

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**



THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records *

FIRST COMMITTEE
35th meeting
held on
Thursday, 17 November 1977
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 35th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 38: INCENDIARY AND OTHER SPECIFIC CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE THE SUBJECT OF PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE FOR HUMANITARIAN REASONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 40: URGENT NEED FOR CESSATION OF NUCLEAR AND THERMONUCLEAR TESTS AND CONCLUSION OF A TREATY DESIGNED TO ACHIEVE A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 42: EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO IMPLEMENT THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DISARMAMENT DECADE (continued):

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 45: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 47: REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 48: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE OF PEACE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: CONCLUSION OF A TREATY ON THE COMPLETE AND GENERAL PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR-WEAPON TESTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 51: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued):

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

AGENDA ITEM 52: SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT: REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 53: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/32/PV.35
18 November 1977

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 38, 40, 42, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51,
52 and 53 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Assistant Secretary-General, Centre for Disarmament, to give the clarification requested by the Netherlands delegation.

Mr. BJORNERSTEDT (Assistant Secretary-General, Centre for Disarmament): Several delegations have expressed their interest in the work of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, in particular concerning the publication of the Disarmament Yearbook and a disarmament periodical, as proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.13.

Guidance for the activities of the Centre can be found in several documents as well as in those pertinent resolutions the General Assembly may adopt during its present session. One of the documents in question is the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of the Role of the United Nations in the Field of Disarmament (A/31/36). It reproduces recommendations on the "Ways and means of improving existing United Nations facilities for collection, compilation and dissemination of information on disarmament issues, in order to keep all Governments, as well as world public opinion, properly informed on progress achieved in the field of disarmament". It gives particular attention to the Yearbook and a possible disarmament periodical.

The proposals regarding the United Nations Disarmament Yearbook have found their partial reflection in the first issue of that publication.

Preparations for the 1977 Disarmament Yearbook are now under way, with the objective of providing essential information for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in addition to the background and working papers prepared for the Preparatory Committee. Therefore, a special effort is being made to present the second yearbook in time for the special session.

BG/3

A/C.1/32/PV.35
3-5

(Mr. Bjornerstedt)

As regards the layout of the 1977 issue, an attempt will be made to follow the framework developed for the first edition, with some necessary changes and additions, in view of the results of the deliberations of the General Assembly at its present regular session.

(Mr. Bjornerstedt)

It is hoped that the 1977 edition can go more deeply into some subjects and also discuss others which were not treated in the first volume. The issue will be prepared so as to make it a self-contained publication of essential developments and trends in the field of disarmament.

Proposals for a periodical in the area of disarmament are, of course, still under discussion. Besides the recommendations made in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, note should also be taken of the formulation contained in annex B to document A/AC.181/3, which was prepared for that Committee. Paragraph 3 of that paper states:

"The Disarmament Bulletin could be issued two or three times a year and be printed in languages to be decided at a later stage. Its purpose would be to provide information concerning current facts and developments of importance to disarmament, inside and outside the United Nations, as well as digests of ideas and proposals, and assessments of situations and trends as they appear in official statements and in the disarmament literature. It could serve as a forum for Government representatives and acknowledged experts in the field of disarmament. It could also contain a digest of disarmament literature, a disarmament bibliography, and a calendar of disarmament meetings."

If the General Assembly endorses the recommendation to publish such a periodical, it is now envisaged that it would be produced three times each year. It is planned that the first issue should appear just before the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. That issue would take account of the thirty-second session of the General Assembly and any intervening meetings of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) and other disarmament bodies and be geared particularly to the special session, describing the work of the Preparatory Committee and a number of topics in the area of disarmament of particular interest to the special session. A second issue would appear in late summer 1978 and take account of the special session and events occurring since, particularly in the CCD. A third issue could appear late in 1978 or early in 1979 and would take account primarily of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Bjornerstedt)

Thus, the emphasis would be on current United Nations activities in the field of disarmament. The periodical would be addressed to a wider audience than that of the Yearbook, complementing it to some extent but having less of a reference character and more the nature of a selective, balanced report on specific topics of current interest. It should aim at arousing greater interest in present and future disarmament moves also among those not now directly involved therein. The periodical would contain about 80 printed pages, depending in each case on the length of contributions and particularly on developments in the field of disarmament.

