

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



84th
PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 14 December 1978,
at 3.40 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page	Page
Agenda items 78 and 80: National experience in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for the purpose of social progress: reports of the Secretary-General Importance of the equitable distribution of national income for economic and social development: report of the Secretary-General Report of the Third Committee	1460	1463
Agenda item 79: Preservation and further development of cultural values Report of the Third Committee		
Agenda item 84: International Covenants on Human Rights: (a) Report of the Human Rights Committee; (b) Status of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: report of the Secretary-General Report of the Third Committee		
Agenda item 86: Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the creation of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights Report of the Third Committee	1460	
Agenda item 87: Problems of the elderly and the aged: report of the Secretary-General Report of the Third Committee		
Agenda item 89: Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance Report of the Third Committee		
Agenda item 90: Human rights and scientific and technological developments Report of the Third Committee		
Agenda item 127: Review and co-ordination of human rights programmes of organizations in the United Nations system and co-operation with other international programmes in the field of human rights Report of the Third Committee		
Agenda item 100: Programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979 Report of the Fifth Committee (part I)		
Agenda item 101: Medium-term plan for the period 1980-1983 Report of the Fifth Committee (part I)		
Agenda item 103: Financial emergency of the United Nations: report of the Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations Report of the Fifth Committee		
Agenda item 104: Review of the intergovernmental and expert machinery dealing with the formulation, review and approval of programmes and budgets Report of the Fifth Committee		1463
Agenda item 107: Pattern of conferences: report of the Committee on Conferences Report of the Fifth Committee		
Agenda item 113: Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East (<i>concluded</i>): (a) United Nations Emergency Force and United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General Report of the Fifth Committee (part IV)		
Agenda item 35: Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and establishment of a preparatory committee for the second Conference Report of the First Committee		
Agenda item 36: Implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/76 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) Report of the First Committee		
Agenda item 37: Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament Report of the First Committee		
Agenda item 38: Implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/78: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament Report of the First Committee		
Agenda item 39: Implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/79 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) Report of the First Committee		
Agenda item 40: Effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament Report of the First Committee		
Agenda item 41: Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa Report of the First Committee		
Agenda item 42: Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East Report of the First Committee		

	Page	
Agenda item 43: Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia: report of the Secretary-General Report of the First Committee	1466	Importance of the equitable distribution of national income for economic and social development: report of the Secretary-General REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/33/469) AGENDA ITEM 79
Agenda item 44: Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament Report of the First Committee	1466	Preservation and further development of cultural values REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/33/470) AGENDA ITEM 84
Agenda item 45: Reduction of military budgets Report of the First Committee		International Covenants on Human Rights: (a) Report of the Human Rights Committee; (b) Status of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: report of the Secretary-General
Agenda item 46: Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on the Indian Ocean Report of the First Committee		REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/33/472) AGENDA ITEM 86
Agenda item 47: General and complete disarmament: (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament; (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency; (c) Report of the Secretary-General Report of the First Committee		Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the creation of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/33/473) AGENDA ITEM 87
Agenda item 48: World Disarmament Conference: report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on the World Disarmament Conference Report of the First Committee		Problems of the elderly and the aged: report of the Secretary-General
Agenda item 49: United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects: report of the Preparatory Conference Report of the First Committee		REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/33/382) AGENDA ITEM 89
Agenda item 125: Review of the Implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: (a) Report of the Disarmament Commission; (b) Reports of the Secretary-General Report of the First Committee		Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/33/474) AGENDA ITEM 90
Agenda item 128: Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States Report of the First Committee		Human rights and scientific and technological developments REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/33/475) AGENDA ITEM 127
Agenda item 50: Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: reports of the Secretary-General Report of the First Committee		Review and co-ordination of human rights programmes of organizations in the United Nations system and co-operation with other international programmes in the field of human rights REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/33/476)

President: Mr. Indalecio LIEVANO (Colombia).

In the absence of the President, Mr. de Piniés (Spain), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEMS 78 AND 80

National experience in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for the purpose of social progress: reports of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The report on item 86 has not yet been distributed in the Spanish version; nor are the relevant reports under item 89

yet available. Nevertheless I would request the Rapporteur of the Third Committee, Miss Ana Richter, of Argentina, to present the available reports and introduce them in one statement; later, when the other reports are available, I shall call upon her again.

2. Miss RICHTER (Argentina), Rapporteur of the Third Committee (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to thank those delegations which, in the brief time since the distribution of the reports of the Third Committee this morning and this afternoon, assisted me in the task of revising them, thus enabling me to correct orally the errors appearing in some versions.

3. I would recall that the Third Committee decided to be flexible in its consideration of more or less interrelated items. By virtue of that decision, the items relating to racism and self-determination were taken up together. Similarly, some delegations dealt with items 78, 80 and 87 as one group, and to items 89, 90 and 12 as another, and with items 86 and 127 together.

4. Document A/33/469 contains the Committee's report on items 78 and 80. In connexion with paragraphs 13, 15 and 17 of that report, the interested delegations requested that the word "withdrew" be changed to "did not insist on voting on". In my view, this comment applies to all reports with reference to which delegations used that phraseology in withdrawing their draft resolutions—for example, in document A/33/475, which I shall be presenting later. The Third Committee adopted two draft resolutions on items 78 and 80. They appear in paragraph 20 of the report. Draft resolution I, entitled "National experience in promoting the co-operative movement", was adopted without a vote.

5. Document A/33/470 contains the report on item 79. In this connexion the Third Committee is recommending the two draft resolutions to be found in paragraph 11 of the report.

6. The Third Committee's report on agenda item 84 is contained in document A/33/472, and the draft resolution it is recommending to the General Assembly for adoption may be found in paragraph 9 of that report.

7. The report in document A/33/382, on agenda item 87, was adopted by the Committee without a vote. The text of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 9 of the report and entitled "World Assembly on the Elderly" was so worded as to recall earlier General Assembly resolutions on the subject.

8. Document A/33/475 contains the report on item 90 and the draft resolution entitled "Human Rights and Scientific and Technological Developments", which the Committee is recommending to the Assembly for adoption, may be found in paragraph 10.

9. Document A/33/476 contains the report on item 127. The draft resolution contained in paragraph 11 was adopted by the Committee without a vote.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Third Committee.

10. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will first take up the report of the Third Committee on agenda items 78 and 80 [A/33/469]. The Assembly will now take decisions on the two draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 20 of its report.

11. The Third Committee adopted draft resolution I entitled "National experience in promoting the co-operative movement" without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 33/47).

12. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now take a decision on draft resolution II entitled "World social development". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution II was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 12 abstentions (resolution 33/48).¹

13. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany for an explanation of vote after the vote.

¹ The delegations of Barbados, Lebanon and Mauritius subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

14. Mr. MERKEL (Federal Republic of Germany): In view of the ongoing negotiations on related questions in the Second Committee, the nine members of the Economic Community maintain their positions as expressed in the Third Committee.

15. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now turn to the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 79 [A/33/470]. First we shall take decisions on the two draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 11 of that report.

16. Draft resolution I is entitled "Preservation and further development of cultural values". In the Third Committee this draft resolution was adopted without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 33/49).

17. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Draft resolution II is entitled "Protection, restitution and return of cultural and artistic property as part of the preservation and further development of cultural values". In the Third Committee draft resolution II was adopted by 116 votes to none, with 14 abstentions. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution II was adopted by 127 votes to none, with 13 abstentions (resolution 33/50).²

18. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now take up the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 84 [A/33/472]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "International Covenants on Human Rights", which has been recommended in paragraph 9 of that report. The draft resolution was adopted without a vote in the Third Committee. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 33/51).

19. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next report of the Third Committee is on agenda item 86 [A/33/473]. But as this report is not yet available in all the languages, we shall come back to it once we have concluded consideration of the other items.

20. The Assembly will therefore now go on to agenda item 87 [A/33/382]. We shall take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "World Assembly on the Elderly", which has been recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 9 of the report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution is to be found in document A/33/454. The Third Committee approved this draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 33/52).

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now turn to the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 90, entitled "Human rights and scientific and technological progress". The report is to be found in document A/33/475.

22. I call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

23. Lord BOSTON (United Kingdom): My Government places particular importance on making progress in the area of human rights dealt with in the draft resolution before us, which involves the rights of some of the most unfortunate of human beings, that is, those suffering from mental ill health. We are confident that many other Governments share this concern.

24. The present draft resolution is of course procedural and refers to a resolution which the Commission on Human Rights adopted by consensus. In our view, it would be fitting for the General Assembly to do the same. If there is a vote, we shall vote emphatically in favour.

25. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Human rights and scientific and technological developments" which has been recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 10 of its report [A/33/475]. A recorded vote has been requested.

² *Idem.*

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia,³ Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia

The draft resolution was adopted by 83 votes to none, with 48 abstentions (resolution 33/53).⁴

26. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will take up next the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 127 [A/33/476]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Review and co-ordination of human rights programmes of organizations in the United Nations system and co-operation with other international programmes in the field of human rights" which has been recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 11 of its report. The Third Committee approved this draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 33/54).

27. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to inform the representatives that the consideration of agenda items 86 and 89 will have to be delayed since we do not have available the relevant reports, in some cases because we do not have them in all languages, and in others because their consideration in committee has not been concluded. Therefore, in view of this circumstance, I

³ The delegation of Tunisia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as an abstention.

⁴ The delegations of Comoros, Lebanon and Mauritius subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

suggest to the Assembly that we defer the consideration of those two items.

AGENDA ITEM 100

Programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979

**REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE
(PART I) (A/33/445)**

AGENDA ITEM 101

Medium-term plan for the period 1980-1983

**REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE
(PART I) (A/33/482)**

AGENDA ITEM 103

Financial emergency of the United Nations: report of the Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/33/491)

AGENDA ITEM 104

Review of the intergovernmental and expert machinery dealing with the formulation, review and approval of programmes and budgets

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/33/492)

AGENDA ITEM 107

Pattern of conferences: report of the Committee on Conferences

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/33/414)

AGENDA ITEM 113

Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East (concluded):*

(a) United Nations Emergency Force and United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General

**REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE
(PART IV) (A/33/346/ADD.3)**

28. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee (*interpretation from Arabic*): I have the honour of presenting to the General Assembly for its consideration the following reports of the Fifth Committee.

29. First, part I of the report of the Fifth Committee on its work on agenda item 100 is contained in document A/33/445. This report contains in paragraph 42 two draft resolutions. Draft resolution I is entitled "Questions relating to the programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979" and consists of six sections, all of which were adopted by the Committee by consensus, with the exception of section

* Resumed from the 75th meeting.

VI, which relates to the 1979 budget estimates for the International Computing Centre, and which was adopted as a result of a vote. Draft resolution II is entitled "Use of experts and consultants in the United Nations". The Committee adopted that draft resolution by consensus.

30. Secondly, concerning item 101, the report of the Fifth Committee is contained in document A/33/482. In paragraph 21 of the report the Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly for adoption a draft resolution which it adopted as a result of a vote.

31. Thirdly, the report on agenda item 103 is to be found in document A/33/491. Paragraph 9 contains the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, which it adopted by consensus.

32. Fourthly, the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 104 is contained in document A/33/492. The decision of the Fifth Committee is contained in paragraph 4 of the report; it was adopted without objection.

33. Fifthly, the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 107 is contained in document A/33/414. The Fifth Committee is recommending in paragraph 21 of the report two draft resolutions to the Assembly for adoption. Draft resolution I, entitled "Pattern of conferences", was adopted by consensus after minor amendments. Draft resolution II, entitled "Control and limitation of documentation", was also adopted by consensus. The Fifth Committee also adopted two draft decisions on this item. They are to be found in paragraph 22 of the report. Draft decision I, submitted by the Soviet Union, is entitled "Management of conference resources", and draft decision II, submitted by the United States, is entitled "Organization of work of United Nations bodies". After both decisions were amended, they were adopted by consensus.

