



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2025
20 November 1974

ENGLISH

Twenty-ninth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 20 November 1974, at 3 p.m.

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS	(Argentina)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. COSTA LOBO	(Portugal)

- Reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries /24/ (continued)
- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Distribution of the Funds Released as a Result of the Reduction of Military Budgets;
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General
- Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use: report of the Secretary-General /27/ (continued)
- Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /28/ (continued)

/...

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room LX-2332, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 21 NOVEMBER 1974, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 26 NOVEMBER 1974.

The co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

74-71234/A

519

- Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /29/ (continued)
- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3079 (XXVIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General /30/ (continued)
- Implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean /31/ (continued)
- World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference /34/ (continued)
- General and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /35/ (continued)
- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2286 (XXII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) /100/ (continued)
- Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East /101/ (continued)
- Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health /103/ (continued)
- Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia /107/ (continued)

AGENDA ITEMS 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 100, 101, 103, 107 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote on the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.681 and L.682, which were adopted this morning.

Mr. MIHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.682.

As the Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia pointed out in his statement in this Committee on 7 November, the Yugoslav Government has always supported initiatives aimed at the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world because such zones can represent an important step within the context of so-called collateral measures of nuclear disarmament. We are convinced that they can contribute usefully towards limiting the arms race and creating favourable political conditions in the various geographical regions of the world.

We consider that one of the essential premises for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones concerns the right of countries to take decisions themselves on the establishment of such zones after the necessary steps and preparations have been taken to arrive at such decisions. We have no doubt whatsoever about Pakistan's good will in regard to the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. We feel, however, that more balanced language in the resolution would have better served the purpose of this initiative. It is for this reason that we abstained.

Mr. ECKERBERG (Sweden): The Swedish delegation abstained in the voting on both draft resolutions submitted regarding the proposal for a nuclear-free zone in South Asia. I should like to take this opportunity briefly to explain why.

The Swedish delegation has often expressed its support for regional approaches to disarmament, including the establishment of nuclear-free zones. We believe that the basis for any such regional measures must be the active co-operation and agreement of all countries concerned in the region itself.

(Mr. Eckerberg, Sweden)

Not until they themselves are ready to agree on specific steps to be taken, and the nuclear-free zone thus can be clearly defined, would it seem appropriate for the General Assembly to endorse the establishment of a zone as decided by the regional States.

The Swedish delegation sincerely hopes, of course, that the explicitly stated intention of the countries in the region of South Asia not to become nuclear-weapon States will prove a lasting reality and that this could be a factor facilitating future agreement on the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia. The Swedish Government has taken note of the statements to that effect, and we should welcome it if next year the First Committee were to be presented with a single draft resolution on the question of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia sponsored by all the countries in the region. This year, however, the Swedish delegation felt constrained to abstain on both draft resolutions relating to this item, because, regrettably, there does not at present seem to exist any such agreement.

I should like to add that, in our view, the need to regulate peaceful nuclear explosions internationally should be taken into account also in connexion with the question of nuclear-free zones.

Mr. KAMIL (Malaysia): The Malaysian delegation abstained on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.681 and that contained in document A/C.1/L.682 pertaining to item 107, entitled "Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia".

It is a matter of regret to my delegation that, on the question of the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia, the First Committee has been faced with two somewhat conflicting draft resolutions when there appears to be almost a consensus for the idea as a whole. In this respect, it would have been less difficult for my delegation to give its support to a draft resolution on this item had there emerged, as a result of consultations and compromise, only one draft resolution.

(Mr. Kamil, Malaysia)

I should like to add that the debate on this item, nevertheless, served a useful purpose, and I should like to express the hope that, through consultations, agreement on the idea of establishing a nuclear-free zone will soon be reached among the States concerned. Being one of the signatories of the Kuala Lumpur Declaration, which establishes South-East Asia as a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality, I wish to reassure this Committee that my delegation continues to be sympathetic to the idea of establishing or creating similar zones of peace or nuclear-free zones elsewhere.

Mr. DI BERNARDO (Italy): The ^eItalian Government has always favoured proposals and initiatives aimed at the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the world, because it is convinced that the creation of such zones, if based on certain principles, cannot but contribute to better international security and world détente. Accordingly, the Italian representative to the United Nations speaking during the general debate has referred to the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia as interesting and worthy of careful consideration.

The debate that has taken place so far in the Committee has revealed the interest of the world community in the creation of denuclearized zones. It has also confirmed that careful study and consideration must be given to the problem in both its general and its specific implications. The proposal put forward by Pakistan aims, in our view, at objectives that we cannot but consider with the greatest sympathy. In fact we see in this proposal an attempt to strengthen regional détente and to create a better political climate in Asia. However, comments and reactions which we have heard in this Committee make it clear that this proposal must be submitted to further study and more careful consideration in order to achieve full success.

In the light of these considerations, the Italian delegation abstained in the voting on the two proposals put forward under item 107 of our agenda, because it deems it more constructive not to influence the hopeful positive developments of the dialogue among the parties more directly concerned.

Mr. F. KARIM (Bangladesh): My Ambassador wished to speak to explain our vote on the draft resolution A/C.1/L.682, but because of some misunderstanding about timing I am afraid he is not here yet. Therefore, may I suggest, Mr. Chairman, humbly, if it is possible, that you proceed with the other speakers who may wish to explain their vote and then later on we may have an opportunity to speak. I hope by that time my Ambassador will be here.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Later on in our meeting I shall call again upon the representative of Bangladesh.

Mr. CRAW (New Zealand): This morning my delegation voted in favour of both resolutions on the nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia because we believe that the General Assembly should encourage all positive proposals which will increase regional stability and security in various regions of the world by the institution of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

There is one aspect, however, of the resolution which is contained in document A/C.1/L.682 on which we wish to comment. In the general debate in this Committee my delegation referred to nuclear proliferation and the need to strengthen the non-proliferation Treaty. We pointed out that the question of whether a State which explodes a nuclear device does so for peaceful or for military purposes is not really relevant to the proliferation danger if the State concerned is not prepared to conduct its nuclear programme under recognized international procedures and safeguards.

New Zealand is a sponsor of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.690 which, inter alia, points out the desirability of

"... the planning and conducting of peaceful nuclear explosions, ~~to be~~

being carried out under agreed and non-discriminatory international arrangements, such as those envisaged in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which are designed to help prevent the proliferation of nuclear explosive devices and the intensification of the nuclear arms race".

(Mr. Craw, New Zealand)

The resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.682, which was adopted this morning, does include provisions looking forward to an equitable and non-discriminatory system of verification and inspection to ensure that nuclear programmes are in conformity with commitments by the States concerned to use nuclear materials exclusively for peaceful purposes and to prevent the testing, use and so on, of any nuclear weapons.

But the resolution, at least as we understand it, does not propose an agreement which would preclude the development by any party of a capacity to conduct nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. As my delegation noted in the general debate, it is impossible for a State to develop a capacity to conduct nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes without acquiring a device which could be used as a nuclear weapon. My delegation wishes, therefore, to record its view that great care must be taken in the formulation of proposals for regional nuclear-free zones, so as not to weaken in any way the restrictions which the non-proliferation Treaty imposes on the parties to the Treaty which are not nuclear-weapon States, in regard to the conduct of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. It must, in our view, be the aim of such agreements to strengthen the non-proliferation Treaty. And it follows, therefore, that the development of such regional arrangements does not relieve the participants of the need to accept the obligations of the non-proliferation Treaty, but, as we have already stated, makes it even more desirable that they should do so at the earliest possible date.

