations on a draft convention.

We note with satisfaction that draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6 requests the Committee on Disarmament to prepare specific agreements on particular types of new weapons of mass destruction. We will continue to support all efforts to reach specific agreements on such individual types of new weapons of mass destruction as may be identified.

Mr. ERSUM (Turkey) (interpretation from French): Turkey's position on the question of weapons of mass destruction is well known. The Turkish Government heartily supports any efforts to arrive at an agreement to prevent the emergence of new weapons of mass destruction and based on new principles of scientific progress.

The consideration of this complex matter should naturally take place in the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, which is the only multilateral competent negotiating body now at the disposal of the international community.

(Mr. Ersun, Turkey)

As we all know, that organ works on the basis of the rule of consensus. Therefore, we would have sincerely hoped that resolutions similarly approved on the basis of a consensus at the United Nations would indicate to all Member States the common desire to avoid any possible danger of such weapons appearing in the future. We think that the modalities and the form of an agreement on this extremely complicated matter cannot be decided in advance by a deliberative body such as the First Committee.

With these ideas in mind, the Turkish delegation last year voted in favour of resolution 33/66 A which more or less reflected a consensus among the Powers which possess sufficiently advanced technology to manufacture such weapons. We abstained on resolution 33/66 B which defined, in our view, a more limited and restrictive approach bearing more on form than on substance.

The Turkish delegation abstained today on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6 for the same reason.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The Finnish delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.6 which has just been adopted by this Committee.

We did so because we believe that all approaches to the problem of preventing the emergence of new weapons of mass destruction should be explored. That includes the possibility of an agreement or agreements on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of such weapons.

With this in mind, Finland last year supported both resolutions 33/66 A and 33/66 B which were adopted by the General Assembly. As one step towards the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, we have welcomed the recent reports on progress concerning a convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: It is my intention now to begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1. Before we put the draft resolution to the vote, the Soviet Union has requested a separate vote on operative paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5. I shall read out once more the list of sponsors of this draft resolution: Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mauritius, the Netherlands, Philippines, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, Uruguay and Zaire.

(The Chairman)

The Chair was not quite clear as to whether the Soviet Union intended for these paragraphs to be voted on as a group or separately. I should like an explanation at this time before I proceed to the vote.

Mr. KRASULIN (Soviet Union) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would not object if all these paragraphs were voted on together.

The CHAIRMAN: Operative paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1 are now put to the vote.

Operative paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1 were adopted by 109 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: Those paragraphs are adopted and will be included in A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1. The representative of the Federal Republic of Germany now asks that the draft resolution as a whole be adopted without a vote. If I see no objections, it is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted.

Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation joined in the unanimous support with which draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted. I should like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's thanks to the sponsors of that draft resolution for the understanding and co-operation they demonstrated when consultations were held on it. My delegation could thus join the other sponsoring delegations once the views and observations we expressed were taken into consideration.

Mr. IMAM (Kuwait): My delegation cast an affirmative vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1, because it believes that confidence-building measures can help to facilitate the process of disarmament.

However, confidence-building measures do not apply equally to all regions. It is a cause of satisfaction that the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution recognizes that there are situations peculiar to specific regions which have a bearing on the nature of confidence-building measures feasible in those regions.

We are also gratified that operative paragraph 1 takes into account the specific conditions and requirements of each region. It is my delegation's understanding that confidence-building measures do not apply to regions where colonialism, foreign occupation, racism and apartheid prevail. We also believe that Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories and the establishment of a Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza are necessary prerequisites for confidence-building measures in the Middle East. Confidence-building measures should never be used as a means to perpetuate foreign occupation, racism and apartheid or to prevent displaced and uprooted people from regaining their sovereign, national and human rights in their homelands.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1, entitled "Israeli Nuclear Armament". This draft resolution has 39 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Iraq at the Committee's

(The Chairman)

thirty-second meeting on 9 November 1979. The draft resolution has financial implications that are contained in A/C.1/34/L.43.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Iraq, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen and Yugoslavia.

I now call upon representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): I propose to make a statement by way of clarification of Ireland's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1, entitled "Israeli Nuclear Armament". I wish to begin by placing on record once again Ireland's clear support for the existing non-proliferation régime and for ongoing international efforts to strengthen that régime through the development of ever more effective and comprehensive safeguards.

We recognize, moreover, that the objectives of non-proliferation can be pursued and assisted through the efforts of States belonging to clearly defined regions to exclude nuclear weapons permanently from their area. We have in particular encouraged such endeavours in the Middle East context and have supported resolutions at the General Assembly aimed at advancing this objective.

Notwithstanding these considerations, Ireland feels obliged to abstain in the voting on the present draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1. In this connexion, Ireland believes it essential to recall that any threat of proliferation by any State in any region would risk undermining the credibility of the non-proliferation régime as a whole and, as such, would have serious international as well as regional consequences.

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

Because of this, we do not regard it as prudent, productive or just to single out as a special case the problem of unsafeguarded nuclear facilities in Israel, while other related regional aspects of the proliferation problem are not treated in the present draft resolution under this agenda item. Therefore, that the present text serves to introduce an imbalance into the international debate on this question is clear, and it thereby complicates efforts to bring the global proliferation problem under control.

While accepting that States can have legitimate preoccupations with the possibility of proliferation in their own region, we find the present text, as an expression of these concerns, unnecessarily restrictive in its emphasis and conclusions. The selective focus in the text on the Israeli nuclear industry, to the neglect of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and safeguards régime existing throughout the Middle East region as a whole, cannot in our view contribute to productive or balanced conclusions on methods of enhancing the over-all nuclear-weapon-free status of the region to which we are committed.

Moreover, the exclusive focus in the draft resolution on Israeli nuclear policies seems to us to point to the intrusion of larger political considerations into the region's nuclear-arms-exclusion efforts, which can only serve to impair the prospects for progress on this important objective.

Further, the tone of the text and the condemnations which it contains do not appear appropriate to an appeal to a fully participating United Nations Member State to introduce comprehensive safeguards. We have grave reservations on the reference to the Security Council in operative paragraph 5 of the present draft, and not least, moreover, operative paragraph 6 would seem to predetermine the result of the inquiry which the Secretary-General is being called upon to carry out.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): For several years, the Pakistan delegation in this Committee has indicated that the primary danger of nuclear proliferation today arises from Israel and South Africa. Their nuclear-weapons capacity, if acquired, will no doubt be used to prolong the policies of occupation, aggression and racism. The Pakistan delegation, in the light of these circumstances, fully supports draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

The representative of Israel attempted the other day to divert attention from Israeli nuclear ambitions by making baseless allegations against various other States, including my country. Pakistan's programme for the use of nuclear energy is peaceful and is designed entirely to promote our economic and social development. While we have benefited from international co-operation under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, our peaceful nuclear programme is based on technological self-reliance and is not dependent on external finances or assistance. Pakistan's support for nuclear non-proliferation is a matter of record. We have taken various initiatives within and outside the United Nations to ensure non-proliferation both globally and in our own region.