34. Sixthly, concerning agenda item 113 (a), the Fifth Committee is recommending to the Assembly for adoption two draft resolutions grouped under the title "Financing of the United Nations Emergency Force and of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force". These draft resolutions are to be found in paragraph 13 of part IV of the Committee's report.⁵

35. I hope that the reports of the Fifth Committee will be supported and approved by the Assembly.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fifth Committee.

36. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to inform representatives that the reports relating to agenda items 100, 101 and 103 are not yet available in all languages. We shall therefore begin with item 104, for which the report is available. The report of the Fifth Committee on that item appears in document A/33/492 and the decision of the Fifth Committee appears in paragraph 4 of its report. May I take it that the Assembly adopts that decision?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 33/415).

37. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We come now to agenda item 107, entitled "Pattern of conferences". The report of the Fifth Committee is in document A/33/414. The Assembly must now take a decision on the two draft resolutions recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 21 of its report.

38. Draft resolution I is entitled "Pattern of conferences". The Fifth Committee adopted draft resolution I by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 33/55).

39. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Fifth Committee adopted draft resolution II, entitled "Control and limitation of documentation", by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 33/56).

40. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now proceed to the two draft decisions recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 22 of its report [A/33/414].

41. Draft decision I is entitled "Management of conference resources". The Fifth Committee adopted this draft decision by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision?

Draft decision I was adopted (decision 33/416).

42. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Draft decision II is entitled "Organization of work of United Nations bodies". The Fifth Committee adopted this draft decision too by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision?

Draft decision II was adopted (decision 33/417).

43. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We come now to agenda item 113 (a), concerning the financing of UNEF and UNDOF. Part IV of the report of the Fifth Committee is contained in document A/33/346/Add.3. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 13 of its report.

44. I call on the representative of the USSR, who wishes to explain his vote before the voting.

45. Mr. FOKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the USSR considers it its duty to express its strong disagreement with the decision of the Fifth Committee in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution B in paragraph 13 of part IV of the report [A/33/346/Add.3] concerning the application of article 4 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations to United Nations armed forces.

⁵ For part I of the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 113, see the 23rd meeting, paras. 1-29; for part II, the 47th meeting, paras. 1-22; for part III, the 47th meeting, paras. 23 and 24, the 48th meeting, paras. 18-39; and the 49th meeting, paras. 5-19.

46. As is known, since 1973 there has been a considerable residue of unexpended allocations and unextinguished obligations in the UNEF accounts, principally because of the fact that the States sending contingents of troops make inopportune demands for reimbursement by the Secretariat of the United Nations of the expenses they have incurred.

47. In accordance with the United Nations Financial Regulations, established by the General Assembly, these residual funds must be returned to States Members 12 months after the conclusion of the financial year during which they accrue. However, the Secretariat of the United Nations has so far not only not returned those funds but is trying now by means of subterfuge and other contrivances to find some sort of legal basis for its unlawful actions.

48. The delegation of the USSR considers that such actions on the part of the United Nations Secretariat are not lawful. The Secretariat should not follow in the wake of those who do not comply with the Financial Regulations. Instead of revising those Financial Regulations, the Secretariat must comply strictly with the rules and regulations established by the General Assembly. This means it is necessary to cancel the financial obligations of the United Nations with regard to States which have not presented in due time claims for compensation in connexion with expenses borne by them, and the funds remaining in the accounts of UNEF should be returned to Member States.

49. The delegation of the USSR can only regret that in this respect the Fifth Committee has followed the lead of the Secretariat. It may not be amiss in this connexion to point out that the United Nations was put in a difficult position to a large extent as a result of the weak financial discipline exercised by the Secretariat.

50. The delegation of the USSR is convinced that the proposed violation of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations can only contribute to a further weakening of the financial discipline of the Secretariat and thus exacerbate the financial difficulties of the Organization. It will therefore vote against both draft resolutions in the report of the Fifth Committee.

51. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will first take a decision on the first of the two draft resolutions grouped under the heading "Financing of the United Nations Emergency Force and of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force" in paragraph 13 of part IV of the Fifth Committee's report [A/33/346/Add.3], draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mal-

dives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Democratic Yemen, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, France, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Madagascar, Malawi, Poland, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A was adopted by 105 votes to 9, with 14 abstentions (resolution 33/13 E).⁶

52. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Democratic Yemen, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Poland, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe

⁶ The delegation of Mauritius subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 111 votes to 9, with 9 abstentions (resolution 33/13 F).⁷

53. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I would inform representatives that reports are not yet available in all languages on agenda items 100, 101 and 103. Accordingly, in order not to delay the work of the Assembly, it would seem appropriate to defer consideration of those items until the reports are available. As soon as we are in a position to consider those items representatives will be informed.

AGENDA ITEM 35

Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and establishment of a preparatory committee for the second Conference

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/423)

AGENDA ITEM 36

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/76 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/424)

AGENDA ITEM 37

Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/425)

AGENDA ITEM 38

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/78: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/426)

AGENDA ITEM 39

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/79 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/427)

AGENDA ITEM 40

Effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/428)

AGENDA ITEM 41

Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/429)

AGENDA ITEM 42

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/430)

AGENDA ITEM 43

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/431)

AGENDA ITEM 44

Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/432)

AGENDA ITEM 45

Reduction of military budgets

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/433)

AGENDA ITEM 46

Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/434)

AGENDA ITEM 47

General and complete disarmament:

- (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency;
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/435)

AGENDA ITEM 48

World Disarmament Conference: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the World Disarmament Conference

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/436)

AGENDA ITEM 49

United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be

⁷ *Idem.*

Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects: report of the Preparatory Conference

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/437)

AGENDA ITEM 125

Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session:

- (a) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/461)

AGENDA ITEM 128

Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/462)

AGENDA ITEM 50

Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: reports of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/486)

54. Mr. MIHAJLOVIĆ (Yugoslavia), Rapporteur of the First Committee: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the reports of the First Committee on its work relating to agenda items 35 to 50, 125 and 128. The First Committee considered these 18 items during the period from 16 October to 8 December 1978. As a result of its deliberations, the Committee adopted 45 draft resolutions and one recommendation, which are contained in the following reports.

55. The report on item 35 is in document A/33/423, and the relevant recommendation of the First Committee is to be found in paragraph 6.

56. The report on item 36 is in document A/33/424, and the relevant recommendation is in paragraph 7.

57. The report on item 37 is in document A/33/425. Two draft resolutions are recommended in paragraph 9.

58. The report on item 38 is in document A/33/426, and the relevant recommendation is in paragraph 8.

59. The report on item 39 is in document A/33/427. The relevant recommendation is to be found in paragraph 7.

60. Document A/33/428 contains the report on agenda item 40. The relevant recommendation is in paragraph 8.

61. The report on item 41 appears in document A/33/429. Paragraph 7 of the report contains the relevant recommendation of the Committee.

62. Document A/33/430 contains the report on item 42. The relevant recommendation is in paragraph 7.

63. Document A/33/431 contains the report on item 43. The recommendation of the Committee appears in paragraph 7.

64. Document A/33/432 contains the report on item 44. Two draft resolutions are recommended in paragraph 9.

65. The report on item 45 is in document A/33/433, paragraph 7 of which contains the recommendation of the Committee.

66. The report on item 46 is to be found in document A/33/434. The relevant recommendation is in paragraph 8.

67. The report on item 47 is contained in document A/33/435. Under this item the First Committee adopted 9 draft resolutions, which are to be found in paragraph 24 and 1 recommendation, which is to be found in paragraph 25.

68. Item 48 is the subject of the report contained in document A/33/436. The relevant recommendation is in paragraph 8.

69. Document A/33/437 contains the report on item 49. The recommendation of the First Committee is in paragraph 8.

70. Document A/33/461 contains the report of the First Committee on item 125. Under that item, the Committee adopted 14 draft resolutions which are to be found in paragraph 33.

71. Document A/33/462 contains the report on item 128. Under this item the First Committee adopted two draft resolutions which appear in paragraph 10.

72. Finally, I have the honour to introduce the report of the Committee on item 50, contained in document A/33/486. Under that item the Committee adopted four draft resolutions, which are contained in paragraph 13.

73. This year—as a result of the decision of the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament—the First Committee dealt exclusively with the problem of disarmament and related international security questions. The unprecedented number of proposals adopted by the Committee—41 draft resolutions concerning disarmament and four concerning international security, and one recommendation on disarmament—and the record number of statements made during the general debate and in the course of consideration of the aforementioned agenda items, are, in my opinion, an expression of the increased interest, particularly of small countries, in the solving of questions of disarmament and international security within the framework of the United Nations and in the strengthening of the role of the world Organization in this field.

74. On behalf of the First Committee it is my pleasure to commend to the General Assembly for its adoption the draft resolutions and the decision to which I have just referred.

75. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Algeria wishes to make a statement, and I now call on him.

76. Mr. KERROUM (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): In paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the tenth special session [*resolution S-10/2*] the General Assembly, *inter alia*, welcomed the agreement reached following appropriate consultations among the Member States that the Committee on Disarmament would be convened in Geneva not later than January 1979 by the country whose name appears first in the alphabetical list of membership.

77. At the beginning of the current session of the General Assembly, the membership of the Committee on Disarmament was announced officially. In conformity with the list published in document A/S-10/24, the responsibility for convening the Committee on Disarmament falls to my country. Accordingly, I have had informal consultations concerning the date which would be most suitable for the first meeting of the Committee, and general agreement has been reached that the Committee should meet on 24 January 1979.

78. I have requested the Secretary-General to issue instructions to the Secretariat so that it may provide the necessary assistance in the administrative preparation for the holding of the next session of the Committee on Disarmament. Among the administrative provisions which are to be adopted, there is the list of speakers. I have also requested the Secretary-General to entrust to the Secretariat the task of drawing up such a list.

79. As the provisions of paragraph 120 of the Final Document were adopted by consensus, I asked for permission to speak in order to inform Member States of the measures adopted for the application of those provisions.

80. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Due note has been taken of the statement of the representative of Algeria, which will be reflected in the record of this meeting.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the First Committee.

81. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): As representatives are aware, the recommendations and decisions of the First Committee were adopted after a series of long and arduous consultations and negotiations among the entire membership of the United Nations. Representatives have had an opportunity to explain their positions or reservations in the First Committee. May I therefore appeal to those who have put their names on the list of speakers to be kind enough to be as brief as possible in view of the limited time available to us.

82. The Assembly will first consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 35 [*A/33/423*]. We shall now vote on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and establishment of a preparatory committee for the second Conference" which has been recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 6 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

In favour: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: Albania

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Equatorial Guinea, France, India, Israel, Mozambique, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Spain, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia

The draft resolution was adopted by 122 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions (resolution 33/57).⁸

83. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on the representative of China, who wishes to explain his vote.

84. Mr. HSU Yi-min (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The position of principle of the Chinese Government on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is well known to everyone. The Chinese delegation did not participate in the vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

85. At the same time, we wish to state here once again that the explanatory statements made and reservations entered by the Chinese delegation when the various draft resolutions were adopted in the First Committee, either by vote or by consensus, are still applicable to the corresponding draft resolutions to be adopted by the General Assembly. In order to save time, we will not repeat them here.

86. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now turn to agenda item 36 [*A/33/424*]. The First Committee adopted by consensus the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/76 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of

⁸ *Idem.*

Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)", which it recommends in paragraph 7 of its report. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts this draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 33/58).

87. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 37 [A/33/425]. We shall now take a decision on the two draft resolutions grouped under the heading "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons", which have been recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 9 of its report.

88. In the First Committee draft resolution A was adopted by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts draft resolution A?

Draft resolution A was adopted (resolution 33/59 A).

89. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now turn to draft resolution B, which the First Committee also adopted by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts draft resolution B?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 33/59 B).

90. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now take up the report of the First Committee on agenda item 38 [A/33/426]. The General Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/78" which has been recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/33/497. I now put the draft resolution to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo,

Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: China

Abstaining: Argentina, Cuba, Ethiopia, Fiji, France

The draft resolution was adopted by 134 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions (resolution 33/60).⁹

Mr. Liévano (Colombia) took the Chair.

91. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 39 [A/33/427]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/79 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)", which has been recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. The First Committee adopted that draft resolution by consensus. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 33/61).

92. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 40 [A/33/428]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade" which has been recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The First Committee adopted the draft resolution by consensus. May I consider that the General Assembly adopts the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 33/62).

93. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 41 [A/33/429]. We shall now vote on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa" which has been recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial

⁹ *Idem.*

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

Against: None

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 136 votes to none, with 3 abstentions (resolution 33/63).¹⁰

94. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 42 [A/33/430]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East" which has been recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri

Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Israel

The draft resolution was adopted by 138 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 33/64).¹¹

95. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Israel who wishes to explain his vote.

96. Mr. EILAN (Israel): My delegation has studied with great interest the draft resolution on the "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", contained in the report of the First Committee.

97. The Government of Israel wishes to reiterate its support in principle for the establishment of such a zone in our region. However, as we already noted last year, the comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects issued as a special report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament,¹² which remains a most authoritative and comprehensive study on the subject, has demonstrated the considerable disagreement that still exists concerning the practical meaning and implications of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. It confirmed that what might have appeared at first sight to be a clearly defined concept in fact contains several controversial elements. Yet, with all these divergencies, that report indicates clearly that such zones should be established through negotiations among the States concerned.

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

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

"With regard to another crucial aspect of disarmament, Israel has frequently called on its Arab neighbours to join it in direct negotiations with a view to establishing a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. . . . Israel firmly believes that such negotiations should lead to the conclusion of a formal, contractual, multilateral convention between all the States of the region, on the lines of such notable precedents as the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America . . ."¹³

Unfortunately, the Arab States have refused to entertain this particular proposal, and they still persist in that refusal.

¹¹ The delegations of Chad and Mauritius subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

¹² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Supplement No. 27A.*

¹³ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 27th meeting, paras. 160-161.*

99. The representative of Egypt stated in the First Committee that

"... the initiative for the establishment of any given zone must come from inside the zone itself and ... there should be agreement based on negotiations by which countries accept obligations on a reciprocal basis."¹⁴

We are at a loss to understand why the situation in the Middle East is considered by him to differ so markedly from situations in other regions as to make this principle inapplicable in this one area. As a matter of fact, the only pertinent difference between the situation in the Middle East and the situations in other areas is that in this region alone, of all the regions of the world, States have rejected the normal civilized process of negotiations to settle their differences.

100. Now that Egypt has chosen the path of direct negotiations in its relationship with Israel, it is all the more surprising that it still lends its support to the positions of those States that persist in the futile policy of refusing to negotiate.

101. On the question of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, Israel repeats that, as it has stated many times before, it is ready to negotiate the establishment of such a zone with all the States in the region. The procedures contemplated in this resolution are no substitute for a genuine negotiated agreement. We do not believe in unilateral depositions of declaratory statements of intent. If a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East is ever to materialize, it will be the result of a common and binding agreement of all States of the region, arrived at through direct multilateral negotiations.

102. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 43, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". The report is contained in document A/33/431.

103. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

104. Mr. FERNANDO (Sri Lanka): As it did in the First Committee, the Sri Lanka delegation will once again vote in favour of the draft resolution now contained in paragraph 7 of document A/33/431 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. This vote reflects Sri Lanka's continuing support of the concept of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world. We believe that effective nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world not only would contribute to the objectives of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons but would also create conditions that would strengthen peace and security in those regions.

105. While supporting the draft resolution, Sri Lanka believes that consultations must be held by the States of the South Asian zone so as to ensure unanimous support for and approval of the establishment of such a zone,

without which we do not believe that the purpose of the establishment of the zone will be achieved.

106. We also believe that the limits of the zone should be adequately defined. The Sri Lanka delegation does not regard this draft resolution as being directed against any State in the region. My Government appreciates and accepts the solemn pledge given by the Prime Minister of India before the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament reaffirming India's position not to manufacture or to acquire nuclear weapons.¹⁵ Sri Lanka fully believes that this has been the consistent policy of the Government of India, and that it will always remain so. I wish also categorically to state that Sri Lanka has the highest regard for India, which is our closest neighbour.

107. Mr. JAIPAL (India): I wish to explain the reasons why my delegation will vote against the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

108. The position of the General Assembly has always been that proposals for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in appropriate regions of the world should be initiated by the States of the regions concerned, taking into account their special features and geographical extent. The participation by the States of the regions in such zones is to be voluntary and on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at by them.

109. So far as South Asia is concerned, in 1974 the General Assembly for the first time endorsed in principle the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that region, and invited the States concerned to enter into consultations about establishing such a zone [*resolution 3265 (XXIX)*]. Since 1974 the General Assembly has annually repeated its endorsement in principle of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

110. India from the very beginning expressed its opposition to this limited concept, because India does not consider the South Asian region either appropriate or adequate for this purpose. India's opposition is without prejudice to India's decision not to develop nuclear weapons, a decision which was reaffirmed solemnly by the Prime Minister of India at the special session on disarmament.

111. Today once again, and for the fifth time, the General Assembly proposes to reaffirm its endorsement in principle of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, against the declared and consistent opposition of India. We fail to understand why the General Assembly persists in this form of action which is clearly contrary to the principle of free consent that should underlie the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

112. The fact that India, or any other country for that matter, has decided not to develop nuclear weapons does not mean that they should join nuclear-weapon-free zones, or convert their unilateral decisions into binding multilateral commitments, or accept full-scope safeguards and

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Thirty-third Session, First Committee, 47th meeting, p. 51, and *ibid.*, First Committee, Sessional Fascicle, corrigendum.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, Tenth Special Session, Plenary Meetings, 24th meeting.

international inspection. India is certainly not accountable to anyone for its own decision not to develop nuclear weapons.

113. South Asia is not the only region that is free of nuclear weapons. The Nordic region, the Balkans, most of the Mediterranean, South-East Asia and Japan, and the South Pacific are also regions that are free of nuclear weapons. It does not follow that, because a particular region is free of nuclear weapons, it should be converted into a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Different countries have different perceptions of how their national and security interests are best served, and it is improper for the General Assembly to impose its views on them in this manner.

114. My delegation expresses its sincere appreciation to those countries that will not vote for the draft resolution, because by taking that position they show greater understanding of the principle of free consent. However, those who repeatedly vote for this draft resolution cannot but be regarded as tending to tell us what is good for us, and that is not a very nice or friendly thing to do.

115. My delegation requests that a recorded vote be taken.

116. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", which has been recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report [A/33/431]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius,¹⁶ Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire

Against: Bhutan, India

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Italy,

Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malawi, Mongolia, Norway, Panama, Poland, Sao Tome and Principe, Singapore, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia

The draft resolution was adopted by 97 votes to 2, with 37 abstentions (resolution 33/65).

117. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

118. Mr. Reaz RAHMAN (Bangladesh): Bangladesh voted in favour of the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. Our positive vote is in keeping with the position of principle we have repeatedly stated in the meetings of the General Assembly in support of all measures directed towards the protection of non-nuclear countries and serving their interests, including measures for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace, freedom and neutrality in South and South-East Asia, the Indian Ocean and other regions of the world.

119. While reaffirming our consistent stand, Bangladesh has always recognized the constraints governing the realization of these objectives, including the need to iron out difficulties with regard to concepts and geographical delimitations and the paramount necessity for co-operation and mutual consultation freely entered into by the States of the region concerned. In this context we supported the draft resolution just adopted by the Assembly.

120. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): As a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Ethiopia has consistently supported the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all regions and we take particular satisfaction at the increasing recognition given to this principle as an effective measure towards nuclear disarmament.

121. Consequently, my delegation voted in favour of the resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia last year [*resolution 32/83*], despite the abstention on that draft resolution by an important State of the region. At that time, as in previous years, we felt there were sufficient grounds to believe that an agreement or understanding among the States concerned would eventually emerge. Regrettably, however, we have noted that this year India cast a negative vote on the draft resolution contained in the Committee's report.

122. Since we do not wish to contribute in any way towards the hardening of differences which we believe, can be resolved through appropriate consultations among the States concerned, my delegation this year decided not to participate in the vote on the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. We sincerely hope that it will be possible for all concerned to resolve the outstanding differences and enable the General Assembly to adopt a similar resolution in the future by consensus. Furthermore, my delegation would like to stress that it is encouraged in taking this decision by India's solemn declaration not to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons.

¹⁶ The delegation of Mauritius subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as an abstention.

123. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 44 [A/33/432]. We shall now take a decision on the two draft resolutions grouped under the heading "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons" which have been recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested on both draft resolutions.

124. I shall first put to the vote draft resolution A.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malawi, Mongolia, Mozambique, Pakistan, Poland, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A was adopted by 117 votes to none, with 24 abstentions (resolution 33/66 A).

125. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote draft resolution B.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland,

Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

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

Draft resolution B was adopted by 118 votes to none, with 24 abstentions (resolution 33/66 B).

126. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 45 [A/33/433]. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/33/506. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Reduction of military budgets" which has been recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of

America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iraq, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zambia

The draft resolution was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 18 abstentions (resolution 33/67).

127. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next report of the First Committee is on agenda item 46 [A/33/434]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace" which has been recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/33/505. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 14 abstentions (resolution 33/68).

128. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We now turn to the draft decision recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 9 of its report [A/33/434]. The First Committee adopted the draft decision without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 33/418).

129. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since the General Assembly does not have the necessary documents before it, we shall consider item 47 at a later stage.

130. We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 48 [A/33/436]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "World Disarmament Conference" which has been recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution is in document A/33/502. The First Committee adopted that draft resolution by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 33/69).

131. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 49 [A/33/437]. The General Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects" which has been recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution is in document A/33/503. The First Committee adopted that draft resolution by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 33/70).

132. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on the representative of Albania, who wishes to explain his delegation's position after the adoption of the decisions.

133. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): In explaining in a single intervention our votes on the draft resolutions that have been adopted under items 35 to 49 of the agenda, the Albanian delegation wishes to state briefly the following.

134. The delegation of Albania considers that, if weapons have increased beyond any limit and if the arms race is continuing at a dizzying pace, it is not because the resolutions adopted have been inadequate in number or because mankind has not succeeded in understanding the danger of armaments. The real cause of a phenomenon as disturbing as the arms race is quite different and is not at all

unknown. Armaments, the arms race and preparations for war are the direct consequence and the most obvious manifestation of the aggressive policy of the super-Powers and the imperialist Powers, which are not at all interested in disarming.

135. The delegation of Albania did not participate in the decision on the majority of the draft resolutions just adopted. It voted against the draft resolution in document A/33/423, and by that negative vote reaffirmed its well-known attitude concerning the nature and purposes of the so-called Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

136. For the reasons which I have just explained, the Albanian delegation wishes to state that it dissociates itself from the consensus by which a certain number of the resolutions were adopted, both in the First Committee and in this Assembly.

137. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now take up the report of the First Committee on agenda item 125 concerning the review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session. The report appears in document A/33/461.

138. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes on any or all of the 14 draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 33 of its report.

139. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The Iraqi-inspired draft resolution A before us would have the General Assembly "gravely concerned" over Israel's military build-up. In this, the sponsors of this draft resolution wish the General Assembly to become a party to an outrageous political hoax.

140. Gone are the days when the details of a country's armament and over-all military strength could be kept secret. The reports of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute and the International Institute for Strategic Studies for this year are unequivocal as regards the Middle East. On the one hand, Arab countries have contracted to acquire \$US 35 billion worth of arms in the next 14 months. On the other hand, Israel has reduced its military budget by 23 per cent and is the only country in the world to have done so. In addition, Arab military superiority over Israel in terms of manpower and arms can be summed up as follows: armed forces, 6 to 1; combat aircraft, 3.8 to 1; tanks, 3.6 to 1; artillery, 10 to 1; surface-to-air missile batteries 20 to 1.