Mr. MISHRA (India): My delegation has, in the course of the general debate on disarmament items and while introducing the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.681, explained and stated India's consistent position in regard to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Now I would like to express some views on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.682 and explain why we voted against it.

Our basic objections are directed towards the operative part of the draft resolution. However, there are one or two points in the preambular portions as well which seem to us to be inconsistent with our position.

(Mr. Mishra, India)

In the fourth preambular paragraph a conviction is expressed that the establishment of such zones can contribute most effectively to halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons. As would have been clear from our statements in this Committee not only this year but in previous years, we believe that the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is of a wider nature and cannot be tackled merely by binding the hands of non-nuclear-weapon States. This is a question in which the greater responsibility lies with the nuclear-weapon States.

In the seventh preambular paragraph certain ideas are mentioned, ideas which are supposed to be indispensable to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. One of them is the reference to an equitable and non-discriminatory system of verification and inspection to ensure that nuclear programmes are in conformity with the foregoing commitments.

Now, as we have explained India's views in regard to verification, inspection and a system of safeguards, it should be clear that we are in favour of universal, functional and non-discriminatory safeguards which apply to all, whether they are nuclear-weapon States or non-nuclear-weapon States, and that they apply to all programmes. It is not possible for us to agree to a system of verification and inspection which would be applicable to the peaceful activities of non-nuclear-weapon States only; or, at best, applicable to the peaceful activities of all States, while leaving open the military activities of nuclear-weapon States.

Then, in the last preambular paragraph there is a mention of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, and it is said that this could serve as a model to be emulated with advantage by other regions. We have supported the military denuclearization of Latin America. We have supported the particular Treaty mentioned here. But it is not necessarily true that the same kind of arrangements would be satisfactory in other regions.

(Mr. Mishra, India)

Turning to the operative paragraphs of the resolution, operative paragraph 1 takes note of the affirmation by the States of the region not to acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons. We have made repeated statements in this regard, but those statements are of a unilateral nature. If any international commitment is to be entered into by the Government of India, it has to be on a particular basis. Therefore, operative paragraph 1 does not seem suitable to us, as it is out of context.

Operative paragraph 2 of the resolution endorses, in principle, the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. As we have stated in this Committee, our view is that South Asia is an integral part of a larger region and it is not possible for us to agree to the endorsement of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone merely in South Asia, even though that may be in principle. This text, by endorsing the concept, places some of us who are for negotiations and agreement in regard to a larger region at a disadvantage.

Operative paragraph 3 invites the States of the South Asian region to enter into consultations without delay. In regard to the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, it should be clear from what I have just said that we could not accept it on the very same grounds. Moreover, we do not believe that it is the function of the General Assembly to invite States in a particular region to enter into such consultations. We believe that the initiation of such consultations, in fact the very initiation of an idea of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, must be from the States of the region -- must flow from agreement within the region.

In operative paragraph 5 the Secretary-General is requested to convene a meeting for the purpose of the consultations envisaged in operative paragraph 3. Again, our objections are similar. We do not believe that the Secretary-General should get involved in such consultations without the prior agreement of the States concerned.

Finally, operative paragraph 6 decides to include in the provisional agenda of the thirtieth session the item entitled "Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia". We do not agree to this in the absence

(Mr. Mishra, India)

of prior consultation and agreement within the region. In fact, the inclusion of this operative paragraph more or less indicates the continuance of an acrimonious debate in this Committee next year.

For these reasons we felt obliged to vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.682. We should like to make it clear that we are not obliged to enter into any consultations envisaged in that resolution. It is a matter of regret to us that that draft was adopted by the Committee.

Mr. TANKOUA (United Republic of Cameroon) (interpretation from French): This morning my delegation voted in favour of the two draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.681 and A/C.1/L.682, presented respectively by the delegations of India and Pakistan. In acting in this way, we heeded four kinds of considerations.

First, as I already said in my statement in the general debate on disarmament, my country is in favour of general and complete disarmament. Consequently, we cannot take a position against the denuclearization of geographical zones.

Secondly, the two draft resolutions are not contradictory, and their sponsors have recognized this fact. We should even say that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682 to a certain extent subsumes the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681.

Thirdly, we consider that the fundamental differences which do remain between the two countries are an internal affair -- a family quarrel between them.

Fourthly, we have very good relations with the two countries.

For these reasons, therefore, we voted in favour of the two draft resolutions.

Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): This morning my delegation voted in favour of both draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.681 and A/C.1/L.682. In my statement on 25 October before this Committee I had an opportunity to state my delegation's general view on the question of the establishment of a nuclear-free zone, namely, that we can understand the idea of establishing

(Mr. Nisitori, Japan)

nuclear-free zones from the point of view of the necessity to prevent nuclear proliferation. The draft resolutions which have been adopted seek to promote such a zone in the region of South Asia and meet with the approval of my delegation.

I wish to state at the same time that before establishing these zones it is necessary to study the matter from the point of view of ensuring their effectiveness, taking fully into account the effects on the peace and security of the entire world as well as on that of the region directly concerned.

My delegation believes, therefore, that it is important that adequate verification measures should be worked out and also that the concurrence of the States concerned should be obtained.

My delegation hopes that in future consultations among the States regarding a nuclear-free zone in South Asia, as envisaged in the draft resolutions, the points I have just mentioned will be given proper and full consideration.

Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom Government sympathizes with the concept of promoting regional security through the establishment of effective nuclear-free zones compatible with article of the non-proliferation Treaty. The leader of my delegation said as much in his statement before this Committee on 5 November, and we have given effect to our point of view. The United Kingdom was the first nuclear-weapon State to accede to Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

We welcomed the inscription of this item on the agenda. We have followed with interest the emergence of the two draft resolutions and we have much sympathy with the helpful attempt of the representative of Nigeria to avoid a formal vote. We regret that he did not succeed.

(Mr. S. A. Karim, Bangladesh)

in the light of the known opposition by two countries of the region. In the circumstances, the adoption of the draft resolution is going to make the task of the Secretary-General in the matter of consultation a difficult, indeed an impossible, one. We would have liked to see the Secretary-General use his good offices under more favourable circumstances after the countries concerned had arrived at some preliminary understanding or agreement.

These considerations played an important role in our decision to abstain on the Pakistani resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Pakistan has asked to speak, presumably to explain his vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681 since his delegation is a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682 and under the rules of procedure the sponsors cannot explain their vote on their own draft resolution. Since the Minister for Foreign Affairs is better aware of procedures than I am, he will, I am sure, refer to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681.

Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, my intention was only to explain Pakistan's vote on India's draft resolution. I am fully aware, Sir, of your meticulous regard for the rules of procedure and your responsibility to uphold them in letter and spirit, so I will endeavour in what I say to keep within the strict framework of what is permissible under the relevant rules.

First of all, I should like to state that Pakistan had no basic objection to the Indian draft resolution. Our abstention is to be explained in terms of our regret that it did not proceed further than it did. We considered it to be an incomplete draft resolution and that what was stated in its operative part was so self-evident and such a truism that we did not think it belonged in any draft resolution.