This impeccable record, which is well known to the members of the Committee, is enough to expose the falsehood of Israeli allegations against Pakistan's peaceful nuclear programme. On the other hand, Israel's policy and actions have consistently opposed the objectives of non-proliferation. Other representatives have already submitted documentary evidence of Israel's objective of nuclear-weapon development. I shall not repeat these, but it is noteworthy that Israel has opposed the objective of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. It has refused to accept any IAEA safeguards, and it has acquired nuclear capability with a view to advancing its aggressive political and military objectives.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I welcome this opportunity to explain before the vote why the United States is going to vote against this draft resolution.

I believe that a fair review of the record will demonstrate that the United States has been and remains a strong supporter and leading advocate of nuclear non-proliferation. The Middle East is one of those areas in the world in which particular danger of proliferation exists. If such proliferation takes place, then the prospects for tension and even war will have greatly heightened, with profound consequences for global stability and for the survival of all of us in this room.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

It is with these considerations in mind that my Government approaches the question of any draft resolution regarding nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. The draft resolution which is now before us has much in it which the United States can support in principle: specifically, operative paragraphs 1 through 3. The United States has urged Israel and other States in the Middle East to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. That Israel has not yet chosen to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards is regrettable. The United States urges Israel and every other State which has unsafeguarded facilities to place them under IAEA safeguards.

Despite these positive features, the selective approach of singling out a particular country -- in this case, Israel -- for censure and as a target for collective sanctions is not, in our view, an appropriate approach to the goal of non-proliferation. In fact, we seriously doubt that the draft resolution is really designed to discourage the proliferation of nuclear weapons. As has been pointed out by others, only about half of the sponsors of the draft resolution are parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty who have themselves accepted full-scope safeguards.

Accordingly, it appears to the United States that the sponsors of this draft resolution have deliberately focused on a favourite target for political reasons and have used the issue of nuclear proliferation as a means of doing so. For that reason, the United States will vote against this draft resolution. Instead, the United States will support a responsible approach to resolving the nuclear issues in the Middle East and will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.28, proposing the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. By calling on all parties directly concerned to undertake the same steps, this non-discriminatory approach to non-proliferation in the Middle East deserves our support. Moreover, it is the only promising avenue towards the goal which we all endorse.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1, and we shall vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.28. In doing so, we are motivated by the following considerations.

We are of the opinion that any State - I repeat, any State - that introduces nuclear weapons into the Middle East should be condemned. We have, consequently, always voted in favour of resolutions that concerned the establishment in the Middle East of a nuclear-weapon-free-zone and, as I said just now, we shall also this year vote in favour of the draft resolution to that effect, A/C.1/34/L.28, sponsored by Egypt.

In the Iraqi draft resolution, however, it is taken as a fact that one of the States in the Middle East - Israel - actually is attempting to develop and acquire nuclear weapons. This leads, amongst other things, to the strong condemnation, in operative paragraph 4, of all such attempts by Israel.

We would, indeed, condemn any State that would introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East, but my delegation feels that we should proceed to such a condemnation only on the basis of clear and undeniable facts. With regard to Israel, my delegation does not possess such facts. For that reason, we cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1.

For the same reason, we consider it unjustified to focus all attention on Israel exclusively. The Iraqi draft resolution also contains a number of elements that we could fully endorse if only in their presentation attention had not been focused exclusively on one and only one of the countries of the area. I am referring now, amongst others, to the appeal to Israel in operative paragraph 3 to accept full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards on all nuclear facilities.

Another important measure could be added here which the draft resolution unfortunately does not contain. That is that all parties in the region should accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It would be a major step

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

towards the implementation of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.28, on a nuclear-weapon-free zone, if all States in the Middle East submitted all their nuclear activities to IAEA safeguards and become parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. By doing so they would prove conclusively that any accusation that they are contemplating nuclear proliferation is unfounded and that those nuclear installations which some of them, including Israel, possess without their being safeguarded by IAEA are used for peaceful purposes only.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): My delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution, first of all, on the principle that we are against the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The subject is of such importance for the future of mankind and its very survival that I think that all other considerations are secondary. Therefore, anything that will stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons should be voted for.

Now, particularly in an area as sensitive as the Middle East the dangers involved in the proliferation of nuclear weapons are immense. Therefore, we shall vote in any case for this draft resolution, regardless of what the other considerations are. But I would further point out that if, in order to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons, it is found that this will bring some inconvenience to those who want to develop nuclear power for peaceful purposes, I would say that humanity as a whole would rather do without nuclear energy for peaceful purposes than allow the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Mr. BUKAYI (Zaire) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Zaire has always shared the view of those delegations which are firmly committed to complete and general disarmament. When General Assembly resolution 33/71 was adopted last year my delegation abstained in the vote because it did not have sufficient material on which to formulate a position. Since then, however, information which we have received, the statements made by what are known as the Israeli authorities and statements made in South Africa as reported on 7 November by the Reuters agency have led my Government to change its attitude because, first and foremost, my country will always be completely intransigent regarding anything which could endanger the future of Africa.

Since nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa has been clearly proven, there can be no doubt that the possession of nuclear weapons by Israel cannot fail to further complicate the Middle Eastern problem. Ever since October 1973, when President Mobutu spoke from the rostrum of the General Assembly, our position on this subject has been well known. We therefore cannot fail to condemn Israeli nuclear armaments and we will vote for the draft resolution now before us accordingly.

Mr. CORDERO DI MONTEZEMOLO (Italy): Italy has consistently supported the effort of the international community aimed at strengthening the non-proliferation régime and at achieving an appropriate system of effective safeguards.

Our view concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East has been expressed repeatedly and is well known in this forum. Accordingly when it is put to the vote we will support the draft resolution before us urging

"... all parties directly concerned seriously to consider taking the practical and urgent steps required for the implementation of the proposal to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and ... [inviting] the countries concerned to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons".