141. If the United Nations had been the organization its founders had hoped for, there would indeed have been a case for a General Assembly resolution expressing its concern over the world's most gigantic acquisition of arms on the part of Arab States, for, quite apart from the Israel-Arab dispute, so much fire-power so close to so much oil is cause for world concern.

142. There exist today three major military alliances in the world: among the States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], among the Warsaw Pact States, and among the Arab States. In terms of certain

types of military hardware the Arab States are fast reaching a point of parity, though not always of functional equivalence, with either NATO or the Warsaw Pact States. In certain types of weapons the total Arab strength has already exceeded that of either NATO or the Warsaw Pact States.

143. Who is this massive arsenal directed against? It is hardly against NATO or against the Warsaw Pact countries. There can surely be no shadow of a doubt that some Arab States are investing their excessive oil profits to acquire such an overwhelming superiority of arms against Israel as to be able to overrun it without undue risk.

144. As Iraq is the prime mover of draft resolution A before us, I invite the General Assembly to take a close look at Iraq's own military build-up. In the period between 1973 and 1978 Iraq doubled its army divisions. Its armoured units have been reinforced by 1,000 advanced tanks, T-62 and T-72. Similarly, more than 1,000 armoured personnel-carriers have been introduced into its infantry units. The strength of Iraq's artillery has been doubled. The number of ground-to-air missile batteries jumped from 3 in 1973 to 50 in 1977, while 9 ground-to-ground Scud launchers have been added to Iraq's missile power. The number of helicopter and missile boats has been tripled. This frantic drive in the acquisition of novel means of destruction has made Iraq today the most heavily armed Power in the region.

145. Yet, Iraq wishes to see Israel disarmed, preferably totally disarmed, for reasons that its leaders have proclaimed repeatedly and very clearly for the last three decades. Unlike Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria, Iraq has never concluded an armistice agreement with Israel and has regarded itself as being in a state of war with Israel ever since 1948.

146. In June 1977 the Iraqi President Ahmad Hasan al-Bakr asserted, and I quote the statement as reported by Radio Baghdad on 16 June 1977:

"Efforts of the forces of peace, progress and revolution in the world must be consolidated... to support the liquidation of the racist Zionist entity so as to build a democratic society."

147. Iraq has rejected all United Nations efforts for a peaceful settlement of the Israel-Arab dispute, including Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

148. On 22 October 1973, when the Security Council called for a cease-fire in the Yom Kippur War, the Baghdad Government announced, and I quote from *The New York Times* of 28 November 1973:

"Iraq does not consider itself a party to any resolution, procedure or measure in armistice or cease-fire agreements or negotiations or peace with Israel, now or in the near future."

149. More recently, the Iraqi Ambassador in Delhi had the following to say at a press conference, as reported by the Middle East News Agency on 24 October 1978, and I quote: "Iraq does not accept the existence of a Zionist state in Palestine... the only solution is war."

150. Draft resolution A before us must therefore be judged in the light of Iraq's official policy. By demanding an arms embargo against Israel, this draft resolution is intended to pave the way for Iraq to accomplish its declared aim of destroying Israel. It also asks all Member States to aid and abet Iraq in this gravest contravention of everything the Charter stands for. It is specifically designed to impair Israel's ability to exercise its inherent right of self-defence as provided for in Article 51 of the Charter.

151. Here we have Iraq, the author and sponsor of this draft resolution, openly and unashamedly committed to the destruction of Israel. Iraq and a number of States equally inspired by this lofty and noble end have discovered, much to their chagrin, that their intended target is determined to resist their criminal design. Feigning outrage, they engage the world Organization, the Charter of which imposes on its Members the duty to refrain from the threat or use of force against another State and commits the Organization to promoting the maintenance of international peace and security. Shamelessly, they request that the world Organization recommend the disarming of a State with which they are in a state of war, so as to facilitate the implementation of their illegal and openly avowed goal—the liquidation of a State Member of the United Nations.

152. When the Jewish people, after many centuries, re-established the State of Israel in the land of Israel in 1948 we vowed we would end the state of defencelessness that had been the fundamental cause of the tragedy of my people, and that assaults on Jewish lives and Jewish dignity could no longer be made with impunity. None the less, supported by all those who have consistently fomented trouble in the Middle East and are now opposed to the peace-making process there, Iraq and its allies would like to reduce the Jewish people again to that state of defencelessness. Let the word therefore go forth loud and clear from this place: "The days of Jewish defencelessness are over for ever, and the State of Israel will resist every assault on its existence and its integrity."

153. In an obvious ploy to attract African support for draft resolution A, Iraq has falsely accused Israel of collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear field. Given the arithmetical majority at the disposal of Arab States, the presence of an empty accusation against Israel in a resolution of the General Assembly—

154. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Iraq on a point of order.

155. Mr. AL-ATIYYAH (Iraq): The speaker who just preceded me asked to speak in explanation of his vote before the vote. However, for the last seven or eight minutes we have listened to him embarking on a slanderous attack on my country, Iraq. Iraq is not the point under discussion. What is under discussion is draft resolution A adopted by the First Committee. If he is not going to limit himself to the subject under discussion, I beg you, Sir, and I beg the Assembly as a whole, to put a limit to that.

156. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Israel will now continue his statement.

157. Mr. BLUM (Israel): In an obvious ploy to attract African support for the draft resolution, Iraq has falsely accused Israel of collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear field. Given the arithmetical majority at the disposal of Arab States, the presence of an empty accusation against Israel in a resolution of the General Assembly is in itself no proof of its veracity.

158. I should like to refer to the content of the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A. The Government of Israel has stated on several occasions that it would not be the first to introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East. That is a formal Government position. It is an undertaking of which due note has been taken in responsible quarters the world over.

159. Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan, addressing the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, had the following to say about a nuclear-free-zone in the Middle East:

"Israel firmly believes that such negotiations should lead to the conclusion of a formal, contractual, multi-lateral convention between all the States of the region, on the lines of such notable precedents as the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America and the proposals for similar agreements in the areas of south Asia and the south Pacific. Unfortunately, the Arab States have totally rejected this call by Israel which, after all, is in the interests of all the people of the Middle East. On this occasion, I repeat our proposal."¹⁷

160. On the general issues of disarmament, my Foreign Minister told the current session of the General Assembly:

"Israel is prepared to play its part in the reduction of the arms race and it remains ready to enter into agreements on arms limitation with all States in the Middle East. There is no doubt, however, that the appropriate way to bring about an arms reduction in the Middle East is through peace treaties which would include limitations on armaments within their framework." [26th meeting, para. 74.]

161. Israel's contribution to the reduction of regional tensions and to providing a proper setting for disarmament in the Middle East has been threefold. First, on the unilateral level, Israel has considerably reduced its military budget. Israel invites Iraq, the prime mover of this draft resolution, and all other Arab States to follow suit and similarly cut their budget by over 20 per cent. Secondly, on the bilateral level, the Camp David agreements,¹⁸ as well as negotiations at present being conducted, are intended to open the way to peace for the entire Middle East. Thirdly, on the multilateral level, Israel has come out with a certain proposal concerning the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. To our regret, that proposal has been rejected out of hand by Arab Governments. Israel is

¹⁷ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings*, 27th meeting, para. 161.

¹⁸ A Framework for Peace in the Middle East, Agreed at Camp David, and Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel, signed at Washington on 17 September 1978.

still awaiting a favourable response to the offer extended to Arab Governments by the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs.

162. Draft resolution A before us was submitted with the express purpose of harming the process of peace. Instead of establishing a multilateral framework for peace, as the Camp David agreements did, Iraq by its own admission seeks to establish a narrow framework for war, and the draft before us is a part of it.

163. If there is any genuineness in Iraq's posturing, as expressed in the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A, why is it that Iraq and the other Arab sponsors of the draft resolution do not respond favourably to the offer made by the Foreign Minister of Israel at the last General Assembly and negotiate with Israeli and other countries of the region a Middle East "Tlatelolco" on the lines of the Treaty the countries of Latin America have so wisely concluded?

164. In the course of this session of the General Assembly, in the period of time that has elapsed between the adoption of this draft resolution—

165. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Jordan on a point of order.

166. Mr. GAMMOH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is the right of my delegation and of any other Member of this world Assembly to raise a point of order at any time it deems appropriate and I think that that point was totally disregarded by the President.

167. We agreed in the First Committee at the beginning of our discussion of this topic, as well as of other topics, not to reopen discussion on the substance of the subjects discussed, and we also agreed that statements in plenary meetings should be limited to explanations of votes. The representative of Israel has reopened the discussion of a subject which was discussed in full in the First Committee. The statement of the Israeli delegation, therefore, is not in exercise of its right to explain its vote. The Israeli representative is exploiting the patience and wisdom of this Assembly. I ask the President to request him to respect the rules of procedure. Sixty-eight countries voted in favour of this draft resolution, and it is therefore the property of all those countries, not of Iraq alone.

168. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Israel to continue his explanation of vote.

169. Mr. BLUM (Israel): In the course of this session of the General Assembly, in the period of time that has elapsed between the adoption of draft resolution A by the First Committee on 27 November and its submission to the plenary meeting today, certain Arab States have demonstrated their real views about peace in the Middle East. They have done so on three occasions and their voting record on vital disarmament issues speaks for itself. The Jordanian representative saw to it that the draft resolution on confidence-building measures was greatly weakened as regards the Middle East. Even though the draft was adopted unopposed in Committee, there were six abstentions—all of

them Arab. The Jordanian and Syrian representatives also made clear their objections to the regional disarmament approach, and when the relevant draft was voted upon it was adopted by 79 votes to none, with 40 abstentions. The bulk of those abstentions were Arab States and their political allies. And, finally, with reference to nuclear-weapon-free zones, the Arabs reaffirmed their refusal to join "arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region" by making up the majority of those who abstained when a revised paragraph to that effect was voted upon.

170. I am aware that most representatives in this hall tacitly agree with what has just been said. The Iraqi draft resolution is not only a highly controversial one but also a highly unpopular one. The procedural vote that took place in the First Committee on the matter before us several weeks ago clearly demonstrated that fact. If voting on draft resolutions in the United Nations were secret, the Iraqi draft would indeed have few supporters. I call upon Member States to address themselves to the real meaning of draft resolution A before us within the context of present developments in the Middle East. I call on them to reject this act of warmongering calculated to undermine the peace-making process, and to vote instead for peace.

171. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now take decisions on the 14 draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 33 of its report [A/33/461].

172. We shall take a decision first on draft resolution A. Before we proceed to vote on it the General Assembly must take a decision on whether the adoption of draft resolution A requires a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting. I have reached this conclusion in the light of the provisions of Article 18 of the Charter and of rules 83 and 85 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and in view of the fact that a number of delegations have presented to me in private diametrically opposed arguments which indicate the controversial nature and uncertainty of the point.

173. I therefore propose to put this question to the vote so that the Assembly may take a decision on the question. I shall put the vote in the following way: delegations which consider that the adoption by the Assembly of draft resolution A requires a two-thirds majority will vote in favour; delegations which consider that adoption by the Assembly of draft resolution A does not require a two-thirds majority will vote against.

174. I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

175. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I had asked to be allowed to speak strictly with regard to the vote on draft resolution A just before you asked the Assembly to determine whether a two-thirds majority vote was required.

176. Before I go any further, Mr. President, I do not want to be misunderstood. Earlier in the meeting I tried to speak from the floor to uphold the right of Iraq—and not just because it is an Arab State—and also of Jordan to raise points of order. You were a little late in recognizing their points of order, so I had to do something that might better

be communicated to the ear rather than to the sight, and that is why I tapped my table strongly. I hope that you will understand that that was not meant to be a reflection on the President and the orderly manner in which he has been conducting our work since the first day of the General Assembly.

177. With regard now to my point of order on the question that you are submitting to the Assembly, namely, whether a decision on draft resolution A should require a two-thirds majority for adoption, I have the following to say.