So, as I have said, we entirely agree that the creation and establishment of a nuclear-free zone can be the result only of consultations, but we felt that the Indian proposal led nowhere and, indeed, was not necessary at all. But we shall accept it in the spirit in which it has been offered.

(Mr. Shahi, Pakistan)

Mr. Chairman, I am under very great constraints imposed by your ruling; I could say a great deal but I do not wish to convert my explanation of vote into a right of reply. All that I should like to do -- if you would permit me -- is to thank all the delegations which have supported our draft resolution; we have noted that even those who abstained have been in favour of consultations with a view to considering the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. There has been no opposition expressed to the endorsement in concept of such a zone except by two States of our region.

As I have said, Mr. Chairman, the great respect in which I hold you and in my deference to your ruling I am under great constraint and I should not like to give my comments on what has been said by the representatives of India and of Bangladesh. But I should like to state that the interpretation put on certain paragraphs of our draft resolution by the two delegations -- India and Bangladesh -- is certainly not in accord with the intent and clear, grammatical meaning of those draft resolutions and, in particular, I cannot accept the interpretation put by the representative of Bangladesh on the role of the Secretary-General.

That is all I wish to say. However, Mr. Chairman, with your permission I should like to stretch your ruling to a certain extent in a non-controversial direction. I was guilty of a great sin of omission in that I failed to mention the role played by Ambassador Garcia Robles in trying to evolve a compromise between the Pakistani and Indian drafts. I should like to put on record that he strove mightily, and we benefited from his wise counsel and were prepared to go much further to reach a consensus, if that had been possible. I am only perturbed about the interpretation put by the representative of India on his own draft resolution. I should like to point out that the Indian draft resolution has to be read in conjunction with the Pakistani draft; and as to the refusal of India to engage in consultations, we always have bilateral consultations with India, but this is essentially a concept that requires multilateral consultation among the regional States. I hope and prefer to believe that what the representative of India has said is not the last word of the Government of India.

Mr. DUGERSUREN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to explain, some of the reasons why our delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682. The position of our Government with regard to the establishment of a nuclear-free zone is well known, so I do not need to go into it. After we learned, to our regret, that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan and the representative of India could not come forward with a joint draft resolution on this subject our delegation weighed very carefully the merits of both drafts and came to the conclusion that the one in document A/C.1/L.682 as a draft resolution -- and I stress, as a draft resolution -- did not meet with the support of some of the States in the area where it was intended to create a nuclear-free zone.

Secondly, in our view, the draft resolution contains some provisions which require study. As the Committee will no doubt remember, during the general debate many delegations supported the idea that it was necessary to have a comprehensive study by appropriate bodies of the problems connected with the establishment of nuclear-free zones. In the light of that, we thought it preferable that the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.682) should not be adopted at this session and that it would be better to await the outcome of the comprehensive study of the problems connected with the creation of nuclear-free zones.

Those were some of the points we wanted to make to explain why we abstained in the vote on this draft resolution. I shall not now go into the other aspects of the question of creating a nuclear-free zone in South Asia.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of India has asked to speak. Since he has already explained his vote, I presume he wishes to exercise his right of reply, and I now call upon him.

Mr. MISHRA (India): I merely wish to reiterate two points. First, the United Nations has a very distinguished Secretary-General and the delegation of India has always extended full co-operation to him. However, as I said earlier, we do not see that the Secretary-General has a role to play in this type of question without the prior agreement of the States concerned.

(Mr. Mishra, India)

Secondly, the Government of India is not obliged to enter into consultations in terms of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682.

Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): I have no wish to prolong this debate. The Committee has adopted, by very large majorities, two draft resolutions on the item which my country had the honour to submit for consideration at this session. Both drafts speak for themselves. The fact that the Committee has adopted the draft resolutions surely entails certain consequences. I do not think that we would be helping matters, or contributing to the process of co-operation which everyone has stressed so much, or upholding the principles of the United Nations Charter if we engage here in an exegesis of these documents. It is not for my delegation as an individual Member of this Organization, or even as a sponsor of one of the draft resolutions, to state what the Secretary-General may or may not do. I do not think it is for any individual Member here to pre-empt the role of the Secretary-General in the Organization.

I would suggest that we now go forward with these draft resolutions and in the spirit which has animated these discussions -- and I think everyone here will agree that the debate, although it reflected differences of opinion, perhaps very sharp differences of opinion, on certain matter, was remarkably free of acrimony and that not only between the sponsors of the drafts but all round a considerable effort of goodwill was deployed. I think if we persist in that direction and continue to show that goodwill the difficulties which at this point seem to loom so large, in the immediate aftermath of the adoption of the two draft resolutions, will not be impossible to overcome.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): No other delegation has expressed a wish to speak on this item.

I regret that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan is not in the room because I personally would like to say to him how grateful I am for his co-operation with the Chairman and to express my pleasure at seeing him again in the First Committee. I would ask the representative of Pakistan to convey those sentiments to his Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

I should like also to thank the representative of India for the way he dealt with this subject, which enabled us to conclude our consideration of the draft resolutions A/C.1/L.681 and L.682.

The Committee has now concluded consideration of agenda item 107.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): I should like to request that the name of Gambia be added to the list of co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.694 of 18 November 1974.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

Some weeks ago, after following the debate on the five items relating to nuclear-free zones, we indicated that we proposed to introduce a draft resolution on the denuclearization of Africa. That we have been unable to do so before now has not been due to any lack of will. It is because we have had to deal with the festering foreign sores on the body politic of Africa; it is because we wanted our effort to be seen in the proper perspective of history and geography; it is because we wanted to secure prior, unanimous support and approval for our draft resolution.

Caught in the reality and contingency of both underdevelopment and unarmament, the 25 African States on whose behalf I have the honour of introducing the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.694 have been closely associated with the consideration of agenda item 35, entitled "General and complete disarmament". When the discussion became specific regarding nuclear-free zones, we did not shirk our responsibilities. Thus, at the instance of African States, the General Assembly adopted resolution 1652 (XVI) in 1961 and resolution 2033 (XX) in 1965. Both resolutions, which have been so graciously referred to by many delegations, dealt with the question of the denuclearization of Africa.

Let me hasten to clarify our objective with respect to the question in the words of His Excellency Dr. Ahmed Esmat Abdel Meguid, Permanent Representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the United Nations, when he addressed this Committee on 25 October 1974 on agenda item 101, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East". The Ambassador said:

"The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone means the total absence of nuclear weapons, but it does not mean a prohibition on enjoying the benefits of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, especially for developing countries in their rightful quest for economic development." (2001st meeting, p. 36)

Our draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.694 is not asking for a new declaration. The only necessary and relevant declaration has already been made. It was solemnly made by the Assembly of Heads of State or Government

of the Organization of African Unity at its first regular session, held at Cairo in July 1964. That historic declaration on the denuclearization of Africa has also been endorsed by the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries. That endorsement took place in Cairo on 10 October 1964. Both the declaration and the endorsement were the subject of General Assembly resolution 2033 (XX) of 3 December 1965, which was overwhelmingly adopted by a vote of 105 to none, with 3 abstentions.