(A/C.1/34/L.28, operative para. 1)

(Mr. Cordero di Montezemolo, Italy)

My delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1, introduced by Iraq. We consider that its general objectives are in line with the purpose of reinforcing the non-proliferation régime. However, we cannot subscribe to the reference to resolution 33/71 A on which we had to cast a negative vote last year. We have serious misgivings on the wording of certain paragraphs, in particular paragraphs 4 and 5. Moreover, we cannot share a polemic approach which is not likely to be conducive to conciliation on a crucial and highly sensitive political issue of particular concern to the Italian Government.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): The Turkish Government feels that the proliferation of nuclear weapons would have more destructive and catastrophic effects than mankind has ever known. The civilization of the twentieth century is threatened with self-extinction and the introduction of nuclear weapons in the Middle East region might well be the beginning of the end. At present we are seeing at the world level numerous demonstrations of collective madness and we should do everything we can in order that the situation prevailing in the Middle East shall not prove decisive in triggering an apocalyptic count-down.

At the thirtieth meeting of the First Committee on 5 November Turkey was cited among the countries that had signed but not ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It is true that the parliamentary system and its procedures in Turkey place emphasis on effectiveness, and even perfectionism, sometimes at the expense of speedy working. However I am happy to be able to inform members that the Turkish Parliament has ratified the Treaty in question by law No. 2,225. When the formalities relating to the preparation of the instruments of ratification have been concluded those instruments will then be forwarded to the Depositary Governments.

I wanted to offer this parenthetical correction and to state that the Turkish Government, in view of the consideration that I have just enumerated, has decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1

Mr. ELARABY (Egypt): The delegation of Egypt supports each and every genuine attempt which aims at keeping the Middle East free from nuclear weapons. As representatives are well aware, we have signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty and made our ratification conditional upon Israel's adherence to it.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1, my delegation believes that it reflects the deep concern of the States of the region regarding Israel's nuclear armaments programme and its continued refusal to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and place its nuclear activities under proper International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and controls. We take note of paragraphs 6 and 7 of the draft resolution, which request the Secretary-General, with the assistance of qualified experts, to prepare a study on the Israeli nuclear armament and to report to the General Assembly. We believe that that would be extremely useful and that in an area as sensitive as the Middle East the objective of this Committee should be to take every possible effort to ensure that nuclear weapons are not produced, acquired or in any way introduced into the area.

In conclusion, we do not find that there is any contradiction between draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1 and our draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.28, and we shall therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation would request that a recorded vote be taken.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Belgium, Denmark, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sierra Leone, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Nepal, New Zealand, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Upper Volta, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1 was adopted by 90 votes to 11, with 33 abstentions.*

* Subsequently the delegations of Bolivia and El Salvador advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour. The delegation of Sierra Leone advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

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

Mr. PEARSON (Canada): The delegation of Canada abstained on this draft resolution for the following reasons. We consider there are some elements in it with which we are in general agreement, namely, those which aim at the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, which Canada strongly supports. Those elements include the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, restrictions on forms of nuclear co-operation which could lead to the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the acceptance of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards on all nuclear facilities.

Canada strongly opposes the efforts by any non-nuclear-weapon State to acquire nuclear weapons or nuclear explosive capability of any kind, and encourages all countries to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to submit all of their nuclear activities to full-scope IAEA safeguards. Because of these long-standing Canadian policies we shall support the draft resolution proposed by Egypt on the nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

The present draft resolution, on the other hand, refers to prior resolutions which were opposed by Canada and are therefore unacceptable to us. Moreover, it singles out Israel for censure and prejudices its nuclear intentions on the basis of unreliable evidence. It assumes Israeli nuclear armament as an already existing fact. We believe that in the Middle East, as in Africa and other areas of the world, it is not useful and, indeed, may be counter-productive to single out for criticism any State with the potential of acquiring nuclear-weapon capability. In our opinion, it would be far better to proceed as did the parties to the Treaty of Tlatelolco - to create a nuclear-weapon-free zone with such States as are willing to become parties, in the hope and expectation that the very creation of the nuclear-weapon-free zone will generate political, moral and psychological incentives for all States of the region to join and for the exercise of self-restraint by those not yet ready to become full parties to the instrument creating the nuclear-weapon-free zone.

(Mr. Pearson, Canada)

Finally, in our view, the draft resolution infringes upon the prerogatives of the Security Council with regard to the termination of threats to international peace and security and to actions to be taken in that regard.

Mr. NOLAN (Australia): The Australian delegation has abstained on this draft resolution, "Israeli nuclear armament". There are elements of the draft resolution which are unacceptable to Australia. In particular, we cannot agree with an approach to potential proliferation in the Middle East region which singles out one particular State. That is the effect of this draft resolution.

In addition, we have difficulty in accepting the wording in the first preambular paragraph, and the assumption elsewhere in the draft resolution, that there is evidence that Israel has in fact acquired nuclear weapons.

The Australian delegation also has reservations on the language in operative paragraph 5. As it stands, this paragraph could be interpreted to the effect that the Security Council should act on resolution 33/71 A: Australia remains opposed to such a course of action.

Our abstention, however, reflects Australia's concern about the potential for proliferation among Middle East States and our belief that all countries in the region should adhere to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, or should at least accept IAEA safeguards on all their nuclear facilities.

Because of this, we shall support the draft resolution proposed by Egypt on the nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French Government is very much in favour of this strengthening of measures to ensure the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this connexion, the President of the French Republic, in his address to the General Assembly on 25 May 1978, expressed himself as explicitly as possible when he said:

"Nothing could be more destabilizing ... than to introduce nuclear weapons into these zones where none exist".

(A/S-10/PV.3, p. 17)

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

The French delegation has, moreover, constantly voted in favour of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the establishment of a denuclearized zone in the Middle East. It is with that objective in mind that the French delegation has voted on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament". If it has had to abstain, it is because the text, whatever may have been its underlying motive, singles out one State of the Middle East region.

On the one hand, it explicitly prejudices the action of that State and that State alone, which allegedly aims to manufacture, acquire, store, test or introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East; whereas in that region there are other States than Israel whose possible nuclear activities also are not at present subjected to the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

On the other hand, the draft resolution on which the French delegation has just abstained seeks to impose upon a Member State a specific system of control by the Security Council. It will be noted, in fact, that the Security Council is requested in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution:

"to adopt appropriate measures to ensure the implementation of the relevant resolutions concerning Israeli nuclear armament".

But among those resolutions is resolution 33/71 A, against which the French delegation voted. The French Government has not changed its position on that resolution; therefore it could not support a new text which referred to it.