178. Draft resolution A, which was earlier submitted at the tenth special session of the Assembly,¹⁹ on disarmament, was referred to the General Assembly because it was considered that at the thirty-third session there would be ample time to debate and to vote on it. The words "General Assembly" here refer to the thirty-third session; it was not allocated to the General Committee because it is as if the General Committee of the thirty-third session had decided that there was no difference. A decision was taken at the tenth special session, but no committee was designated; the draft resolution was referred to the General Assembly in the sense that it was to be discussed during the thirty-third session. A committee could have been designated for its discussion. The mere fact that it was referred to the thirty-third session does not mean, in the narrow sense, that draft resolution A is so important that the General Assembly should vote on it by a two-thirds majority. The implication here is incorrect if I may say so with all due respect to anyone whose view may differ from mine. I am to some extent conversant with, but am still learning about, the rules of procedure, but this is the context in which the General Assembly at its tenth special session referred the matter to the Assembly at its thirty-third session, because, after all, everything has to come before the General Assembly.

179. Having said this, I do not think it to be in order to ask the General Assembly if it wishes to decide by a simple majority or by a two-thirds majority. I do not say that this would be out of order. We have decided many spurious out-of-order requests. I am divesting myself of any considerations. Incidentally, this is not an Iraqi draft resolution because there are many sponsors; it was dubbed "the Iraqi draft resolution" by our colleague from Israel, but whenever there is more than one sponsor one country should not be singled out as being the author of a draft resolution, although it may or may not be so. In other words, all the sponsors of the draft resolution are at one with the Iraqi delegation. Therefore, in stressing the Iraqi sponsorship, the Israeli representative took the opportunity, quite naturally, of—not to use harsh words—making propaganda before we voted. He said, "Look, Iraq did this and this; Iraq harbours ill feelings towards us; Iraq has designs on us." I do not blame him. This is a place where you argue your case and try to see how many friends you can gain at the last minute. If you cannot gain their positive vote, you can perhaps persuade them, aside from the lobbying, to abstain, to sell out. This is very important. This is not an Iraqi draft

resolution; it is the draft resolution of all those who are sponsoring it. Similarly, when a draft resolution is adopted, even if it has only one sponsor, it becomes the property of the General Assembly, and no one says it is a British resolution, or an American resolution, or a Saudi Arabian resolution. But here this does not obtain, and the rules of procedure as to whether a two-thirds majority is required do not apply. The reference to the General Assembly is in the context of the thirty-third session. This did not go to the General Committee because it was agreed at the tenth special session that issues which there was no time to discuss would be referred to the General Assembly at its thirty-third session.

180. With all due respect to those who want to interpret the rules of procedure otherwise, I repeat that I think they are mistaken. Furthermore, I want to say to everybody in this room, forget about the two points of order. I happen to represent an Arab State, but I would defend in the same way the right of the representative of Israel, if it was a valid point of order that he was raising.

181. Having said that, Mr. President, may I ask that you discuss the matter with the Under-Secretary-General sitting on your left, who knows the rules, before you put the question of a two-thirds majority or a simple majority to the vote. There is a legal point here really, much as I would like to spare the Legal Counsel. As I was coming in I said to him, "I sympathize with you; whenever there is a little confusion in a Committee they call you in. But this is such an important matter that it should not set a precedent. If Mr. Buffum is not too certain on this point, I will ask you for your opinion—regardless of the rules of procedure here, because in this context the General Assembly was mentioned not because of the importance of this matter but because it was not allocated to a Committee, something which would have been welcomed by everyone, including, I believe, the representative of Israel, since then he would have had ample time to put forward his point of view." As God is my witness, I said this objectively. I forgot I was an Arab. An Arab has no privileges but he, like others, can analyse things. Being an Arab does not mean being inferior to our friends from Britain, who consider themselves past masters—and rightly in some respects—or from the Soviet Union, or other big Powers. We are human beings on the same level.

182. I hope that you, Sir, after consultation, will take into consideration the points I have raised. I reserve the right to take up the matter again, calmly and objectively, I promise you, Sir, and far from emotionally because the subject happens to be a problem not only between Israel and some of the Arab States but also between Israel and the other States which are sponsors of the draft resolution.

183. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): The United States considers that the Charter of this Organization requires a two-thirds majority for the adoption of draft resolution A recommended by the First Committee in its report on the review of the implementation of the recommendations of the special session on disarmament [A/33/461]. Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter specifies that any recommendation by the General Assembly with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security must be decided by a two-thirds

¹⁹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Tenth Special Session, Annexes*, agenda items 9, 10, 11 and 12, document A/S-10/23, para. 11.

majority of the members present and voting. Draft resolution A asks the Security Council to impose a mandatory embargo under Chapter VII against a State Member of the United Nations. Indeed, operative paragraph 1 calls for action by the Security Council "to avert this grave menace to international peace and security". Everyone understands that the Security Council could impose a binding arms embargo only—and I repeat only—if the Security Council were to make a finding of the existence of a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace, or an act of aggression.

184. Thus it is clear that draft resolution A constitutes a recommendation concerning international peace and security. The General Assembly is obliged to respect the requirement laid down in Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter that such a serious and significant recommendation requires a two-thirds majority. This Assembly cannot legally put this Charter requirement aside. The representative of Iraq has emphasized that draft resolution A deals with an important question. On 23 October, in the First Committee, the Permanent Representative of Iraq, Mr. Al-Ali, said: "We have to make every country in the world aware of its responsibilities with regard to this very important question."²⁰

185. It cannot be argued that the General Assembly has the authority to decide to do away with the requirement for a two-thirds majority. It goes without saying, and I think no one in this room would contest it, that the General Assembly has no right to change fundamental provisions of the Charter. Draft resolution A does not—I repeat does not—present a question relating to the discretionary authority which the General Assembly possesses under Article 18, paragraph 3—the authority to decide what additional questions shall be treated as requiring a two-thirds majority. On the contrary, it is a matter relating to paragraph 2 of Article 18. As to such a question, the General Assembly cannot change the Charter and it cannot change the rules explicitly embodied in the Charter.

186. We hope and trust that the procedural vote on this question will confirm the continuing validity of Article 18, paragraph 2, rather than, through a negative outcome, erasing it from the Charter of the United Nations.

187. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): In the view of the United Kingdom, there is no question but that draft resolution A, under Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter, requires a two-thirds majority. I listened with great care and attention, as I always do, to the representative of Saudi Arabia. I must say with great respect that I did not entirely understand his argument. When one looks at the Charter—not at the rules of procedure of the General Assembly but at the Charter—when one looks at the voting provisions of the Charter and when one reads Article 18, paragraph 2, which begins with the words "Decisions of the General Assembly", can it be argued that the action we are being asked to take does not constitute a decision of the General Assembly? If it is not a decision of the General Assembly, then, with great respect, I have no idea what it is. It clearly is a decision of the Assembly and it is also a question which

clearly falls within the first of those listed in Article 18, paragraph 2, namely "recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security". Can any representative here who reads operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A before us deny that it is a recommendation with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security? It clearly is. Indeed, it calls upon all States to co-operate fully in effective action to avert a menace to international peace and security. Operative paragraph 2 requests the Security Council to take action under Chapter VII of the Charter, and everybody in this room knows what Chapter VII of the Charter deals with: it deals with threats to the maintenance of international peace and security. I repeat, draft resolution A clearly falls within Article 18, paragraph 2.

188. Furthermore, it is clear—quite clear, in our view—that, because the question falls within Article 18, paragraph 2, it is not a matter which can be decided by a simple majority vote.

189. I should like representatives to look also at Article 18, paragraph 3. What does that refer to? It refers only to "Decisions on other questions" or additional questions. That must mean—it is the only conceivable explanation of the words—questions other than or additional to those already covered by Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter.

190. In my delegation's view, the only way in which this issue can be determined constitutionally and in accordance with the Charter—not with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, but with the Charter of the United Nations itself—is by putting draft resolution A to the vote under Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter. Any other course would, in our view, be contrary to the Charter.

191. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): If I did not have some experience in the United Nations pertaining, *inter alia*, to procedure, I would have perhaps given way to the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, thinking that they had more experience in these matters. I gained my experience here in the United Nations. I do not represent a big Power. I try to find things out for myself instead of going around lobbying for anything. If I wanted to lobby, I would be a very poor lobbyist. I know that if I asked someone to vote with me he might later approach me on a question on which I did not agree with him and attempt to secure my vote. That is why I have never lobbied and I hope people will learn a lesson and not lobby. But that is the way things are done, not only in the United Nations, but in all political organizations. I believe that the position of the United States Government was set on this point of a two-thirds majority before I spoke. Mr. Leonard had his remarks prepared in advance. It never occurred to me before I spoke whether the vote would require a two-thirds majority or a simple majority.

192. I should like to address my words now to Mr. Richard. Although English is not my native language, I learned it at a very tender age and many people tell me that I am quite clear when I speak. I therefore do not understand why Mr. Richard should be confused. He is using what I would call a very, very subtle English ploy. I know it, since I lived in his country for some 10 years. He is being polite but says, at the same time, "I am confused".

²⁰ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, First Committee*, 12th meeting, p. 68, and *ibid.*, *First Committee, Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

How can he say that? He is a friend—but that has nothing to do with it. We are here to argue cases. I must remind him that my best friend who fought against me on the question of self-determination for eight years was none other than Sir Samuel Hoare, and we remained friends. Mr. Richard has used a subtlety to influence the Assembly.

193. My good friend, the representative of the United States, had a statement prepared on the two-thirds majority. The United States has a great deal of clout and it has many clients. I wish we could have as many clients as the United States has, but we do not wield power. And the representative of the United Kingdom uses such subtle words—"I was confused" and "I did not understand it". I must mention these points, so that they will pay attention to what I am going to say now. I have to recapitulate, but not at length, because I believe that many Members are not confused but that many did not know that this question of voting would arise.

194. I would remind my good friends, the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, that I can cite—I wish I had the documents with me—many issues during the last 30 years related to questions which might fall under Article 18, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the Charter. I do not want to prove them wrong after the fact because as we say in Arabic, "What is the use of crying over the heads of the dead" and the point will have been decided one way or the other. But many problems threatening peace as much as, perhaps more than, the war in the Middle East were brought to the General Assembly and not directly to the Security Council. In certain cases, such as an embargo, a two-thirds majority would be needed. But the point here, for my good friends the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, is the following. It is the General Assembly, whether in committee or in the plenary meetings, that is dealing with this. I have always thought it wrong, and my Canadian friend, I think, made this point this year in the General Committee, but some representatives ask for items to be discussed in plenary meetings of the Assembly because they think it gives the matter importance. This big hall does not enhance their arguments. Their arguments should be based on what they think is true and presented simply for agreement or refutation.

195. I would like the representative of the United Kingdom in particular to take note of this. I learned a lot from him even before he came to us because I asked myself, "How does he know so many things?" He is a parliamentarian. I said, "No wonder, he knows the tricks of the game". I learned many things from him. I do not pretend to teach him now, but I would humbly suggest to him that there has been many an item—forget the question of Palestine, the question of the Middle East—that dealt with a crisis more formidable than, or as formidable as, or as acute, if I may use that word, as this question. The introduction of this matter has been attributed only to Iraq on purpose, as if Iraq were the evil spirit behind it, though many non-Arab delegations sponsored the draft resolution. Here is the point, and I hope there will be no confusion: the resolutions of Committees have to come to the General Assembly. The Committees discuss matters with the full knowledge that in spite of the acuteness of the crisis, or the problem, or whether world peace is endangered, they, not the 15 members of the Security Council, will be pronounc-

ing upon it. They wanted the Committee, or in this instance the General Assembly, since in this context it is like a committee, to discuss the matter, knowing all the time that all decisions here are recommendatory and not mandatory.

196. Even the representative of the United Kingdom, who is a member of the Security Council, should know from the record as well as from the experience of the last four or five years that he has been participating in the work of the Security Council, that 95 per cent of the resolutions of the Security Council are not even followed through, either because of the veto or because there is a consensus that suits everybody; and nothing happens.