In our view, nothing has happened since then that has changed the fundamental intent, purpose, scope and application of the declaration. If anything, we are more determined -- in the language of the charter of the Organization of African Unity -- to establish, through faithful adherence to the declaration, conditions for peace and security in our continent and in the world, so as to safeguard and consolidate the hard-won independence, as well as the sovereignty and territorial integrity, of our States and to fight against neo-colonialism in all its forms. But a declaration, unless otherwise stated or interpreted, has no force of law. Its moral effect often wears thin, once its glamour and novelty are gone. Binding obligations are more lasting, more dependable, more reassuring and more realizable. That is why, given the opportunity, we would like to take the next logical step. Indeed, it is a measure of the uniqueness of the African declaration that it has remained and continues to remain valid and operative.

Secondly, our draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.694 is not calling for the implementation of the declaration on the denuclearization of Africa in any particular act or document. Like our sister States in Latin America, whose exemplary Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America is now a byword on the subject -- and I want to seize this opportunity to congratulate them again on its success -- the initiative to implement the declaration in one way or another rests with us, the member States of the Organization of African Unity. That initiative will be taken in Africa. The decision to do so will be taken by our Heads of State or Government. Our Heads of State or Government will decide the time and circumstance to do so.

What, then, is the purpose of our draft resolution? The purpose is simple and non-controversial: it is to reaffirm our conviction of the vital necessity of saving the world from the scourge of a nuclear war; it is to register our opposition to the harmful biological and other consequences of radio-active fall-out; it is to express our concern about the present rate of nuclear armament and the possible spread of nuclear weapons; and it is to enable us to focus undivided attention on the task of harnessing the natural and human resources of our continent for the total advancement of our peoples.

Hence, the draft resolution is procedural in character only. Thus, it aims only at capitalizing on the interest being shown in the issue of nuclear-free zones, particularly at the current session of the General Assembly, as manifested by five items on our agenda: the Treaty of Tlatelolco and its two Protocols; the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace; and the two proposals for the establishment of nuclear-free zones in the Middle East and in South Asia.

Because of the pride of place which Africa enjoys in United Nations efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons -- either through the establishment of nuclear-free zones in which all nuclear weapons are prohibited or through the elaboration of treaties which specifically ban the supply and acquisition of nuclear weapons -- as well as because Africa is a major source of supply of uranium and other ores that are abused in the manufacture of nuclear weapons, we of Africa strongly believe that the interests and the pioneering role of Africa in matters pertaining to general and complete disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, have to be borne in mind constantly when items on the subject are being discussed.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

This is all the more true because the items on the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East touch Africa, not tangentially, but in a manner that does not lend itself to isolated and insulated treatment, with an eye closed to African interest. A number of African countries, with which the other independent member States of the Organization of African Unity are irrevocably linked together in a common destiny, are directly affected. Like the two eyes of a man, when one is hurt, the other spontaneously and instantly sheds tears. Africa is one and indivisible.

I want also to be frank. For quite some time now we have been worrying about the military might of South Africa that enables it to defy the world. Numerous resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly decrying arms sales to South Africa and expressing profound anxiety that South African arms were not only contributing to its repression and suppression of the African population of South Africa in pursuit of its nefarious apartheid policy, but also that its arms were being used for aggressive purposes against independent African States north of the Limpopo. My own country, Nigeria, was a target of South African arms. So is Zimbabwe today. Zaire was a target of South African arms in the early 1960s. So is Namibia today. Now we are apprehensive, very apprehensive.

It is common knowledge that South Africa has nuclear capability. Will South Africa use its nuclear capability to blackmail the independent African States so as to weaken their opposition at the United Nations and elsewhere to its policy of apartheid? What protective measures can the African States legitimately take against South Africa's nuclear weapons? Are there ways whereby the African States can ensure that South African nuclear capability is converted to solely and purely peaceful purposes? These are some of the considerations at the back of our minds in submitting the draft resolution, for we have a saying in Nigeria to the effect that a leopard which has just escaped from a trap fears every crooked tree.

After all that I have said, there is very little left to be said to explain the provisions of the draft resolution and to commend it to the unanimous approval of this Committee. The first two preambular paragraphs are self-explanatory. They are sacrosanct in the theology of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and in the vocabulary of the United Nations.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

The third preambular paragraph is equally non-controversial. The phrase "militarily denuclearized zones" means what it says. Like many other good ideas, that phrase was borrowed from the third preambular paragraph of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America to define our vehement opposition to the manufacture, use and proliferation of nuclear weapons and at the same time to emphasize our commitment to the use of nuclear energy for exclusively peaceful purposes. With this explanation, the fourth preambular paragraph is logical and needs no further clarification.

The fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs merely recall what is no longer an issue. The declaration of Africa as a nuclear-free zone is universally accepted and respected. The geographical area or zone, as delineated in the former, is in conformity with article 1 (2) of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity which reads as follows:

"The Organization /that is, the Organization of African Unity/ shall include the continental African States, Madagascar and other islands surrounding Africa."

The last preambular paragraph is self-evident. A majority of the non-aligned countries are in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America. It is the countries in those areas that are directly affected by the five agenda items on nuclear-free zones of which this Committee is seized. It is therefore important to recall that the declaration on the denuclearization of the continent of Africa has been endorsed by the Heads of State and Government of the non-aligned countries; that those countries, unable to compel the nuclear Powers to disarm, are taking steps to ensure that nuclear weapons are not used against them.

The five operative paragraphs also should raise no problems. Paragraphs 1 and 2 merely repeat the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2033 (XX). So also does paragraph 3, except that the idea of "transporting", which was in resolution 1652 (XVI) and inadvertently omitted from resolution 2033 (XX), has been restored and reinstated. Let me emphasize in this connexion that central to our thinking on the matter is our fear that nuclear weapons in transit across Africa may be dropped or even fall accidentally on our continent, resulting in unspeakable calamity and annihilation. After what we heard the representative of Japan say on 18 November 1974 concerning the experience of his country, we want to avoid this fearsome contingency.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

In any case, it is reasonable to expect that the question of transportation will be dealt with later, when the written text of a treaty is also available for negotiation; but the question of transit must be seen in the light of international law. In addition to the four or so criteria enunciated by the United States and the United Kingdom with regard to the concept of nuclear-free zones, there must be other equally compelling criteria, including an undertaking on their part not to do anything that will jeopardize regions that have voluntarily renounced the nuclear option. In this regard, one cannot but recall the views of His Excellency Mr. Agha Shahi, Foreign Secretary of Pakistan, when he said on 15 November 1974 in reference to the inadequacies of the security guarantees extended to non-nuclear States under Security Council resolution 258 (1968) that:

"One would have thought that on the question of refraining from the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against such States --"

and here he was referring to the States that have renounced their nuclear option --

"the attitudes of the nuclear Powers would be more positive." (2020th meeting, p. 17)

By action or inaction, like failure to appreciate the genuine fears of the African States concerning the transporting of nuclear weapons into and from their territories, the nuclear Powers may be endangering the life of the goose that lays the golden egg. Speaking for Nigeria, I would say that the lesson will not be lost on us, if the word "transporting" in this paragraph is seized upon by any nuclear Power to refuse us their full support.

Paragraph 4 is merely to serve notice on the Secretary-General that we shall need his help and assistance in this our venture to maintain and promote international peace and security in Africa and the world. We do not envisage any immediate financial implications or technical assistance at this stage. Our Heads of State will have to decide into what form the declaration should be translated and what features the exercise should have before we shall return to the Secretary-General for necessary assistance. We can only hope at this stage that the Secretary-General will be as generous to us as he has been to our friends of Latin America with whom we share many common aspirations.