Mr. MOULTRIE (Bahamas): Because of the importance which my delegation attaches to the whole question of disarmament, it has followed with great interest the debate on the items pertaining thereto. The discussion on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1 is no exception. Regrettably, my delegation is not convinced that a great deal of progress has been made. Be that as it may, I should like to state that while my delegation is keenly aware that the subject of disarmament, especially in the nuclear field, is a complex one and that it evokes emotional and political sentiments, it cannot close its eyes to the broad view that the establishment of nuclear-free zones could serve as a constructive means of promoting greater universal stability and eliminating the fear of the threat of a nuclear holocaust.

In this regard, my delegation, despite certain reservations on the language and structure of the text, voted in favour for the following reasons: first, it would wish to see an end to the dangers involved in nuclear collaboration and proliferation; secondly, it hopes that Israel and other States would be persuaded to co-operate with International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards and by so doing be instrumental in playing an even more positive role in the strengthening of the maintenance of peace in the region and thus in the world; thirdly, it hopes that the cause of world peace would be enhanced and the escalation of nuclear weapons lessened.

Finally, my delegation wishes to make it clear that the Bahamas vote was neither in support of the sponsor of the draft nor against Israel, but rather an appeal to all nations to comply with the Treaty of non-proliferation so that it may be implemented.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): The Federal Republic of Germany wants to stress again its clear support for the existing international non-proliferation régime and the efforts made by States belonging to clearly defined regions to exclude nuclear weapons from their area.

We have in particular encouraged such efforts in the Middle East and have supported resolutions in the General Assembly. This year we are going to support draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.28 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal
Republic of Germany)

The Federal Republic of Germany was not, however, in a position to support draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament", as we are of the opinion that its text singled out and tries to internationalize a specific case while leaving out interrelated global aspects.

The Federal Republic of Germany cannot support a draft resolution that introduces an imbalance into the international debate and it therefore abstained. We accept the fact that States have legitimate preoccupations with regard to the possibility of nuclear proliferation within their region, but we find the text of this draft resolution not an appropriate expression of those preoccupations. The selective focus on the Israeli nuclear industry cannot, in our view, contribute to creating conditions for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

My Government will continue to support all reasonable efforts that aim at establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region acceptable to all States of that region.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The delegation of Finland abstained in the vote just taken on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1. The consistent policy of the Government of Finland against the spread of nuclear-weapon capability and in favour of the non-proliferation régime based on the Non-Proliferation Treaty is well known to the members of this Committee. It follows that, in our view, the achievement of nuclear-weapon capability by any State is a threat not only to the security of the region concerned, but also to the international community at large.

In a memorandum circulated in this Committee as document A/C.1/34/4, my delegation, together with other Nordic delegations, has expressed its views on the present dangers of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The subject addressed in draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1 is one aspect of this over-all problem. Although as a rule we do not favour an approach that singles out a particular country while leaving unmentioned a number of similar cases of equal gravity, we cannot but act in accordance with our deep concern, whatever may be the case or the context.

However, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1 because the text is prejudicial to the findings of the study

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

requested in operative paragraph 6 and contains a reference to resolution 33/71 A, on which my delegation cast a negative vote last year.

Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala)(interpretation from Spanish): The Republic of Guatemala has outlined as the policy of its Government the promotion of any action designed to denuclearize regional geographical areas and we therefore supported the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which is designed to ensure that Latin America remains a continent of peace and security.

My delegation has always favoured any attempt made in this Organization to extend the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones to other areas of the world. It is precisely this sense of commitment that led us not to vote in favour of this draft, A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1. We felt that it was not conducive to the establishment of authentic treaties that would bring about real, equitable and balanced denuclearization in the world. In Asia, in the Middle East and in Africa it is essential, in our view, to promote the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones to promote peace, but we cannot, of course, agree to imbalance and to a political tendency to single out one country, because that is not what the Organization should seek to do. In both the preambular and operative sections, this draft contains numerous paragraphs that my delegation finds unacceptable. We therefore were obliged to vote against it.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): Sweden abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1, since we hold that it singles out one party to the complicated Middle East conflict whereas it would be desirable to ask for caution in the nuclear field by all parties concerned.

Our abstention was also caused by the reference to last year's resolution concerning military and nuclear collaboration with Israel, with which, for similar reasons, we could not associate ourselves.

I should like, however, to recall in this context the grave concern of the Swedish Government over the development and achievement of nuclear explosive capability by any State other than the five nuclear-weapon States. Our conviction in this regard is evident from the memorandum on the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, which was circulated in this Committee by the five Nordic countries and to which the representative of Finland just referred.

Regarding the question of nuclear transfers, I should like to make it clear that Sweden requires a recipient State to be party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or otherwise to have entered into an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for scope safeguards covering all nuclear facilities. Sweden would in this context like to express its support for the draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.28 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. We feel that the approach in that draft resolution tries to deal with the nuclear issue in the Middle East in a more balanced way than the present text, and we shall consequently vote in favour when it is put to the vote.

Mr. RUDOFISKY (Austria): The Austrian delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1. My delegation's vote reflects its continuous concern over the prospect of proliferation of nuclear weapons as well as its support for the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

On the other hand, my delegation has serious misgivings about some of wording in the draft resolution. We object to the singling out of one particular country in this context, as well as to the prejudicial formulations contained in the text. Austria, having cast a negative vote on resolution 33/71 A, also objects to the reference to that resolution in the text of this draft resolution.

Mr. ANTILLON (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): Costa Rica abstained in the vote on this draft resolution because it singles out a particular country in respect of actions as yet unproven. We would have cast an affirmative vote on a more balanced text. We nevertheless endorse the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world or, at least, in most areas or countries.

Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): In casting an affirmative vote on this draft resolution my delegation is complying with specific instructions from its Government, since my Government is opposed to the extension of nuclear weapons to countries or areas which do not have them yet or are about to initiate research into this type of nuclear or other weapon of mass destruction.

Mr. DE ZAVALA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Although Bolivia as a matter of principle opposes all proliferation of nuclear weapons, my delegation none the less abstained, as it did last year on a similar text, when the vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1 which has just been adopted.

That is a biased draft resolution because it prejudices the case and makes an equitable solution of this problem more difficult.

The CHAIRMAN: We now turn to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.21. It is sponsored by 42 countries and was introduced by the representative of France at our 37th meeting on 19 November. The financial implications are contained in document A/C.1/34/L.42. The sponsors are as follows:

(The Chairman)

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Italy, Liberia, Mauritius, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

I now put draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.21 to the vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.21 was adopted by 113 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

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

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to explain his vote.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The delegation of the United States would simply like to note that its position on this issue as set forth in our letter to the Secretary-General and in our explanation of vote at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly remains unchanged.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.21.