197. Are you going to deny the General Assembly the right to pronounce itself—never mind the result of the vote—on a draft resolution which is recommendatory and not mandatory? Are you going to say, "This is the prerogative of the Security Council. Later we could take the matter up in the General Assembly"? I think the result would be zero: no sanctions; nothing. Ask me, and from my humble experience that is what I would say. Why is it that the representative of the United Kingdom wants to deny the General Assembly its right? Is it for propaganda purposes? Is it to show he is marching like a stooge behind Israel? It is pathetic, honestly.

198. I will defend at any time any Jew who does not use religion as a motivation for political ends. And I will fight any Moslem or any Christian or any Bhuddist who wants to use religion in that way. That has been tried before and it has failed; but now there is a new Khazar experiment in our area. I say a Khazar experiment because our Jews never thought of such things.

199. Am I clear? Have I dispelled the confusion?

200. If anyone wants to argue the case further, I am prepared to do so and I shall do so, indeed, with all the objectivity and detachment that I am capable of, forgetting the specific subject matter. I repeat, the General Assembly has no right to impose sanctions, but it can talk of sanctions and it can recommend sanctions and the other things mentioned in Article 18 of the Charter by a draft resolution that will be voted on.

201. If I have made my position clear to my good friends, especially from the United States and the United Kingdom, I shall be pleased. If not, I shall have to listen to what they say, or I shall ask the Legal Counsel to comment. I shall not embarrass him by asking him to rationalize the law on the side of one or the other party. I hope that is clearly understood by my good friends. I am at their disposal if they want to carry the matter further.

202. Finally, I submit that even if there were a more than two-thirds majority things would not be changed here, since all resolutions are recommendatory; but that does not prevent our making recommendations to other General Assembly sessions—or, in particular, if that is wanted, to the Security Council. I hope I have this time made my point clear.

203. Mr. AL-ATIYYAH (Iraq): It was the understanding of my delegation and of the other sponsors of the draft

resolution A/C.1/33/L.1, now draft resolution A, that rule 83 of the rules of procedure was not applicable to this case. It is rather obvious that most, if not all, of the matters discussed by the First Committee relate to peace and security. As a matter of fact, among the conclusions of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly, as mentioned in paragraph 32 of annex II of General Assembly resolution 2837 (XXVI), appears the following:

“The Special Committee, recognizing that the role of the First Committee is essentially political, recommends that this Committee devote itself primarily to problems of peace, security and disarmament.”

However, the procedure that has been adopted by the General Assembly concerning all draft resolutions referred to it by the First Committee has been that the voting should be on the basis of a simple majority.

204. Furthermore, I should like to point out that at its thirty-second session the General Assembly adopted resolution 32/105 F, relating to military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa. The elements of that resolution are similar to those in the present draft resolution concerning military and nuclear collaboration with Israel. Nevertheless, the voting took place on the basis of a simple majority at the thirty-second session.

205. However, we are faced today with a situation in which a number of delegations are requesting a change in the procedure that has been consistently adopted by the General Assembly concerning First Committee draft resolutions and similar draft resolutions adopted by other organs. My delegation is convinced that recourse to such tactics is a disservice to this body and constitutes a precedent which would be detrimental to the United Nations. It is no surprise that those who advocate such manoeuvres are those who have consistently opposed and stood out against most of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations concerning the Middle East problem.

206. I should like to point out, however, that the draft resolution under consideration was actually adopted in the First Committee by more than a two-thirds majority. We have no doubt that it will achieve a similar success here. However, the question under debate now is a matter of principle: shall we allow a minority to dictate its terms to the majority by resorting to unknown tactics and manoeuvres that are definitely alien to the spirit of the United Nations and its Charter?

207. We know that the General Assembly is the master of its own rules, and if a delegation for one reason or another wants us to vote on a particular draft resolution on the basis of a two-thirds majority, it is free to request that. In that case, we would invoke rule 85 which you, Mr. President, personally mentioned. Accordingly we will go along with the suggestion made by you.

208. Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, concerning the statement you made with regard to the conduct of the work, I should like to give the reasons for our vote.

209. The delegation of Uruguay will vote in favour of the two-thirds majority requirement because we consider that the decision which the General Assembly is to take on draft resolution A in document A/33/461 is an important question. We consider that the operative part of the draft resolution is entirely covered by the provisions of Article 18, of the Charter and in rule 83 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly which state that among the questions considered as important are “recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security”.

210. That affirmation is reinforced by the fact that the fifth preambular paragraph of this part of the draft resolution refers precisely to what Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter and rule 83 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly laid down with regard to General Assembly decisions on important questions. I quote the paragraph of the preamble concerning this point:

“Recognizing that the continued escalation of Israeli armament constitutes a threat to international peace and security . . .”

211. From the foregoing, the situation is quite clear. We are not speaking of the substance of the matter. It is merely a question of whether we are going to comply with the Charter or violate it once more.

212. Mr. EL-CHOUFFI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I was surprised to hear the statement made by Mr. Leonard, the representative of the United States, who said that the taking of a decision on the question of preventing Israel from acquiring nuclear weapons without a two-thirds majority might lead to undermining the United Nations Charter on the ground that the General Assembly does not have the right to alter the Charter and that this question is an important question which requires a two-thirds majority. In fact, respect for the procedures and for the Charter, in my view, should be comprehensive, in the sense that we should not respect the Charter in regard to one item and show disrespect in regard to another item which is very similar to the first. As has been mentioned by a number of representatives who preceded me, all the work done by the First Committee and all the topics discussed before that Committee are matters related to international peace and security. Moreover, this evening we have adopted two resolutions in one of which—that relating to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East—is stated that the General Assembly is convinced that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East would greatly enhance international peace and security in that area. However, nobody required a two-thirds majority when voting on that resolution which the Assembly just adopted. I am speaking of resolution 33/64.

213. There is another resolution related to the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, which is contained in document A/33/429. That resolution was adopted as resolution 33/63. Paragraph 4 of that resolution states:

“Requests the Security Council to exercise a close watch on South Africa and to take appropriate effective

steps to prevent South Africa from developing and acquiring nuclear weapons which endanger international peace and security".²¹

Here again, as representatives may note, the reference is very clear, that is to say, there is a reference to the threat to international peace and security posed by the possibility of South Africa's acquiring nuclear weapons.

214. Without going into the substance of the draft resolution before this Assembly and in view of the way in which the Assembly and its Main Committees have conducted their voting during the thirty-third session, I think it is obvious that the difference between Israel and South Africa is non-existent. Therefore, those who are worrying about procedure and the Charter should have required a two-thirds majority vote on the resolution concerning the Declaration of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

215. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): After having heard the various views of the representatives who have spoken, I find further valid reasons for reaffirming my conclusion that the General Assembly must take a prior decision on whether draft resolution A requires for adoption a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. A recorded vote will be taken.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Samoa, Singapore, Suriname, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Abstaining: Bhutan, Burma, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, India, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, United Republic of Cameroon

²¹ Quoted in English by the speaker.

By 70 votes to 38, with 26 abstentions, it was decided that a two-thirds majority was not required.

216. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now vote on draft resolution A of the 14 draft resolutions grouped under the title "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session" in paragraph 33 of the report of the First Committee [A/33/461]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Suriname, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Abstaining: Argentina, Barbados, Burma, Central African Empire, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Greece, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Upper Volta, Venezuela

Draft resolution A was adopted by 72 votes to 30, with 37 abstentions (resolution 33/71 A).

217. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Israel who wishes to explain his vote.

218. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The manner in which this resolution was just adopted by the General Assembly is yet another illustration of the way in which a mathematical majority of the General Assembly is mobilized in order to violate the Charter of the United Nations. Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter unequivocally states:

"Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. These questions shall in-

clude: recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security . . .”.

219. The language of Article 18, paragraph 2 is categorical: “these questions shall include”. The resolution is equally clear. In its fifth preambular paragraph it refers to “a threat to international peace and security”, and operative paragraphs 1 and 2 mention specifically Chapter VII of the Charter which is entitled “Action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression”. All respected and authoritative legal opinion is unanimous in saying that the resolution in question comes squarely within the language of Article 18, paragraph 2 of the Charter and that the question of whether a two-thirds majority is required for it should not even have been put. However, the mathematical majority thought otherwise.

220. There is no need for me to waste any words on the implications of this. Following directly from the language of the Charter it is clear that those who prompted that mathematical majority to vote as it did on the improperly put procedural question do not regard the decision of the General Assembly as an important one. We shall, therefore, follow them in that regard, and we are sure that the Security Council, if the matter ever comes before it as requested in the operative paragraphs, will likewise take due note of the view of the General Assembly that this question is not an important one. This is one more illustration of the manner in which, at the time when all efforts are being made to overcome 30 years of bitter hostility in our region, the General Assembly is being bullied into adopting policies of confrontation and condemnation in lieu of policies of reconciliation and peace. We have duly taken note of the fact that, in doing this, the majority, with its eyes wide open, has belittled the significance of its action by determining that its decision is not important. We shall treat this resolution, accordingly, as an unimportant resolution.

221. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of

Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Draft resolution B was adopted by 103 votes to 18, with 18 abstentions (resolution 33/71 B).²²

222. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote draft resolution C. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: China, France

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

Draft resolution C was adopted by 130 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions (resolution 33/71 C).

²² The delegation of Mauritius subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

223. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We now turn to draft resolution D. The First Committee adopted it by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution D?

Draft resolution D was adopted (resolution 33/71 D).

224. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We come now to draft resolution E. The First Committee adopted it by consensus. May I consider that the General Assembly adopts draft resolution E?

Draft resolution E was adopted (resolution 33/71 E).

225. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We now turn to draft resolution F. The First Committee adopted it by consensus. May I consider that the General Assembly decides to adopt draft resolution F?

Draft resolution F was adopted (resolution 33/71 F).

226. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Next, we turn to draft resolution G. The First Committee adopted it by consensus. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution G?

Draft resolution G was adopted (resolution 33/71 G).

227. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote draft resolution H. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands,²³ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution H was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 13 abstentions (resolution 33/71 H).

228. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We come now to draft resolution I. The First Committee adopted it by consensus. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution I?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 33/71 I).

229. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote draft resolution J. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Sao Tome and Principe, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America

Draft resolution J was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 18 abstentions (resolution 33/71 J).

230. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We now turn to draft resolution K. The First Committee

²³ The delegation of the Netherlands subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

adopted it by consensus. May I consider that the General Assembly adopts draft resolution K?

Draft resolution K was adopted (resolution 33/71 K).

231. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We come now to draft resolution L. The First Committee adopted it by consensus. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution L?

Draft resolution L was adopted (resolution 33/71 L).

232. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We now come to draft resolution M. The First Committee adopted it by consensus. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution M?

Draft resolution M was adopted (resolution 33/71 M).

233. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Lastly, we come to draft resolution N. The First Committee adopted it by consensus. May I consider that the General Assembly adopts draft resolution N?

Draft resolution N was adopted (resolution 33/71 N).

234. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Next we shall consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 128 [A/33/462]. In paragraph 10 of its report the First Committee is recommending to the Assembly for adoption two draft resolutions under the heading "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States".

235. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

236. Mr. SEZAKI (Japan): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A and B in document A/33/462. I must emphasize, however, that we shall do so with certain reservations. In our view, not only do the draft conventions proposed by the Soviet Union and Pakistan on the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States fail to dispel serious doubts about verification and the effectiveness of such conventions but they risk destabilizing the international military balance in such a way that it might bring about results directly contrary to the goal of strengthening international peace and security. In the end, however, last week's efforts by the parties concerned in the First Committee resulted in amendments to the draft resolution in question the effect of which was to broaden the scope of the matter to be considered by the Committee on Disarmament. It is only because of those amendments that my delegation, which is deeply concerned about the strengthening of the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States, will vote in favour of both draft resolutions and is now prepared to join in taking up this matter in the Committee on Disarmament.