The fifth and last operative paragraph is the main goal of our present endeavour. We want an item to be inscribed on the provisional agenda of the thirtieth session of the General Assembly, so that Africa's views may be heard more pertinently in the context of the five items on our agenda and such other related items as may be proposed later on the subject of nuclear-free zones.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Nigeria for his introduction of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.694, on item 35 of the agenda. The Committee has taken due note of the fact that the delegation of Gambia has joined the co-sponsors.

Mr. STEPHANIDES (Cyprus): Mr. Chairman, with reference to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.686, which the Committee adopted at yesterday's meeting, I should like to state for the record that had we been present at the time of the voting, we should have voted in favour of that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The statement of the representative of Cyprus will appear in the records of the Committee.

Mr. MARIN (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Just a few words, Mr. Chairman, in explanation of the revised version of the amendments which the delegation of Mexico presented with regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690. The revised draft amendments appear in document A/C.1/L.693/Rev.1, circulated this afternoon at the beginning of our meeting.

In the light of the comments made by the co-sponsors of document A/C.1/L.690, we have modified the text of our draft amendments as follows:

The text of the first amendment, relating to a new preambular paragraph, remains unchanged.

The text of the second amendment has been modified slightly. First, it will become paragraph 5, not paragraph 2, of the operative part. Second, the text now reads:

(Mr. Marin, Mexico)

"Invites, in this connexion" -- and that is the new part, "in this connexion" -- "the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to provide the review conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" -- this too is new, the invitation to them to inform the review conference on the non-proliferation Treaty -- "with information concerning such steps as they have taken since the entry into force of the Treaty, or intend to take, for the conclusion of the special basic international agreement on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes which is envisaged in article V of the Treaty;".

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Mexico for the explanations he has provided in connexion with document A/C.1/L.693/Rev.1, containing revised draft amendments to document A/C.1/L.690.

I now call on the representative of Mauritius to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.699.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I have the honour of introducing a least controversial draft resolution on the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, which I submitted this morning and which has been efficiently and speedily processed by the Secretariat and circulated in document A/C.1/L.699. The purpose of the draft resolution is to make the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean more representative in character, taking into account the political changes that have occurred in the Indian Ocean area since the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee in 1972, and to intensify its efforts for completion of its task.

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean was established by General Assembly resolution 2992 (XXVII), of 15 December 1972. According to that resolution, the main objective of the Ad Hoc Committee was to study the

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

implications of the Indian Ocean peace-zone proposal with special reference to the practical measures that might be taken in furtherance of the objectives of the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI), and having due regard to the security interests of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean and the interests of any other State consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter. The General Assembly further decided in resolution 2992 (XXVII), that the Committee should consist of the following 15 Member States: Australia, China, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritius, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Zambia.

There is a general realization among the countries of the area that the full implications of the proposal for the establishment and preservation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean have not been worked out fully. In comparison with other oceans, the question of defining oceanic limits of the Indian Ocean is complicated and remains unsettled. Further clarification is required on other questions.

In its report contained in document A/9629, the Ad Hoc Committee recommended that it should: (a) proceed with its consultation with the four permanent members of the Security Council which are not members of the Ad Hoc Committee -- this is contained in paragraph 31 of the report; (b) give priority attention in 1975 to the definition of such terms as "limits of the Indian Ocean, in the context of the Declaration", "littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean", and "foreign military bases" -- this is contained in paragraph 34; and (c) give consideration to the convening of a conference of the littoral and hinterland States -- and this is contained in paragraph 33. The Committee, therefore, felt that it should continue and intensify its efforts in accordance with its mandate.

There has been in recent times an increase in the military presence of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean which has made the countries of the area more keenly aware that deliberations concerning the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace need to be pursued in a purposeful manner.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

I believe, therefore, that it is now desirable to give due consideration to the question of enlargement of the Ad Hoc Committee's membership. Those States that were not Members of the United Nations at the time of the establishment of the Committee should get an opportunity to serve on it. Since the establishment of the Committee, one littoral State, namely Bangladesh, having a long coast line on the Indian Ocean, occupying a strategic position and having an abiding interest in the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, has become a Member of the United Nations. Mozambique, another littoral State of the Indian Ocean, is now virtually self-governing and, with the process of decolonization which the Portuguese Government has so happily introduced, we can reasonably expect Mozambique to have full independence and membership in the United Nations in the near future. With the continuing process of decolonization in parts of Asia and Africa, we can expect a number of other countries -- for example, the Comoro Islands, Papua New Guinea, the Seychelles, etc. -- to secure statehood in the not too distant future. The membership of the Ad Hoc Committee, therefore, should be enlarged to keep pace with the increased membership of the United Nations and offer the new Member States which have an abiding interest in, and commitment to, the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace an opportunity to serve on the Committee.

I would now like to explain the specific proposals contained in the draft resolution.

The first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution recalls resolution 2992 (XXVII), of 15 December 1972, by which the Ad Hoc Committee was originally established.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

The second and third preambular paragraphs note the two trends of development in the area to which I referred earlier in my introduction, namely, an increased interest on the part of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean in creating a zone of peace in that region and the emergence of new States in the area since the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee. The fourth preambular paragraph recognizes the interest of those littoral and hinterland States in the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

The core of the draft resolution is really the first and, in fact, the only operative paragraph, which, in the light of the new developments in the area, would decide to enlarge the composition of the Ad Hoc Committee from 15 to 17 or 18 member States to offer an opportunity to other countries that have shown an interest in the matter to serve on the Committee.

There arises here a question of procedure, and I believe there is a valid precedent regarding this, contained in document A/8908, the report of the First Committee on agenda item 34 of the twenty-seventh session, paragraph 9 of which states:

"At its 1910th meeting, on 5 December" -- that is, in 1972 --
"the Committee decided to put to the vote the draft resolution ... on the understanding that the names of the members to serve on the ad hoc committee ... would be designated by the Chairman and would be communicated to the President of the General Assembly before the draft resolution was put to the vote in plenary, and that this decision should be recorded in the report of the First Committee to the General Assembly" (A/8908, para. 9).

I would mention for the information of the Committee that I have had an opportunity to conduct some limited informal consultations in this connexion. I regret that I am heading a one-man delegation, and it has been impossible for me to contact all the members of this Committee, and I apologize to them, but I have certainly contacted Mr. Amerasinghe of Sri Lanka, who is the bachelor-father of this item, and discussed it with him. I should like to inform you, Mr. Chairman, that Somalia and Bangladesh have expressed the wish to be appointed to the Ad Hoc Committee. If there is any other third country that would wish to serve on the Committee, I have no doubt that it will communicate its name to you.

(Mr. Ramphul, Mauritius)

The draft resolution that I have just introduced is very simple and certainly non-controversial. Therefore I formally request that you, Mr. Chairman, consult the Committee as to whether it is prepared to adopt this draft by consensus, without undue debate, and dispose of it without much ado. Otherwise I would formally request that the draft be put to the vote as soon as possible -- preferably immediately -- and I hope it will be adopted unanimously, but I do not believe this will be necessary. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your co-operation and understanding.

Mr. HASSAN (Sudan): My statement concerns the question of the denuclearization of Africa.