The Committee will now take a decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.25, entitled "General and complete disarmament". This draft resolution has 13 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Canada at the thirty-fifth meeting of the First Committee on 15 November 1979. The sponsors are: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Romania and Sweden.

I shall 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): In connexion with the forthcoming vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.25, we wish to emphasize that the Soviet Union advocates the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed. We propose that preliminary consultations and negotiations on this question should be started immediately. As pointed out in the statement of the group of socialist countries made in the Committee on Disarmament (document CD/4) it would be possible at different stages of the negotiations to consider the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. In our opinion, however, the solution of the question of the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes cannot be considered in isolation from the question of the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed, since that is the aim of disarmament.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The problem of nuclear disarmament, we are deeply convinced, must be resolved in an integrated and comprehensive manner. Each measure taken individually must fit organically into the whole programme of disarmament. In the final analysis, this must provide a fully integrated approach to the solution of the problem of nuclear disarmament. The decisions of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament guide us on this point. Paragraph 50 of the Final Document indicates that the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes is linked to the question of the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery and is one of the measures leading to the reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their complete elimination.

The Soviet delegation has held consultations with the sponsors of this draft resolution and has proposed amendments which are based on the approach set out in paragraph 50 of the Final Document. Unfortunately our views were not taken into account and, as a result, this draft resolution runs counter to the provisions of paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the special session.

For these reasons, the Soviet delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.25.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce that Uruguay has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.25.

I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.25.

The draft resolution was adopted by 107 votes to 10, with 11 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the United Kingdom who wishes to explain his vote after the vote.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): In voting for this draft resolution, my delegation recalls that the cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes was one of those items identified in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the United Nations special session on disarmament as requiring negotiations at an appropriate stage and with adequate measures of verification. The draft resolution requests the Committee on Disarmament to pursue its consideration of the subject at an appropriate stage in its work. We

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

believe that because of the technical problems of verification, the implementation of a cut-off would present some formidable difficulties. Therefore, in any such consideration, the United Kingdom believes the Committee on Disarmament should give priority to the verification aspect of the question.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.25.

The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.28, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East". This draft resolution has one sponsor and was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the thirty-ninth meeting of the First Committee on 21 November 1979.

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

Mr. EILAN (Israel): The Israel delegation wishes to take this opportunity to reaffirm our awareness of the dangers posed to the survival of mankind by the existence and spread of nuclear weapons.

Israel will continue its commitment to their prohibition and to the prevention of their spread. Ever since the problem of nuclear armaments was raised at the United Nations, Israel has consistently supported resolutions aimed at preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Israel voted in 1968 in favour of the United Nations resolution on the text of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We did this in the belief that practical and satisfactory solutions would be found for the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Israel's concern with this problem and its particular relevance to the latest developments in the nuclear field in the countries of our area is fully evident in our persistent and protracted support for the idea of the establishment through direct negotiations involving all the States of the region, of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Such arrangements should provide secure, binding international guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, as provided for by the Non-Proliferation Treaty. These are measures which could contribute to the objectives of non-proliferation.

The signing of the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt has proved that direct negotiations can solve seemingly intractable problems and that this path offers the best hope for progress. Such a development could contribute significantly to the implementation of a process leading to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East in a manner similar to that in which the Tlatelolco Treaty was achieved for Latin America. As far as Israel is concerned, such direct negotiations with the participation of all the States in the region could start without pre-conditions at any time and in any place.

In Israel's view, the negotiations on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East should also include the major question concerning the geographical limits of this zone. The definition of the area should be wide enough to include States bordering on the Middle East which are not members of a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

Two representatives of States involved have already publicly expressed their support for the idea that the initiative for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should emanate from the States of the region, and that the same States should initiate the necessary consultations for that purpose.

Israel does not and will not accept the view proposed by some that direct negotiations which are relevant to the Tlatelolco Treaty, are relevant for South-East Asia, and are relevant for every area in the world, should not be considered relevant in the Middle East.

We would finally wish to echo the words of one distinguished representative who stated at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly that

"...today more than ever we have the most urgent need to examine the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East on the basis of non-conventional, non-traditional approach which would show the necessary flexibility".

We are convinced that this goal of freeing the Middle East from the threat of nuclear proliferation can be achieved by the path of negotiation and co-operation. We have, therefore, reluctantly to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.28.

The CHAIRMAN: Egypt is the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.28, which I shall now put to the vote.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.28 was adopted by 130 votes to none, with

1 abstention.*

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

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

Mr GLAZIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic):

My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.28 because we are convinced that the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones contributes to international peace and security.

In our view, "efforts to create an atmosphere of confidence in the Middle East" (A/C.1/34/L.28 preambular para. 4) will be a possible result once a just, equitable and global peace has been achieved in the Middle East on the basis of United Nations resolutions on the subject.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): I just want to state for the record that had a separate vote been taken on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.28, my delegation would have abstained on that paragraph.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.28. Iraq is convinced that the creation of such nuclear-weapons-free zones in the world is useful. However, we have certain reservations concerning the fourth preambular paragraph, and we would have preferred it to have been amended to read:

"Considering its resolution 32/82 of 12 December 1977, in which it expressed the conviction that the development of nuclear capability would further complicate the situation in the Middle East".

Mr. DORJI (Bhutan): While my delegation fully supports the principles and objectives contained in draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.28, which has just been adopted, we wish to reserve our position with regard to operative paragraphs 1 and 3, which refer to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This, however, does not mean that we are in any way favouring the proliferation of nuclear weapons. My delegation's reservations relate to the fact that my Government has not yet acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Mr. DUBEY (India): While we are in full sympathy with the objectives which motivated the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.28, India would like to record its position on operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of the Egyptian proposal.

Had there been a separate vote or votes on those paragraphs, India would have abstained, in accordance with its well-known position of principle on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to which a reference is made in operative paragraph 1. Similarly, India's position on the need for non-discriminatory and universal safeguards on the nuclear activities of all States is not adequately reflected in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. We therefore have reservations on these two paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.32, entitled "Declaration on international co-operation for disarmament".

This draft resolution has 25 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Czechoslovakia at the thirty-ninth meeting of the First Committee on 21 November. The sponsors are as follows: Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Jordan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Qatar, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Viet Nam and Yemen. There have been some technical changes in the text of this draft resolution and I shall now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read them out.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the First Committee): We have been requested to bring members' attention to the following technical changes in the draft resolution. On page 3, in operative paragraph 5, line 3, the phrase "to refrain from any impeding of such negotiations" should be changed to read, "to refrain from impeding such negotiations".

In operative paragraph 7, in line 3 and 4, "a central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament," should be changed to read, "... that the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament".