237. Mr. MADADHA (Jordan): In conformity with our position in the First Committee concerning draft resolution A in document A/33/462 under agenda item 128, the delegation of Jordan requests a separate recorded vote

on the third preambular paragraph. Jordan will abstain in the vote on that paragraph because it is contrary to our position concerning the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, since it does not take into consideration the differing nature of various regions. We believe that no country that is in favour of the establishment of such zones should hesitate to declare its intention unconditionally, since the interests of international peace and security have never been conditional.

238. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now take a decision on draft resolutions A and B recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 10 of its report [A/33/462]. The first vote will be on draft resolution A. As requested by the representative of Jordan a separate vote will be taken on the third preambular paragraph of that draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Bahrain, Djibouti, France, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

The third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A was adopted by 118 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.²⁴

²⁴ The delegation of Brazil subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

239. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Albania, China

Abstaining: France, Pakistan, Somalia, Turkey

Draft resolution A, as a whole, was adopted by 137 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions (resolution 33/72 A).

240. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now vote on draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway,

Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bhutan, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, India, Ireland,²⁵ Israel, Mongolia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America

Draft resolution B was adopted by 124 votes to none, with 14 abstentions (resolution 33/72 B).

241. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Albania, who wishes to explain his vote.

242. Mr. CERGA (Albania): During the First Committee debate concerning agenda item 128 the delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania expressed its viewpoint on the question of concluding an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States. In the Committee our delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.2 and did not participate in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.15/Rev.1.

243. In explaining our vote in the First Committee our delegation gave the reasons for its stand.²⁶ We do not wish to go into detail again in order to explain our stand, but we deem it necessary to point out that the danger posed by the nuclear weapons which the imperialist super-Powers and imperialist Powers have manufactured and continue to manufacture is neither diminished nor eliminated by conventions and juridical formulas, especially when these are proposed and drawn up by the imperialist super-Powers.

244. The *pro forma* guarantees proposed by the imperialist super-Powers do not exclude the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons. The texts of both the draft convention and draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev.1 submitted to the First Committee contain formulations aimed at legalizing the right of the super-Powers to maintain their arsenals of nuclear weapons and carry on the production and perfection of those weapons, and at legalizing their use whenever the nuclear Powers deem it fit.

245. Those are some of the reasons which caused the delegation of Albania to vote against draft resolution A contained in the report submitted to the General Assembly by the First Committee.

²⁵ The delegation of Ireland subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

²⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, First Committee, 27th meeting, pp. 11-17, and ibid., First Committee, Sessional Fascicle, corrigendum.*

246. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee [A/33/486] on agenda item 50 entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". The First Committee is recommending to the Assembly for adoption draft resolutions I to IV in paragraph 13 of its report.

247. I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes before the voting on the draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee.

248. Mr. MONTIEL ARGÜELLO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): There were serious irregularities in the way in which draft resolution IV, on the situation in Nicaragua, adopted by the First Committee was dealt with. First of all, this draft resolution was taken up in the First Committee although it had already been decided that the First Committee would deal exclusively with the question of disarmament and other matters closely related to disarmament. There is nothing in the draft resolution which has the slightest reference to disarmament. Secondly, the debate and the voting took place on the same day in which copies of the revised draft were distributed. It is true that on the previous day copies of the draft resolution had been distributed, but that was the draft before revision, which introduced substantial changes. Thirdly, the draft resolution was introduced under item 50 of the agenda, which deals with the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The draft resolution is nothing more than flagrant intervention in the internal affairs of Nicaragua and there is nothing in it related to international security.

249. Reference is made in the draft resolution to a violation of the territory of Costa Rica by Nicaraguan military aircraft, but as a basis for submitting the draft resolution that is extremely weak and a patent exaggeration.

250. It is true that some months ago Nicaraguan aircraft crossed the frontier in hot pursuit of guerrillas from Costa Rica who had carried out raids into the territory of Nicaragua. Costa Rica used that incident, which caused it no damage in lives or property, to request intervention by the Organization of American States [OAS], which then convened a meeting of Foreign Ministers. The meeting investigated the matter and gave its views on it.

251. Then within the inter-American system Venezuela requested another meeting of the Foreign Ministers. My country supported that request and a meeting was convened, which is still under way.

252. I shall not try to establish the exact limits of the competence of our world Organization in respect of matters relating to regional affairs when there are regional agreements and regional bodies involved. I am sure that all Members of our Organization would agree, however, that when those regional bodies are taking active and effective measures to deal with a regional problem, our Organization should not place any obstacles in their way by adopting resolutions on the problem.

253. The present case is all the more serious in that among the sponsors of the draft resolution we have three American States: Colombia, Panama and Venezuela. The fact that those countries do not have confidence in the inter-American system would not, I think, justify their sponsoring the draft resolution now before us. I would recall that Venezuela had earlier requested Security Council action but that body, which was informed of the actions of the OAS, rejected that request. I would just point out that I have not referred to Cuba which, in spite of being an American country, was expelled from all participation in the OAS.

254. I would maintain, accordingly, that since the OAS is fully informed of the situation in Nicaragua and is taking active and effective measures, there should be no resolution on this matter here.

255. One of the measures taken by the OAS was the establishment of a friendly *ad hoc* Committee of Conciliatory Efforts, composed of representatives of the Dominican Republic, the United States of America and Guatemala. That Committee has been quite successful in its activities and is now negotiating to ensure that the Nicaraguan people can take a decision on their future.

256. The Government of Nicaragua has already removed any restrictions there were on constitutional guarantees and has decreed total and unconditional amnesty for those responsible for political or any related crimes. Accordingly, Nicaraguan citizens are fully exercising their human rights, and there are no political detainees. This is something that cannot be said of all the countries sponsoring the draft resolution, and it is proof that the Government of Nicaragua wishes to achieve a lasting peace.

257. As I have spoken about the situation in Nicaragua, I should like to repeat what I have said on earlier occasions, which is that this situation is the result of terrorist attacks and action by subversive movements, helped by various foreign countries, including some of the sponsors of this draft resolution.

258. The purpose of those attacks and the action of those movements was to bring about the overthrow of the Government of my country, which has been given a mandate as a result of popular elections, in accordance with the democratic Constitution governing my country.

259. Those actions failed because they were rejected by the Nicaraguan people who love peace and order. There has been no repression of the civilian population, although during the restoration of peace there was unfortunately loss of human life and material damage. However, that damage and loss of life has been greatly exaggerated in the First Committee debate. I should like to say that the responsibility for that loss of life and damage was not that of the Government of Nicaragua, which could not allow disorder to prevail, but rather that of those who initiated the violence and the foreign countries which helped them.

260. The acts of terrorism and the activities of subversive movements in Nicaragua can in no way justify the statement that there is a danger to international security. Such activities occur not only in Nicaragua but in many

other countries. We constantly see news reports about terrorist attacks in many countries, including developed countries and also about subversive or guerrilla movements in many other countries, including several South American countries which have sponsored this draft resolution. To date, it has not occurred to anybody that the United Nations should deal with such internal affairs and adopt resolutions on these matters, because that would be contrary to the principle of non-intervention, one of the fundamental principles of our Organization.

261. As far as concerns the violation of human rights—which is something my country is accused of in this draft resolution—I would state emphatically that this is a totally false allegation and it was only reported in press dispatches that were intended to defame my country. The only action that was taken was to maintain order, and even the restriction on constitutional guarantees, which it was necessary to enact, has now been lifted.

262. During the debate, a report of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights was mentioned to justify the allegation that human rights have been violated in my country. My country rejected that report, *inter alia*, because it had not had an adequate opportunity to defend itself. Moreover, the OAS has not taken a position on that report, and it would be rather illogical for our Organization to use it as a basis for its resolutions.

263. Moreover, I would just say that this draft resolution lacks balance because it only mentions the obligations of the Government of Nicaragua. It makes no reference to the obligations of foreign countries not to help those who are trying to disturb the peace in Nicaragua, nor to those countries which should refuse to allow their territory to be used for the preparation of raids against Nicaragua. Such actions are indeed international crimes, and it is those countries which are responsible for the situation in Nicaragua. The draft resolution should rather have been directed against them.

264. In conclusion, I should like to say that the draft resolution before us creates an extremely dangerous precedent because of procedural irregularities in the handling of resolutions. However, even more serious than this, it would set a precedent for a violation of the principle of non-intervention and would also jeopardize the prestige and effectiveness of the regional organizations.

265. We cannot allow ourselves to be carried away by passing emotions and violate those basic principles.

266. I should like to repeat that the Government of Nicaragua is deeply concerned to achieve a stable peace and is doing all it can, with the co-operation of the friendly *ad hoc* Committee of Conciliatory Efforts of the OAS.

267. It is true that in the preambular part of the draft resolution a passing reference is made to the efforts of that *ad hoc* Committee of the OAS, but that in no way changes the basic practical effect of the draft resolution. All the draft resolution does is to encourage the advocates of violence and the enemies of peace, thus going against the paramount objective of our Organization.

268. All peace-loving countries must co-operate and work together to ensure that we do not approve resolutions full of censure and criticism, such as the present one, which in no way help us to move towards our noble objective.

269. For all these reasons, the delegation of Nicaragua will vote against the draft resolution, and we would call on all countries which truly desire a peaceful solution to the situation in Nicaragua not to lend their support to this draft.

270. Mr. PIZA-ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I certainly do not wish to try to reopen the debate of this question of Nicaragua. This is something which has been judged by all the peoples who respect the sovereignty of neighbouring countries, their territorial integrity and the dignity and worth of the human being, and freedom and justice. I just wanted to point to a few facts which I think should be made known to all Members of the United Nations, particularly to those who for any reason are unfamiliar with the changes that the peoples of the Latin American continent sometimes experience.

271. It is a matter of importance to my delegation to make these explanations before the vote is taken, although, for reasons of procedure, we have only a very short time to express our serious concern about a problem which has become one of exceptional gravity for the people and Government of Costa Rica and, as we have said, which has indeed seriously jeopardized peace and security throughout our region.

272. For a long time, long before our independence was achieved, for the people of Costa Rica peace represented not the state of quiet and dejection produced by the rule of force and the infringement of civil liberties, but the release of the forces of the mind that enable man to fulfil his destiny.

273. From the very first days of our independence, at a time when Costa Rica was trying to perfect its democratic system, which had always been based on respect for fundamental freedoms and human dignity, our sympathy with the sufferings of other peoples led us to make our country an inviolate asylum for those who were persecuted politically whatever their allegiance or ideology and degree of their support in our country.

274. Since 1827, the year in which our Government first passed a decree allowing for political asylum—and indeed it was for a Nicaraguan—people have been coming to Costa Rica seeking peace of mind and security for their persons. They have hailed from all countries and have been of all political persuasions. They have ranged from humble men who, to lift their voices in protest against the abuses committed by their Governments, have suffered torture and imprisonment to glorious heroes of mankind like Jose Martí and the Maceo brothers. They included distinguished public figures, like Rómulo Betancourt, Pedro Joaquín Chamorro, Juan Bosch, Miguel A. Morales and the illustrious President Carlos Andrés Pérez of Venezuela. There have been many who have shared with us the gift of freedom and the warmth of human brotherhood.