That concludes my statement. If there are further questions, I am, of course, willing and present to answer them.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope that the clarification the Assistant Secretary-General has given will satisfy the Netherlands delegation and any delegations which might desire explanations.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): For some time the question of the reduction of military budgets has appeared in one way or another in the agenda of the General Assembly. Many of the speakers who participated in the general debate on disarmament items which concluded on Monday of last week referred to this question and specifically mentioned the fact that at present the amount which the world spends annually for military purposes has been estimated at more than \$350 billion. Furthermore, several speakers emphasized the fact that three quarters of that total amount is spent by countries which are in the first six places as regards levels of military expenditure, and that investments by the super-Powers in the technological development of their arsenals is the decisive factor in the dynamics of the qualitative arms race.

Since 1975 the General Assembly has been dealing specifically with the urgent need for the States permanent members of the Security Council and all other States with comparable military expenditure to lower their military budgets, and for part of the resources thus released to be used for social and economic development, particularly of the developing countries. In order to achieve this, a satisfactory instrument is necessary so that States may supply data in standardized form regarding their military expenditure. The main achievement of the

studies prepared in 1974, 1976 and 1977 by the Secretary-General, with the assistance of expert consultants, has been precisely to prepare that instrument on the submission of information.

Draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.24*, which I now have the honour to introduce on behalf of the delegations of Sweden and Mexico, refers specifically to the last of these reports, which was prepared in the course of this year. In the preamble to that draft resolution some background information is recalled which is contained in the report in document A/32/194. Furthermore, it is recognized that:

"... the work set in motion by the General Assembly on the reduction of military budgets has reached a decisive stage and that successive expert reports have moved the whole exercise to a position where practical steps for testing and refining the proposed reporting instrument could now be taken."

(A/C.1/32/L.24*, p. 1)

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Likewise, we take note of the opportunity that will be provided by the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in May-June 1978, to consider the disarmament problem in a broad perspective, including several matters related to the reduction of military expenditures.

In the last three preambular paragraphs, the General Assembly would first reaffirm its conviction that part of the resources released by the reduction of military expenses:

"... should be utilized for social and economic development, particularly that of the developing countries". (A/C.1/32/L.24*)

Secondly, the General Assembly would reaffirm its conviction:

"of the urgent necessity that the States permanent members of the Security Council, as well as any other State with comparable military expenditures, carry out reductions in their military budgets" (ibid.).

Lastly, we emphasize that:

"without an accompanying process of co-operation among such States, it will not be possible to accomplish the ultimate objectives" (ibid.).

It is obvious that we have already exhausted all possibilities of continuing to study the technical aspects of the question of the reduction of military budgets. As I stated earlier, we finally have a satisfactory instrument by means of which States can report effectively on their military expenditures. The next step should be to set in motion the practical process for testing and refining the proposed reporting instrument. Nevertheless, as is emphasized in the last preambular paragraph which I quoted, we must, first and foremost, have a clear indication that the States permanent members of the Security Council - especially, I would add, the two States having the highest military expenditures in absolute terms - are prepared to take the political decision which must precede any stage of testing and refining the aforementioned proposed reporting instrument.

Accordingly, the operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.24* is confined, first, to expressing the appreciation of the General Assembly to the Secretary-General and to the group of qualified experts which assisted in the preparation of the 1977 report; secondly, to requesting the Secretary-General

"to prepare a background report to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and transmit it not later than 1 April 1978 to all Member States, compiling the proposals and recommendations put forward by the

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

expert groups appointed by the Secretary-General and under General Assembly resolutions 3463 (XXX) and 31/87" (ibid.); and, thirdly, to deciding to include the item in the provisional agenda of its thirty-third session, as can be seen from the text.

The co-sponsors hope that in coming months the States permanent members of the Security Council, as well as other States with comparable military expenditures, will give evidence that they are prepared to carry out reductions in their military budgets, and that the two super-Powers will set the example.

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): The General Assembly has on several occasions through the years called upon its Members to carry out reductions in their military budgets. Conceptual and technical difficulties have so far prevented serious consideration of the expenditure approach. The work set in motion in 1973 on the reduction of military budgets has now, however, reached a decisive stage. The work began pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 3093 A and B (XXVIII) of 7 December 1973. Those resolutions called for the reduction of the military budgets of all States permanent members of the Security Council, as well as of any other State with comparable military expenditures. The resolutions also called for the utilization of part of the resources thereby saved for assistance to developing countries.

The 1974, 1976 and 1977 reports on the reduction of military budgets have moved the exercise to a position where practical steps for operational testing, refinement and implementation can be taken. In the course of the analysis underlying the reports much progress has been made towards implementing a measurement and reporting system on military expenditures: first, delimitations and definitions of the military sector and of military expenditures have been devised; secondly, an international reporting and measurement format has been elaborated; thirdly, the comments of States on the proposed system for international reporting and comparison of military expenditures have been analysed.