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon members who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting, taking into consideration the technical changes just read by the Committee Secretary.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): On behalf of the Nine Member States of the European Community, I should like to explain our common abstention on the proposed Declaration on international co-operation for disarmament, introduced by Czechoslovakia in draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.32.

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

The Czechoslovak initiative is one which, of course, we have been aware of for some time. We have had an opportunity to study it and to take into account the comments made on it by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia, His Excellency Mr. Bohuslav Chnoupek, in the course of his statement in the general debate in the General Assembly, in discussions with Mr. Milous Vejvoda, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, and in statements made in this Committee by the Czechoslovak delegation.

The Nine feel it necessary to say that the proposal is one which raises difficulties for them and one which they will not be able to support. The objections of the Nine are objections of principle. The Final Document of the special session already enunciates the principles for disarmament negotiations, and we do not see the need for yet a further document in this matter.

The Final Document is, of course, a consensus text. In our view, any selective reformulation or reinterpretation of its provisions would only serve to cloud its meaning and complicate its implementation. A danger exists of a conflict of interpretation arising in the future between the provisions of the proposed declaration and those of the Final Document. As the Nine see it, the immediate priority is to make progress in the practical, detailed negotiation of initiatives in the field of disarmament. Concentration at this stage on broad, declaratory documents setting out points of procedure or general considerations which have already been the subject of lengthy discussion is, in our view, not only unnecessary, but could also risk complicating the conduct of concrete negotiations by offering an interpretation of the Final Document which departs from the consensus achieved at the United Nations special session on disarmament.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): My delegation will abstain in the voting on this draft resolution. Frankly, we regard it as an empty exercise. We refuse to negotiate on this draft resolution this year, and we shall continue to refuse to negotiate on such empty draft resolutions in the future.

In addition to this general observation, there is a more precise reason for the United States' abstention. In operative paragraphs 5 and 6 in section II, the draft resolution clearly states the intention to impose an obligation on States to control their mass media and their educational systems to comply with the purposes of this draft resolution. The media in the United States are free of government control. Our educational institutions are locally run. I would hope that our media and educational institutions would in their wisdom see the need for promoting a better understanding of the arms race and the need for disarmament, but the United States Government cannot force them to do so, and cannot support a draft resolution that implies an obligation to apply such force.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.32 and of the Declaration on international co-operation for disarmament contained therein must be considered to be a necessary and timely act by the United Nations. For that reason, my delegation intends to vote in favour of this draft resolution.

In actual fact, only a short while ago a special session of the United Nations General Assembly was held which was devoted to disarmament. It was the first special session of the General Assembly which concentrated exclusively on questions of the cessation of the arms race and disarmament - matters which are of universal interest.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The Final Document adopted by the General Assembly then adequately expresses the determination of peoples to put an end to the arms race and achieve a breakthrough in disarmament negotiations in the direction of the adoption of concrete and tangible measures leading, in the final analysis, to general and complete disarmament.

The task before us now is to make an effort to apply the provisions of that Document which was unanimously adopted by all delegations participating in the special session. The timeliness of such an effort is all the greater in that in the recent past we have witnessed an intensification of the arms race. It is precisely with a view to restraining and halting the arms race that the delegation of Czechoslovakia and 21 other sponsors have submitted this draft resolution.

From a reading of the document one cannot fail to note that the proposed organic combination of the various ideas contained in the declaration is designed to bring about the further development of the provisions of the Final Document of the tenth special session on disarmament and to give them concrete expression in terms of the demands of the current age and the activation of disarmament negotiations.

The draft declaration before us solemnly calls upon all States actively to promote the development, strengthening and intensification of international co-operation designed to achieve the goals of disarmament, as defined at the tenth special session, and it particularly calls for negotiations to be held in good faith on all priority disarmament items concurrently, including appropriate confidence-building measures, with a view to ensuring that such negotiations will complement one another and will be conducive to the early achievement of a decisive breakthrough in the sphere of disarmament.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The manner in which work is customarily conducted in the United Nations convincingly demonstrates the usefulness and practical expediency of such a further development and concrete expression of provisions contained in United Nations documents. Suffice it to refer in this connexion, by way of example, to documents which have been adopted by the United Nations and have acquired broad international recognition, such as the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the General Assembly resolutions on the non-use of force in international relations and on the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and the Declaration on the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente, among others. No one surely can doubt that those documents, which were prepared in strict compliance with the Charter, consolidate and strengthen that fundamental instrument of our Organization.

The basic provisions of the Final Document of the special session developed in the Declaration on international co-operation for disarmament make that Declaration a logical extension of the Final Document and one that is consistent with it. The substance of the Declaration can be expressed briefly as the formulation of a code - and I emphasize here, a code - of international co-operation for the purpose of the successful conduct of negotiations to put an end to the arms race and bring about disarmament, and it is precisely this aspect which is most timely.

On the agenda of world political affairs there is the problem of the very acute need to produce results from the numerous disarmament negotiations. The pace of the arms race makes this need all the more urgent. It is our task to make disarmament negotiations fruitful and effective, and the Declaration on international co-operation for disarmament is designed precisely to bring that about.

The delegation of the Soviet Union wishes to take this opportunity to declare its full support for draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.32, and intends to vote in favour of it.

Mr. OTEGUI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.32 for the flexibility which they showed in the consultations held over the last few weeks.

(Mr. Otegui, Argentina)

We also wish to express our appreciation particularly to the delegation of Czechoslovakia for its spirit of compromise in accepting a number of suggestions made by my delegation as well as by others interested in this subject. We believe that the draft declaration, with the introduction of a number of the changes that were proposed, is now a valuable instrument that warrants support in the General Assembly. The Argentine delegation, consistently with this view, will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.32.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.32 and I should like briefly to explain the reasons for our position.

The question of international co-operation in the field of disarmament is undoubtedly a significant problem which so far has not been considered in its totality. The current discussion in the First Committee has confirmed, among other things, that the development of international co-operation is an essential prerequisite for the solution of questions of disarmament. During the tenth special session devoted to disarmament, the importance of and necessity for broad and constructive international co-operation and co-ordination of the efforts made by States to that end were very often pointed out and emphasized.

The draft declaration on which we are about to vote elaborates the concept of international co-operation in the field of disarmament and reiterates that principle as a major tool for the practical implementation of the resolutions which the General Assembly customarily adopts on individual partial questions of disarmament. The principle of international co-operation for disarmament therefore affects all disarmament negotiations and deals with the approach by States to the solution of the disarmament issue in general. In view of these facts, we cannot agree with those who consider this document a mere exercise or a repetition.