(continued in Arabic)

We have always had a very clear attitude concerning nuclear-free zones, for we have always supported this principle ever since it was submitted. The reason, of course, as is well known to everyone, lies in the dangers represented by nuclear weapons -- dangers from explosions or from the possession or use of nuclear weapons. In addition to these threats, we know that the development of nuclear weapons does indeed involve a great deal of effort to no useful end and indeed threatens to result in the disappearance of mankind from the globe. All efforts exerted in this particular field are at the expense of what the developing countries need for much more useful things, particularly in the economic and social fields.

The efforts exerted with regard to disarmament are a reflection of the true political will among the nuclear-weapon Powers to denuclearize several zones and to eliminate all use of such weapons, as a first step towards the complete denuclearization of their territories. In the face of such an attitude, the non-nuclear Powers, as we have heard from one of the speakers, indeed have no choice but to widen these nuclear-free zones until they extend all over the world. Thus the nuclear zones would be isolated and actually quarantined areas.

(Mr. Hassan, Sudan)

Although the concept of denuclearized zones was introduced into the United Nations in 1957, the African and Latin American continents were pioneers in the elaboration of the concept. Actually the African States were the first to obtain a declaration on that concept, while Latin America was the first to implement that concept. At the epoch-making fifteenth session of the General Assembly -- which was called the session of the African States, because many of them were admitted to the Organization at that particular session -- the African delegations submitted the idea in the Assembly. It was no wonder that they did so, since they had suffered from the development of nuclear arms. The declaration of the zone was adopted at the sixteenth session, when 14 African countries, my country included, introduced what became resolution 1652 (XVI).

When Africa decided to establish its regional organization in May 1963, the African Heads of State and Government unanimously endorsed the declaration reaffirming that decision at the first session of the Assembly of the Organization of African Unity, which met in Cairo in 1964. The General Assembly again reaffirmed its previous resolution by adopting resolution 2033 (XX).

The ultimate aims and objectives of the declaration of Africa as a denuclearized zone were spelled out in resolution 1652 (XVI) as follows:

"Recognizing the need to prevent Africa from becoming involved in any competition associated with the ideological struggles between the Powers engaged in the arms race, and particularly with nuclear weapons,"

and

"Recognizing further that the task of economic and social development in the African States requires the uninterrupted attention of those States in order to allow them to fulfil their goals and to contribute fully to the maintenance of international peace and security,".

(Mr. Hassan, Sudan)

Africa is indeed looked upon as a non-aligned, neutral continent.

The African States, with their different peoples, different religions, different languages and rich cultures, have been living in peace and wish to co-operate and combine their efforts in order to solve the problems of the heavy burden they have inherited from foreign domination. Consequently we note that the African States do not fear one another. They do not have the desire or the ambition to go nuclear.

But from where does the threat to Africa come, consequently, and why should Africa be declared a nuclear-free zone? In fact, the threat comes from the north and from the south. The representative of Nigeria, in a brilliant statement, pointed out the threat posed by South Africa. South Africa has been provided by nuclear reactors in excess of its power needs. And indeed, this has been done in contravention of General Assembly recommendations, particularly resolution 2033 (XX), which indeed calls for not giving such weapons to any authority in Africa, directly or indirectly, so that it may not contribute to having one of the States of the continent develop nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, aid has been given to South Africa in contravention of General Assembly resolutions, unless they want us to believe that South Africa has no negative intentions. The struggle against apartheid and racial discrimination, which are the policies adopted by the Government of South Africa, is indeed going to become much more intense. We are now faced with a turning point. Africa must be safeguarded against such a danger. Israel occupies part of the African continent, and the stand of the two countries is very well understood. The Egyptian delegation has told us of its intentions, whereas Israel has remained silent. The tense situation in the Middle East is known to all and Israel's intentions to produce nuclear weapons are well known to the international community.

In this particular field we want to draw attention to the threats against Africa coming from the north. South Africa and Israel did not sign the non-proliferation Treaty, whereas the attitude of the African States is quite clear to the General Assembly and needs no further comment. We would like to appeal to the international community against the threat to our continent from the north and from the south. The protection of non-nuclear States is absolutely essential and the signing of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in conformity with the resolution of the Security Council, is essential. As to whether it is a sufficient safeguard or not, this will be rediscussed in the review conference of the Treaty which will be held next May.

(Mr. Hassan, Sudan)

But as we know, there are countries which have not signed this Treaty and do not abide by it, and these have to be protected so they do not have to join the nuclear armaments race. To say that denuclearized zones would be sufficient safeguard to these States is not enough. Hence the importance of the role of the nuclear Powers when they accept the commitment of declaring a zone to be a nuclear-free zone. It is their commitment not to use nuclear weapons against this particular zone and not to threaten the use of such weapons and not to undertake any steps which would introduce nuclear weapons in this area.

Africa has special characteristics. It stands between the north and the south. Foreign domination is still apparent in many parts of Africa. We state as an example Rhodesia. Our delegation has pointed out the danger posed by those colonial enclaves, when we were discussing the denuclearization of Africa in the twentieth session of the General Assembly. The safety of Africa is important and the responsibility of the Member States is great in this sense. Let us pray that Africa will be free from colonialism and racism and will be spared from the nuclear armaments race.

Allow us to conclude this statement by saying that if there were ever to be a nuclear threat against an African State, and this State were not to be protected fully, everything we will have achieved in the field of disarmament will go with the wind. Hence, on this basis stems our attitude to the draft resolution submitted to us.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): On behalf of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution A/C.1/L.690 on the subject of non-proliferation and peaceful nuclear explosions, we want to express our appreciation to the representative of Mexico for the words he has just spoken. The strength of spirit which Mexico has shown on this subject, as is clear from the revised version of the Mexican amendments before us, gives us good hope for fruitful co-operation in the field of non-proliferation problems in the future. The Netherlands will vote in favour of the revised amendments. I understood that this will be the general attitude of the co-sponsors.

(Mr. Meerburg, Netherlands)

Availing myself of this opportunity, I would like to comment on the remark made this morning by the representative of Yugoslavia. He thought that the role of the United Nations in this draft resolution was not sufficient. I perhaps may quote from the introductory statements by our State Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Kooijmans, on this question. He said:

"All the above-mentioned bodies -- IAEA, CDD and the non-proliferation Treaty review conference -- are requested to report to the General Assembly at its next regular session. Thus next year all lines on the different aspects of peaceful nuclear explosions will come together in our world Organization. In operative paragraph 5 the Secretary-General is invited, if he should wish to do so, to present his own views on the question, taking into account the reports submitted to the Assembly. In any case, the General Assembly at its thirtieth session will have before it reports on all the problems in this area and, it is hoped, many suggestions for solutions, so that it can decide in all freedom what should be the next steps with regard to the problem of peaceful nuclear explosions."

(A/C.1/PV.2018, pp. 16-17)

That is what I wanted to quote because I think this will clarify that the draft resolution wants to give the General Assembly next time all freedom to decide what to do next. But, in the meantime, we need experts' reports on the different aspects.