According to the 1977 report, the views of respondent States reaffirm the validity of the reporting instrument recommended. The Swedish Ministry of Defence has produced a working document presenting Swedish military expenditures in the format recommended for international reporting. This document is attached to the

1977 report as annex II. Despite strictly limited resources of time, it was possible to achieve, with some small exceptions, what is requested by the reporting format. The implementation of the international reporting instrument, although that instrument is subject to clarifications and refinements in a number of respects, thus seems possible and appropriate.

Draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.24*, submitted by the delegations of Mexico and Sweden, notes that the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will provide an opportunity to consider this and other related disarmament issues in a broad perspective. It seems appropriate to adopt at that time a programme for operational development and implementation of the reporting system.

Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): I come here today to deal with agenda item 48, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". This Committee has before it the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, published as document A/32/29, Supplement No. 29, Official Records of the thirty-second session. Six years have elapsed since this item was brought before the General Assembly. The proposal itself was first mooted at the Third Conference of Heads of State and Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in Lusaka in September 1970 and was approved by that summit Conference.

It represented one of the many initiatives taken by the non-aligned movement for the purpose of strengthening international peace and security and reducing international tension. It was in a sense one side of the coin, the other side of which was general and complete disarmament. A brief account of the history of this item might serve a useful purpose in our discussion today.

This first step was a major one: the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 2852 (XXVI) of 16 December 1971, the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. That resolution clearly enunciated the essential features of a zone of peace and the scope and substance of this concept. The next step was the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean to study the implications of the proposal, with special reference to the practical measures that should be taken in furtherance of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. I refer to General Assembly resolution 2952 (XXVII) of 15 December 1972.

The five years that have passed since then have been devoted to this effort. Our principal task has been to secure the co-operation and support of the great Powers, the permanent members of the Security Council, and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean. From the outset we had the co-operation and active participation of one permanent member of the Security Council, China, and one major maritime user of the Indian Ocean, Japan. We are indebted to these two countries for the interest they have taken in our work and to the contribution they have made to the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee and to the furtherance of the idea.

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

In the 1974 General Assembly resolution on the subject, resolution 3259 (XXIX), the littoral and hinterland States were requested to enter into consultations with a view to convening a conference on the Indian Ocean. That resolution also invited all States, especially the great Powers, to co-operate in a practical manner with the Ad Hoc Committee in the discharge of its functions.

The next stage was the 1975 General Assembly resolution 3468 (XXX) of 11 December 1975, which delineated the main features of the proposed conference, and once again invited all States, in particular the great Powers and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean, to co-operate in a practical manner with the Ad Hoc Committee.

All our efforts to secure the practical co-operation of certain great Powers and certain major maritime users proved, however, to be of no avail. On one flimsy pretext or another, they would not change their attitude of aloofness and indifference. There seemed in particular to be a concert of Europe - both Western and Eastern Europe - in this respect.

As befits a concept of this type, there was a striking, if deeply disconcerting, solidarity between the two sections of Europe on this matter. I should point out, however, that from this observation I exclude Australia, though it is a member of the Group of Western European and other States, for the simple reason that it has been a member of the Ad Hoc Committee from its very inception and has made a signal contribution to the deliberations of that Committee.

Last year's General Assembly resolution 31/88 of 14 December 1976 once again expressed regret - and here I paraphrased the resolution - at the indifference of certain great Powers and certain major maritime users, and asked the Ad Hoc Committee to persevere in its efforts. It appeared as if those countries which had withheld their co-operation feared the contagion of peace, although some of the great Powers were fascinated by the concept of nuclear-free zones.

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

During the last year, as the report of the Ad Hoc Committee before us today indicates, there was a noticeable change of heart and of attitude on the part of those who had withheld their co-operation. The Ad Hoc Committee, it seemed to us, was pronounced free from infection; the incubation period was over. More nations, especially major maritime users in the Indian Ocean, responded some more positively than others, to our invitation to participate in consultations looking forward to the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

Paragraph 5 and annex I of the report before this Committee give the substance of the replies received to the Ad Hoc Committee's invitation to the great Powers and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean to co-operate with it. There are three categories into which those replies fall. Two major maritime users, Greece and Panama, accepted the invitation in positive and affirmative terms. One country appears to have had difficulty with its postal and telegraphic services, as it has not yet received instructions. The third category is made up of those who, like visitors to a patient dying of terminal cancer, expressed a sympathetic attitude, but again, like hospital visitors, brought some flowers and left no doubt with some apprehension that the patient would survive and that the expenditure on the floral demonstration as a proof of sympathy might prove to be a waste of money.