In our submission the draft declaration on international co-operation rests completely on the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly without repeating it. Its purpose is to facilitate the comprehensive

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

implementation of the Final Document and consequently it has a supporting role in that sense. The draft stresses explicitly that none of its provisions may be interpreted as superseding those of the Final Document. The two documents deal with different aspects of the over-all problem of disarmament, although those aspects are naturally interrelated. It is obvious, however, that because of the complex character of the issue of disarmament there are always some aspects of the problem where repetition is unavoidable, even if the contexts are different, given the logic inherent in this problem. We have noted that in the course of the preparation of the most recent version of the draft declaration the sponsors succeeded in eliminating the overlapping of some of its provisions with those in the Final Document.

Finally, I should like to commend the Czechoslovak delegation for its sustained efforts during the long process of consultations and negotiations with all regional groups. If it was not possible for all delegations to agree on the document, that was not due to the lack of time or opportunity during the process of drafting.

For all these reasons, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. BUKAYI (Zaire) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Zaire feels that the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly remains both the basic document and the reference document for our work. In addition to a declaration, that Final Document contains also a Programme of Action and appropriate machinery. My delegation considers that it is through specific measures, binding on States, and not by additional declarations that we shall achieve progress towards disarmament. While praising the efforts that have been made and the ideas contained in draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.32, my delegation considers that the proliferation of declarations of this type threatens to water down the very content of the Final Document. Not having been sufficiently informed of the precise scope of this draft declaration, my delegation will abstain.

Mr. KOCHUBEY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR also would like to state its position on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.32. In our opinion it is a profound and substantive document. The provisions of this draft declaration are fully in keeping with the United Nations Charter and with the principal task facing all States, regardless of their economic and military potential, namely, the achievement of a radical breakthrough in the safeguarding of international peace and security and the cause of disarmament. We consider that if all States adhered to the important principles of international co-operation outlined in this draft, that would do much to help to bring about concrete results in the halting of the arms race and the achievement of disarmament and, in particular, the fulfilment of the terms of the Final Document of the special session.

We therefore support draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.32 and we wish to be included among its sponsors.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The draft resolution now before this Committee on the adoption of a declaration on international co-operation for disarmament is an important document which will doubtless make a great contribution to the attainment of the aims set out in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, and other progressive United Nations decisions on disarmament matters.

The draft declaration, based on the United Nations Charter and on the spirit and letter of the Final Document of the special session and other United Nations disarmament decisions, develops and consolidates the principles of the policy designed to have States bring about the achievement of the most important aim of the present age - disarmament. The draft declaration rightly emphasizes that the Governments of all countries of the world - and the role of the nuclear Powers is particularly noted - bear historical responsibility for the elimination of war primarily through the adoption of effective and decisive measures in the field of disarmament designed to bring about general and complete disarmament and genuine agreement on real measures

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

of a limited nature. The draft declaration proceeds from the assumption that this lofty aim can be achieved only on the basis of effective, constructive and constant co-operation and the manifestation of political will by all States, regardless of their social system and level of economic development.

In the part of the draft declaration devoted to the principles for the holding of disarmament negotiations, emphasis is laid on the need to hold them in good faith in order that they should lead to the rapid attainment of a decisive breakthrough in the disarmament sphere such as is expected by all progressive mankind and to which the Organization has devoted considerable effort. It is extremely important to strengthen, through the adoption of this draft declaration, the principle which consists of abstaining from the creation of any obstacles to disarmament negotiations, particularly through the use of questions irrelevant to disarmament itself.

Considerable significance attaches also to the declaration's urgent appeal to States to consider:

"in a fully responsible manner and in a spirit of co-operation all proposals and initiatives aimed at promoting the achievement of mutually acceptable concrete measures of disarmament and helping to accelerate progress in disarmament negotiations."

The strengthening of the content of United Nations disarmament principles designed to bring about disarmament would also be promoted by the appeal to States:

"To affirm, wherever possible, in their constitutional norms or by any other appropriate means, their political will and determination to promote with all their strength the cause of peace and international security and the achievement of progress in the field of disarmament",

and also:

"to take all appropriate measures ... to prevent and prohibit propaganda for war and the arms race ...".

Such a policy is consolidated and embodied in the constitutional system in my country.

We wish to emphasize in this respect the need to strengthen, on a treaty basis, the necessity for full compliance with the principle of the non-use of force or threat of the use of force in international relations. The draft declaration on international co-operation for disarmament is based on the United Nations Charter and on previously adopted disarmament decisions and is in keeping with the interests of all peoples.

The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR will support the draft declaration on international co-operation for disarmament, and calls upon all delegations actively to support draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.32 and in future to abide by the principles and aims proclaimed therein in the sphere of the cessation of the arms race and disarmament.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): My delegation would like to say that it will vote in favour of the draft declaration in document A/C.1/34/L.32. Last year when the United Nations held its first special session devoted to disarmament it was in part to emphasize the vital interest of all countries in disarmament negotiations. The consensus on the importance and urgency of disarmament was embodied in the Final Document of the special session. While my delegation does not see any need for reinterpretation of the provisions of the Final Document, we nevertheless do not see any objection to any initiative which is designed to further the attainment of the objectives of disarmament.

My delegation is therefore in a position to support the initiative which was taken by Czechoslovakia and we are appreciative of the willingness of that delegation to negotiate on the original text with other delegations which had views on ways and means of improving that text and bringing it into line with the provisions of the Final Document. My delegation will therefore support the draft declaration.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): The Swedish Government understands and shares the concern behind many of the thoughts expressed in this proposal. We share the disappointment, despair and frustration which obviously lies behind it, and we trust that that disappointment and despair, for the initiators of the proposal as well as for its sponsors and supporters, is primarily directed towards the arms race and the intransigence in disarmament matters of the two super-Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States. Thus the motivations behind the proposal deserve respect.

Almost everything which is said in this text of five pages has, however, been said before and in a more comprehensive way, most recently in the Final Document of the special session on disarmament. The Swedish Government has on previous occasions expressed its doubts about the advisability of making declarations like the one proposed in document A/C.1/34/L.32. In the Swedish view, it will not facilitate a clear and unambiguous interpretation of either the United Nations Charter or the Final Document of the special session. In the opinion of the Swedish Government, international disarmament efforts are better served by actual deeds leading to concrete progress in current existing negotiations than by general declarations of this nature.

Sweden will therefore abstain on this draft declaration.

Mr. ABBA (Algeria) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to make a few comments before the Committee takes a decision on the draft declaration on international co-operation for disarmament, presented to us by Czechoslovakia.