Mr. NUR YUSUF (Somalia): My delegation would like to associate itself with the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.699 so ably introduced by the representative of Mauritius. My delegation has loudly raised its voice, both in the plenary Assembly and here, regarding the importance of keeping the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

As is shown in the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.699, we think that the establishment and preservation of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is a matter that concerns all littoral and hinterland States. It is therefore our hope that this draft resolution will receive the unanimous approval of the Committee and that the three new positions so created will be filled as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since there are no other speakers, I believe we can proceed to vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.690 and the amendments presented by the delegation of Mexico contained in document A/C.1/L.693/Rev.1. Since the revised amendments, which were circulated at the beginning of this afternoon's session, substantially do not alter the previous draft resolution, I think that we could proceed to vote on them immediately. As regards the amendments and the draft resolution itself, a recorded vote has been requested.

I shall now call on those members who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the vote either on the revised amendments (A/C.1/L.693/Rev.1) or on the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.690).

Mr. TEOMPSON FLORES (Brazil) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to place on record the fact that the delegation of Brazil will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690 and the amendments thereto. We will do so because fundamentally we do not agree that the discussion on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes should be conducted within the framework of a debate on a comprehensive test ban or on the non-proliferation Treaty. In the statements made by my delegation in the general debate on disarmament and its related items we referred to this matter and consequently I do not need to go into detail on the subject now.

Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the forthcoming vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690, the Soviet delegation would like to state the following.

The position of the Soviet Union on the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons has already been set forth in the statement made by our delegation in the First Committee on 28 October last, and there is no need for us to repeat it now. The non-proliferation Treaty is in keeping with the vital interests of all States and peoples, and by curbing the proliferation of nuclear weapons it reduces the danger of nuclear war. The Soviet Union supports the accession of the largest possible number of States to this Treaty.

The draft resolution submitted by a group of countries in document A/C.1/L.690 is in keeping with the general concept of the importance of the non-proliferation Treaty. It stresses the timeliness of a more effective and universal application of that Treaty and gives an important place to nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. As members know, this is covered by article V of the non-proliferation Treaty. The Soviet Union attaches great importance to that article. The Soviet Union actively participates in the activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which conducts important work in this field. The Governing Council of the International Atomic Energy Agency has adopted provisions for the international control of such explosions and has elaborated procedures that will be implemented by the Agency in discharging its functions as the

(Mr. Roschin, USSR)

international control body. The Soviet Union supports the request made in the draft resolution for the International Atomic Energy Agency to continue its studies on the peaceful applications of nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union agrees that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, in submitting its annual report, should include a section on its consideration of the arms control implications of peaceful nuclear explosions, taking into account the views of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

At the beginning of October this year, Soviet-United States talks began in Moscow on questions connected with peaceful nuclear explosions. These negotiations flow from the Treaty signed in July 1974 between the Soviet Union and the United States on curbing underground nuclear tests, and have a direct bearing on the non-proliferation Treaty, article V of which provides for the adoption of measures aimed at making the potential benefits derived from peaceful nuclear explosions accessible to all States.

We believe that a contribution to the further development of the question of peaceful nuclear explosions will be made by the conference of parties to the non-proliferation Treaty to be held in Geneva in May 1975. In principle, however, we believe that it is not advisable for the General Assembly to prejudge to any extent the nature of the communications to be made by the two States depositaries of the non-proliferation Treaty at the forthcoming conference of parties to the Treaty as envisaged in the amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.693/Rev.1, which contains the amendments to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690.

On the basis of the foregoing, the Soviet delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690 as a whole, but will abstain in the voting on the amendments to it.

Mr. MISHRA (India): I should like to request a separate votes on some paragraphs of the preamble of the draft resolution. The first separate vote we request is on the paragraph reading:

"Noting with concern that in the course of this year six States have engaged in nuclear testing".

(Mr. Mishra, India)

Then we should like another separate vote on two preambular paragraphs: first the one reading:

"Noting with great concern that, as a result of the wider dissemination of nuclear technology and nuclear materials, the possible diversion of nuclear energy from peaceful to military uses would present a serious danger for world peace and security".

The next, together with that, is:

"Considering therefore that the planning and conducting of peaceful nuclear explosions should be carried out under agreed and non-discriminatory international arrangements, such as those envisaged in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which are designed to help prevent the proliferation of nuclear explosive devices and the intensification of the nuclear arms race".

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I note that the representative of Japan, who has requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution, also wishes a recorded vote on the separate paragraphs as requested by the delegation of India.

I shall put to the vote first the draft amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.693/Rev.1 to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690.

The first amendment is to add the following after the tenth preambular paragraph:

"Recalling the statements made at the 1577th meeting of the First Committee, held on 31 May 1968, by the representatives of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning the provisions of article V of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons which relate to the conclusion of a special international agreement on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes (A/C.1/1052)".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: India.

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Bhutan, Brazil, Cuba, France, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America.

The amendment was adopted by 89 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 5 contained in document A/C.1/L.693/Rev.1. In this connexion, I should like to state that an error has crept into the English version. In the fourth line the word "may" should be deleted, so that it reads "they have taken": This correction is applicable only to the English text.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia

Against: India

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia

Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 81 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We shall now vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690, co-sponsored by Australia and other States on agenda item 35.

(The Chairman)

First, pursuant to the request made by the representative of India, we shall vote separately on the seventh preambular paragraph, which reads:

"Noting with concern that in the course of this year six States have engaged in nuclear testing".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Laos, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela,

Against: France, India

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Kuwait, Mauritius, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Sri Lanka, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia

The seventh preambular paragraph was adopted by 74 votes to 2, with 25 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now put to the vote the ninth preambular paragraph, which reads:

(The Chairman)

"Noting with great concern that, as a result of the wider dissemination of nuclear technology and nuclear materials, the possible diversion of nuclear energy from peaceful to military purposes would present a serious danger for world peace and security".

A-recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen,

Against: India

Abstaining: Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Cuba, France, Romania, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia

The ninth preambular paragraph was adopted by 89 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now put to the next preambular paragraph, to the vote, that is, the tenth preambular paragraph which says:

(The Chairman)

"Considering therefore that the planning and conducting of peaceful nuclear explosions should be carried out under agreed and non-discriminatory international arrangements, such as those envisaged in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which are designed to help prevent the proliferation of nuclear explosive devices and the intensification of the nuclear arms race".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen

Against: India

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Cuba, France, Indonesia, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia

The tenth preambular paragraph was adopted by 91 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall put the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.690) as a whole, as amended, to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen,

Against: Albania, China, India

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Burundi, Cuba, France, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 91 votes to 3, with 11 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call upon those delegations which wish to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690 as amended, because we agree with its aims and with the intention of its co-sponsors.

As regards some of the comments that have been made during the debate on this item and some of the theories advanced on the desirable priorities in the matter of nuclear non-proliferation, my delegation would like to place on record the fact that its affirmative vote on the draft resolution, as well as its abstention on the amendments proposed by the delegation of Mexico, and its affirmative vote on the three preambular paragraphs which were voted on separately, should not be interpreted as our acceptance of the principle that the measures aimed at preventing horizontal nuclear proliferation should be implemented independently of the measures aimed at preventing the vertical proliferation of existing nuclear arsenals. In fact, my delegation believes that the tenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, as well as operative paragraph 1, confirm the interdependence and indivisibility of the two areas in which nuclear proliferation should be halted.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) (interpretation from French): The problem dealt with in this draft resolution is of great importance. My delegation would therefore like to explain why it abstained on the resolution as a whole and also on the proposed amendments.