275. That attitude has brought us the hostility of régimes that see in our democracy and our protection of the victims of persecution a danger to the survival of the system of predation and shame.
276. In the 1870s Costa Rica was faced with the alternative of either surrendering a prominent political refugee, the former head of State of a Central American country, to whom neither our Government nor our people was sympathetic, or of having to go to war, for which we were not prepared because we are never prepared for war. Finally, our love of peace had to yield to the defence of the principles and dignity of the human person, and against our will and our possibilities and assuming risks, we took the hard road of war, which was declared against us in order to force us to give up the person in question. In the end, just as is happening now, our determination to protect human beings triumphed thanks to our moral steadfastness and the support which, again today, we are receiving promptly from other brotherly nations which also honour the supreme values of the human spirit.
277. Forty-five years ago, when a foreign intervention, abhorred by all right-thinking free peoples, established in power in Nicaragua the founder of the Somoza dynasty, a political régime was set up in that country in which the daily fare was corruption, despotism, the infringement of civil liberties, and the prostitution of democratic principles, with all that that entails in the way of torture, assassination, insecurity, poverty and despair. As principles usually prevail over utilitarian calculations, especially when the principles have become the *raison d'être* of a people such as mine, Costa Rica neither could nor would shirk its destiny as a country dedicated to human dignity. Thus it was that throughout this dark period in the life of the brother Nicaraguan people my country threw its doors open wide to all those who were being persecuted by the implacable fury of a Government which employed to stifle the chorus of protest voiced by the great majority of its people methods which are a blot on the history of humanity and a perversion of American traditions.
278. Costa Rica has always recognized the right of political asylum and has welcomed on its soil more than 100,000 Nicaraguans throughout the duration of the Somoza dynasty and in this respect it is absolutely uncompromising. We believe that the right of asylum is not only an attribute of a State but also a subjective right of every human being, who may claim it from the Costa Rican Government itself, and Costa Rica will never accept any derogation from that right.
279. Let us call things by their right names. Right now the situation is such that only the Nicaraguan régime sticks up for the Nicaraguan régime. It has many covert or naive friends that offer it help by producing strained arguments out of their sleeves in a last-ditch effort to secure at the very least a few abstentions or what is called "non-participation".
280. These far-fetched arguments may be summed up as follows.
281. First of all, they argue that, although the tragedy of Nicaragua relates to mass violations of human rights and the infringement of the freedom of the Nicaraguan people, it is a matter exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of that State and therefore neither requires nor permits intervention on the part of the international community.
282. Secondly, they argue that the problem of Nicaragua is and should remain a problem within the exclusive jurisdiction of the OAS, which is the natural and competent regional forum, and that, in the circumstances, there is no justification for intervention by the United Nations, at least at the present stage.
283. Thirdly, they also argue that for the United Nations to take action at the present stage is inadvisable because there is an intense effort of international mediation going on under the auspices of the OAS and that this effort has already made some progress, including a certain relaxation in the restrictions on freedom of expression; apparently the termination of martial law; a possible amnesty and also the holding of an eventual plebiscite in which the Nicaraguan people would decide whether Somoza should stay in power or not.
284. Fourthly, it is also argued that the international problems between Costa Rica and Nicaragua are merely border skirmishes involving only a few meters of Costa Rican territory and are not sufficiently serious to be called a serious threat to international peace and security. In this way they speak of Central America as if it were an operetta setting in which the human beings who are every day suffering and dying were actors in some kind of tragicomedy who have only to take off their make-up, embrace each other, and peace and brotherhood will prevail. However grotesque this may appear, I am sorry to say this was the impression given almost in so many words in the discussion in the Committee.
285. Fifthly, it is said that Costa Rica has to some extent provoked those problems by encouraging and providing asylum for the rebels who are fighting to throw off the Somoza dynasty.
286. I should like, at the risk of abusing the patience of the representatives present here, to reply briefly to these five objections in turn.
287. First of all, the principle of non-intervention, which is always invoked to delay legitimate international action, has to yield to collective international action. The principle of non-intervention was invented to protect the small nations against the abuses of the big ones.
288. In the Charter of the OAS it is stated quite clearly that the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States has nothing to do with legitimate intervention undertaken collectively by the OAS. In the United Nations Charter it is not so clear in all its aspects, but it is clear that in cases in which a threat is posed to international peace and security, legitimate intervention by the United Nations is expressly exempted from the principle of non-intervention. We also believe that the same exception should be made in the case of massive and flagrant violations of human rights, such as those that the report of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights indicated have taken place in Nicaragua. If this is not so, why do we

vote here in the United Nations against racism and *apartheid*? Why should we be concerned and take action against violations of human rights in Chile or in Palestine? Why do we demand the right to self-determination for Western Sahara or Belize? Why do we intervene in Lebanon and in Cyprus? Are the Nicaraguans and the Central Americans generally second-class citizens and for them there is no right to peace and self-determination, nor the fundamental rights and freedoms of the human person, which is the corner-stone of our Organization? Or is it that those other cases are not cases of violations of human rights but that only some of them are; that is to say they are without clear-cut implications of an international character?

289. It is also said that we must wait until the OAS acts. I should like to remind my colleagues the representatives of the States members of the OAS that Costa Rica had for many years and on many occasions had to resort to this Organization to denounce similar problems, as well as the many OAS resolutions condemning Nicaragua which that country continues to ignore. The latest of these resolutions was adopted only a few days ago. The Nicaraguan representative naturally tried to minimize this resolution here, but it contains a clear and explicit condemnation of the incursions into Costa Rican territory early in September this year, stating that they were deliberate and were carried out in full awareness. We all know that in Nicaragua the army acts deliberately because everything comes out of a single head, which is that of the lord of the country and indeed of everything else.

290. What is clear is that the violations committed against our territory, air space and territorial waters are not small infractions concerning only a few meters—even though even one meter would be sufficiently serious for us. Only lately have we been the victim of constant invasions of our territorial waters, including one case in which some Costa Rican fishing boats were seized in order to be exchanged for some Nicaraguan fishing craft which were seized for fishing in my country's waters.

291. Costa Rica has the right to use the San Juan River for civil navigation and the humble boats of our peasants use it every day as they convey their products via this waterway, but they are hailed, sometimes seized and almost always detained by the Nicaraguan authorities, who do not permit them to use a part of Costa Rican territory and thus invalidate a part of the right of Costa Rica over its own territory, in this case the right of free navigation.

292. A few days ago some launches fishing in Costa Rican waters were seized and taken to Nicaraguan territory. Since it turned out that the crew was American they were very speedily set free.

293. Not only was our air space invaded at the beginning of September but this happened very differently from the way the Nicaraguan representative described it—without damage to life or property. There was one person gravely injured; a professor who was accompanying a group of students who were preparing to go to the Nicaraguan frontier to receive the torch of freedom which had come from Guatemala for the 15th of September events.

294. A few days later, helicopters belonging to the Nicaraguan air force seized the group, claiming they were Nicaraguan citizens, although they had been living in Costa Rica for many years and were residents of Costa Rica. They were seized on Costa Rican territory and were taken to Nicaragua. As far as I know, there has been no news of what happened to them.

295. Thus, we are not dealing with a sporadic and accidental series of events. In November or December last year, Nicaraguan aircraft strafed our Ministry of Security on Costa Rican territory and the group of civilians who were guarding it. More recently, a patrol of our humble civil guards—who, I have to repeat, hardly know how to fire their weapons, if they know or if they have not forgotten—who were doing the duty that Mr. Somoza requires of us to protect our backs and were searching the area near the border for possible Nicaraguan rebels, was savagely fired upon, leaving two dead and one injured. What was left of the patrol was taken to Managua as prisoners. As I say, these facts are neither isolated nor accidental.

296. But there is something even more important to which I can bear witness. All of this has kept the people of Costa Rica in a state of indignation bordering on despair. We do not know how many days longer we will be able to keep this indignation in check, but what is certain is that we are on the threshold of a very grave situation. It is very grave in many respects, especially because Costa Rica is not alone; my country has been offered generous help by friendly countries—among which I should like to mention especially Venezuela and Panama—which are prepared to furnish their assistance, including military assistance if necessary, whereupon the conflict would become even more serious.

297. Moreover, on what authority is it said that when there is a case pending before a regional organization the United Nations loses its competence and its jurisdiction with respect to its solution? Here in the United Nations there are very many examples of the opposite. To adduce one case concerning America itself, resolutions were adopted at this session on the case of Chile, which we all recognize as having no international implications but which is simply singled out as a case of serious violations of human rights. The United Nations has adopted these resolutions encouraged with their votes by some delegations which now abstain in the case of Nicaragua, possibly because a case affecting a large South American State is more important than a case affecting a small and poor Central American State.

298. It is also being said that matters are about to be settled in Nicaragua; that the OAS friendly *ad hoc* Committee on Conciliatory Efforts is making progress; that Somoza has now lifted the restrictions on freedom of expression and ended martial law; that political prisoners have been set free; that an amnesty will be granted; and that the Nicaraguan people are to be given an opportunity to decide whether or not Somoza should remain in power. First of all if this is not complacency, it is at least ingenious. We supported and welcomed the idea of a committee of conciliation. We have no doubt of its good intentions or of its positive achievements, however slow and modest they are in coming. But we do not labour under the illusion that the tragedy of Nicaragua is being resolved in

this way. Of what use is freedom of expression to the Nicaraguan people when anyone who avails himself of it knows that the régime has nothing to prevent it—certainly no scruples—from wiping him out physically, morally, and economically, as well as his family, and when there are no channels or machinery whereby public opinion, however unanimous it might be, can change the situation? What would the Nicaraguan people have to gain in raising the stage of seige if they know that in fact the Somoza régime has maintained and will continue to maintain perpetual martial law in which simple civilians are judged and condemned without defence attorneys and without due process by military tribunals on the base of a code of military justice, which is not legislated but is rather a simple set of rules inherited from the era of United States military occupation and badly translated into Spanish to boot? Think how many political prisoners will be released by a régime that calls any opposition as Communist terrorism and a common crime. Think in what conditions and with what guarantees of freedom and impartiality a plebiscite can have in Nicaragua as long as Somoza is in power.

299. We must convince ourselves that we are not dealing with a normal situation or even a situation that might become normal; that after 45 years of corruption, humiliation and despotism the miracle of a bloodless change cannot be produced at one stroke; that although Nicaragua now needs urgent and abundant international assistance to liberate itself from the tyranny that oppresses it, it will need much more urgent and abundant assistance later to reconstruct the country from the ruins in which it has been left. Over and above all this, the point has been reached where any solution seems to be impossible while Somoza remains.

300. I tried to explain in the Committee some of the reasons for which Costa Rica was the scapegoat of the collapse of that régime, which it hears approaching. I pointed out that the opposition in Nicaragua had gone so far as to spill over its territory; not that anyone is intervening to restore the situation, but that the inhabitants of Nicaragua are fleeing the terror and seeking freedom and are entering neighbouring countries in massive numbers in pursuit of shelter and freedom. We have more than 100,000 Nicaraguan people in Costa Rica. This figure might perhaps not be seen as being very high, but it must be remembered

that Nicaragua and Costa Rica have no more than 2 million inhabitants each.

301. The régime in Nicaragua claims that we should protect our rear. But I have always wondered why Nicaragua's frontiers with Costa Rica should be more difficult to protect than Costa Rica's frontiers with Nicaragua. How can we protect our border when the régime in Nicaragua, which has a sophisticated army and thousands of people under arms, has itself been unable to protect that frontier? We are being accused of failure to discharge an international obligation, but Somoza has not even been able to look after his own borders. He has not even been able to protect the main street of the capital; guerrillas entered that street up to the National Palace and actually occupied it in Somoza's teeth. But Costa Rica is now obliged to protect Nicaragua's rear. Our frontiers go to the San Juan River, and there are tropical forests on the banks of the river, which make it rather difficult to supervise that area. It is much more difficult for us than for them, because Nicaragua has the advantage as far as terrain is concerned, yet it is considered that it is our obligation to protect Somoza's rear.

302. We have been the victims, the scapegoats, in a very carefully prepared plan by Mr. Somoza to convert into an international conflict the internal problem with which he has to cope, and thus to divert the attention of the people from the oppression he is inflicting upon them. The persecution practised by Mr. Somoza is quite understandable, because Costa Rica is far too close and far too obvious an example for Nicaragua and its people, who wonder why they, too, cannot live as we do.

303. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to explain to the Assembly that at this stage in this important debate we still have many speakers on the list, and no provisions have been made by the Secretariat for replacing the interpreters. The interpreters have specified hours of work, and the situation is therefore difficult. I suggest that we now suspend this debate and continue tomorrow, when we hope that the necessary interpretation services will be available. If the Assembly has no objection, we shall act accordingly.

The meeting rose at 8.35 p.m.