My delegation, which will vote in favour of this draft, considers that it is the sort of declaration that may help to create a healthy atmosphere in disarmament negotiations and to maintain the momentum on disarmament achieved during the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

I am happy to note that this draft declaration, in its preamble, stresses "the importance of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament" and refers to the principles proclaimed in the Final Document. It is also a source of satisfaction to my delegation to note that the draft declaration reaffirms "the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations" in the sphere of disarmament and stresses the specific role to be played by the Committee on Disarmament in the development of negotiations leading to disarmament.

Furthermore, the draft submitted stresses the efforts of all States to arrive at concrete disarmament measures the implementation of which would allow resources thus released to be used for economic development. This is in keeping with the desire to establish a New International Economic Order, to which my delegation attaches great importance. In order to adopt such concrete disarmament measures, the draft declaration, finally, stresses the "political will" that should imbue all States, and be the hallmark of all action to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

My delegation will therefore vote in favour of the draft declaration contained in document A/C.1/34/L.32.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote the draft declaration in document A/C.1/34/L.32.

The draft declaration in document A/C.1/34/L.32 was adopted by 98 votes to none, with 30 abstentions.

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

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): The Turkish delegation felt itself obliged to abstain on the draft declaration on international co-operation for disarmament in document A/C.1/34/L.32, while resolutely supporting the main idea of this draft that a more thorough co-operation for disarmament is urgently required in the light of alarming developments that characterize the modern age. Our position is motivated by two types of considerations. First, we do not believe in the need for the elaboration in this First Committee, during the regular sessions of the United Nations General Assembly, of texts of a general nature designed to complete or to modify the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. This is a matter of principle for my country. Secondly, the text itself poses a number of concrete difficulties for my country. It is not my intention to list them all. Let me give merely a few examples.

In section III, we have some difficulties with paragraph 1 because the generally recognized principles of international law form an indissoluble whole which must be carefully preserved. As far as paragraphs 5 and 6 of section II are concerned, I should like to say that the Turkish Government has no legal or administrative authority to utilize "the mass media" for any purpose whatsoever. Moreover, the Turkish legal system does not allow the Government "to prevent and prohibit ... the dissemination of views" on the basis of their content.

It is for those reasons that my delegation abstained in the vote, while at the same time appreciating the positive elements, such as those in paragraph 8 of section I which deals with the relationship between disarmament and development.

Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish):

The delegation of Guatemala was constrained to abstain in the vote on A/C.1/34/L.32, entitled "Declaration on international co-operation for disarmament", which was submitted by Afghanistan and 19 other countries.

In principle we would agree with a declaration that would redouble international co-operation to that end. We admit that in the draft declaration before us the principles and purposes that my delegation has always defended as the basis for co-operation are reiterated, because in it are stressed the strengthening of international peace, security and relations through negotiations in order to achieve a better understanding and atmosphere for disarmament.

Likewise, my delegation agrees with the view that the declaration cannot undermine the freedom of each State directly to exercise its right to individual or collective self-defence in order to ensure its national integrity, sovereignty and independence. But my delegation cannot accept nor go along with some of the formulas, wordings and purposes of the declaration which are destroyed by the concluding words in paragraph 2 of section IV, which sets up for other purposes the right to use every possible means at one's disposal and would thus bestow a blessing on violence in any sense. This would be a violation of international law and international peace and security, and so we had to abstain.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The delegation of Finland abstained in the vote just taken on the draft declaration in document A/C.1/34/L.32, even if the voting board was not in agreement with us.

In our view, the draft declaration contains many positive elements, particularly in those parts where questions directly related to disarmament are dealt with, and we appreciate the efforts of the delegation of Czechoslovakia to make the draft declaration as widely acceptable as possible.

We concur with the aim of the draft declaration to promote international co-operation for the goal of disarmament which has been determined by the international community, in particular, in the Final Document adopted at last year's special session. We regret, however, that it was not possible to reach a consensus on the draft declaration. Adoption by other means than that of consensus inherently detracts from the meaning of decisions taken on disarmament questions.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

This is particularly so in regard to decisions regarding principles of disarmament and guidelines for the behaviour of Governments.

For constitutional and other reasons, my Government would have difficulty in accepting some of the commitments outlined in the draft declaration, in particular concerning those in paragraphs 5 and 6 of section II. With respect to paragraph 2 of section IV, it is an established policy of my Government not to endorse means other than peaceful ones in the struggle for national freedom, independence and self-determination.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to tell the representative of Finland that I saw the print-out of the voting and that his delegation's abstention was recorded. This means that the yellow light on his board indicating an abstention is not functioning.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): It is rare for my delegation to abstain in the vote on a draft declaration on disarmament. Mexico's position has been clear and unshakeable regarding support, encouragement for, and active implementation of, disarmament measures and regarding the creation of an atmosphere that will encourage the adoption and utilization of such measures. It is from that standpoint that we approached the draft declaration contained in document A/C.1/34/L.32.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

We regret that the conclusions to which our studies led us would not allow us to support the draft resolution, as we would have wished. The reason for that lies in a position of principle that we might define by saying that we are convinced that only in exceptional circumstances should an effort be made to prepare and adopt declarations of such ambitious scope as that of the one contained in the draft resolution that has just been adopted.

In fact, we consider that the substance of most if not all of the provisions of this declaration are adequately covered by international instruments which, as a result of long and arduous negotiations, have been adopted by consensus. That was the case with the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and, above all, the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Hence we felt that, to try now once again to reiterate norms and principles that basically may be the same ones as have been repeatedly approved on previous occasions but whose new or inadequately negotiated wording must give rise to negative positions, as we have noted, far from strengthening the possibility of international co-operation would only weaken it.

Very much against its wishes, therefore, we were forced to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.32.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): The Pakistan delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.32. We did so because we share its general objectives of promoting co-operation for disarmament.

However, most of the provisions of the draft resolution are contained in the Final Document of the special session as well as in other international documents that have been adopted by the United Nations. We continue to believe that the authoritative interpretations and provisions on all these matters are those that are contained in the Final Document and in the other authoritative instruments that I have mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to make a few announcements.

The following countries have become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.15/Rev.1: Bulgaria, Hungary and the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

On Monday the Committee will take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.3/Rev.1, L.9, L.15/Rev.2, L.23, L.26, L.29, L.33 and L.35; and on Tuesday on draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.14/Rev.1, L.30, L.34, L.36, L.37, L.38 and Corr.1 and L.39/Rev.1, and on the draft resolution in document A/34/29.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.38 and Corr.1 has yet to be introduced, and I hope that it will be as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.