My delegation has already on several occasions affirmed its position with regard to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. That France is not a party to the 1968 Treaty in no way implies that it has no interest in the problem to which the Treaty relates. It seems to us, on the contrary, that this is one of the most serious questions we have to face. One of its most complex aspects is undoubtedly that of defining the carrying out control over nuclear tests for peaceful purposes. However, as I have pointed out, we are not parties to the non-proliferation Treaty for reasons already explained, the essence of which is based on the discriminatory nature of the Treaty. Furthermore, we do not participate in the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament for reasons which we have also repeatedly explained. That explains our abstention on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690 since in essence it calls upon the Geneva Committee and the review conference of the non-proliferation Treaty

(Mr. Scalabre, France)

to consider the question before us. However, I should like to remind the Committee that my country, as an active member of the International Atomic Energy Agency takes part in all the Agency's studies and has never opposed its activities' being applied to non-proliferation, particularly to the safeguards the working out of which was entrusted to it under the non-proliferation Treaty. Following the same line of conduct, we intend to pursue the same course inside the Agency in the matter of peaceful explosions.

In conclusion I should like to make it clear that my delegation will carefully study any provisions which may be proposed by any of the bodies called upon in the draft resolution to consider the highly important question upon which we are now focusing attention. It will judge them, regardless of their origin on their merits.

Mr. SUTOWARDOYO (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690, as amended, since we are in agreement with the view that effective measures should be taken to reverse the momentum of the nuclear arms race and to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We have some difficulty with the reference to the non-proliferation Treaty in the tenth preambular paragraph, as Indonesia is not a party to that Treaty. When we signed the non-proliferation Treaty in 1970 the Indonesian Government declared that ratification would not follow as a matter of course but would be subject to progress being made in the implementation of the provisions of the Treaty relating to such things as access for the non-nuclear countries to the benefits of peaceful nuclear technology and also in the matter of security guarantees for the non-nuclear-weapon States. Since there has been no such progress, we still maintain that position. That is why we abstained in the vote on the tenth preambular paragraph. We hope that the forthcoming review conference of the non-proliferation Treaty will not fail to address itself to the questions I have just mentioned.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): The United States has strongly supported the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690 as a constructive step towards our common non-proliferation objective. Indeed, the efforts of the Japanese, Netherlands and Canadian delegations, as well as of others, in developing this draft resolution must be greatly appreciated certainly by all the members of this Committee who voted for it.

The United States wishes to explain its vote in one respect, namely, with regard to the statement in the sixth preambular paragraph, which reads:

"... that it has not yet proven possible to differentiate between the technology for nuclear weapons and that for nuclear explosive devices for peaceful purposes".

For countries in the early stage of developing a nuclear explosive capability, we cannot see how it would be possible to develop such a capability for peaceful purposes without in the process acquiring a device which could be used as a nuclear weapon. In the case of advanced nuclear-weapon States, however, it may be possible, under certain conditions, to develop criteria that would be adequate to ensure that nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes are not used to further nuclear-weapon development. But, I should add, if such criteria could be developed they would not be applicable to the problem posed by the development of a nuclear explosive capability by a non-nuclear-weapon State.

Mr. LIN (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation is consistently opposed to the non-proliferation Treaty, because that Treaty serves the super-Powers in maintaining their policy of nuclear monopoly and blackmail. On the basis of this position, we voted against the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690.

Mr. de SOTO (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Peru voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690, and I should like to explain my delegation's vote on the seventh, ninth and tenth preambular paragraphs, on which separate votes were taken.

(Mr. de Soto, Peru)

My delegation approves all parts of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.690) and we voted in favour of it. But our vote in favour of the seventh, ninth and tenth preambular paragraphs -- on which separate votes were taken -- should be interpreted in the light of my delegation's wish to preserve the text for which we voted as a whole. I should like to make it quite clear that our affirmative vote on those preambular paragraphs should not be interpreted to mean that the delegation of Peru approves the contents of those paragraphs in themselves or outside the context of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since no other delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote after the vote, we have thus concluded consideration of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690.

The representative of Mauritius, in introducing the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.699 a few minutes ago, called it the least controversial text that the Committee will examine in the area of disarmament and he also suggested its unanimous adoption, by consensus, as soon as possible -- today, if possible. The draft was circulated this afternoon, so I should like to hear representatives' opinions as to whether they are now prepared to take a position on it. If there is any objection we will, of course, postpone its consideration.

Mr. KEVIN (Australia): Mr. Chairman, since this draft resolution is of some importance to my Government, I would ask leave to seek instructions overnight and make a statement on it at our meeting tomorrow. If you insist that I make a statement now, I will attempt to do so, but I would prefer to wait until I have had an opportunity to seek instructions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The arguments advanced by the representative of Australia are very cogent; we shall therefore postpone until tomorrow consideration of this draft resolution. In this regard, I should like to remind the Committee that only one meeting has been scheduled for tomorrow afternoon. It is my intention to put to the vote the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.691, A/C.1/L.694 and the one I have just mentioned in document A/C.1/L.699.

Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, with regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691, I request you not to insist on putting it to the vote tomorrow, but if possible to vote on it on Friday instead, since the question is very complicated and we would like to consider everything connected with it most carefully.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I have always tried to meet the wishes of all delegations, but I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the following.

We have to vote on the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.691, L.694, L.695, L.675 and, according to the information that I have, draft resolutions under agenda item 24 concerning the reduction of military budgets will shortly be submitted; there will also be another draft under agenda item 27 concerning napalm; there is one under agenda item 34, relating to the world disarmament conference another under agenda item 35, "General and complete disarmament" -- perhaps even two drafts under that item; and one under agenda item 101, concerning a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

If all those drafts materialize -- and I think that will be the case for most of them -- there will be eight draft resolutions to be voted on on Friday, in two meetings.

(The Chairman)

In stating this, I hardly need to point out that it is not only a question of voting on draft resolutions; they have to be introduced. Many delegations wish to speak in explanation of vote, and I really do not know how we shall manage to conclude our work on Friday. I think it will be extremely difficult. I was going to take advantage of tomorrow afternoon's meeting to vote on the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.691, A/C.1/L.694 and the draft to which I have just referred, in document A/C.1/L.699. Therefore I should be most appreciative if the delegation of the Soviet Union -- which is always so ready to co-operate for the best possible conduct of our work -- could obtain the necessary clarifications in order to be able to vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691, as the last draft resolution to be voted on tomorrow.

On Friday, we shall vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.675 and on all those other drafts which will be submitted. I appeal again to delegations now preparing drafts to submit them at the earliest possible moment, because delegations often want to consult their Governments and, unless these drafts are circulated and introduced tomorrow afternoon, we shall not be acting in keeping with the 24-hour rule under the rules of procedure and shall be able to vote on them only if the Committee decides to waive that rule.

In order to organize our work in the best possible manner, I should like to point out that next Monday, 25 November, the First Committee will begin dealing with the question of Korea. We shall hold two meetings on Monday, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. On Tuesday, 26 November, there will be only one meeting, in the afternoon, and on Thursday, 28 November, there will be no meeting, either in the morning or in the afternoon.

Does any delegation wish to make any comments?

(The Chairman)

Since there are no further comments, I shall adjourn the meeting. We shall continue our work tomorrow at 3 p.m. sharp, and I do ask you to be punctual because we have a great deal of work to do, and even if we waste only half an hour we are conspiring against the success of our work.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.