The most impressive development, however, was the response by the two super-Powers, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America. They informed the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, in terms which showed a remarkable identity of approach and an even more remarkable similarity of language, that they had initiated discussions between themselves, that their leaders were seeking ways to achieve mutual military restraint and that they shared the desire of the littoral and hinterland States that the region not become an arena for major competition on the part of outside Powers.

This degree of harmony between the two great Powers recalls to my mind the pungent observation made by a former colleague of ours who was noted for his sharp wit. He once remarked that when the two super-Powers disagree, there is consternation in the rest of the world; when they agree, there is panic. I must assure the representatives of the two super-Powers that on this occasion their agreement has not caused panic among us. On the contrary, my delegation, for its part, would wish to thank them very much for this relief. We hope that their joint discussions and joint efforts will not be limited to a mere freezing of their military presence, or to arms limitation in the Indian Ocean area, or to mutual restraint, terms which are most often mere euphemisms, but will be the first steps, even if they are stumbling and halting, nevertheless steps, towards the fulfilment of the objectives of the Declaration. We hope

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

that they will continue the practice that they have initiated of keeping the Ad Hoc Committee informed, through its Chairman, of the progress of their talks. We wish them success in their efforts, success which will not only benefit them but which will also vastly enhance the prospects of international peace and security. We would prefer, of course, that they enter into direct consultations rather than approach us indirectly - an interesting diplomatic device when we wish to show some interest in the work of a group but would not like to appear to be associated with it.

At the same time, I must make it clear that our desire is not confined to preventing the region from becoming an arena for military competition on the part of outside Powers. We are no less concerned with preventing military competition within the region on the part of the Powers of the region itself. It is not our desire that Satan should leave only to be replaced by Beelzebub. I believe the Chinese substitute the tiger and the wolf for Satan and Beelzebub.

The most significant proposal made to the Ad Hoc Committee during the last year is referred to in paragraphs 30 and 31 of our report. It is a proposal by Madagascar that a preliminary meeting of the States of the Indian Ocean region be held with a view to arriving at a common position on various issues. That preliminary meeting would serve as a prelude to the conference on the Indian Ocean, which was first mooted in General Assembly resolution 3259 (XXX) of 9 December 1974. That is a goal towards which we are moving as a means of achieving our final objective, namely, the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

I should now like to turn to the draft resolution which the Ad Hoc Committee has recommended to the General Assembly in paragraph 34 of its report. I shall first refer to the fifth paragraph of the preamble, which reads:

"Considering that the continued military presence of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean, conceived in the context of great-Power rivalry, with the danger of a competitive escalation of such a military presence, makes the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace an even more imperative necessity,".

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

As every year passes it might well be that instead of our ultimate objective coming closer to us, it may recede further and further away. We hope that will not be the result.

I should also draw attention to the seventh and eighth paragraphs of the preamble, the substance of which I have already mentioned. The seventh paragraph reads:

"Noting that talks between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America regarding their military presence in the Indian Ocean have been initiated and that the two countries have established contacts with the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean through its Chairman,".

The eighth paragraph reads:

"Expressing the hope that those talks between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America will contribute to the attainment of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and lead to practical and effective co-operation on their part with the Ad Hoc Committee and the littoral and hinterland States,".

We have referred to the continued military presence. It is hardly necessary for me to say that so far as the Ad Hoc Committee is concerned, we feel that the most disturbing form of military presence is naturally foreign military bases.

I should now like to draw the Committee's attention to the operative paragraphs of this draft resolution.

In operative paragraph 1 the Committee:

"Renews its invitation to the great Powers and other major maritime users of the Indian Ocean that have not so far seen their way to co-operating effectively with the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to enter with the least possible delay into consultations with ..."

those States of the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

It is absolutely indispensable that we should have their active participation in these consultations if the Conference is to be a success.

I turn next to operative paragraph 3, which records the decision taken by the Ad Hoc Committee that a meeting of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean be convened, and here I should like to make a slight amendment to the draft as it appears in paragraph 3⁴ of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee. In that Committee's report, operative paragraph 3 reads as follows:

"Decides that, as the next step towards the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean, a meeting of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean be convened at a suitable venue in" - and then there is a blank. We felt that we should be more precise, and the amendment that I wish to propose is that after the word "convened" we delete the words "at a suitable venue in" and the blank and substitute the following words: "in New York at a suitable date". In other words, the operative paragraph would read, "a meeting of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean be convened in New York at a suitable date".

We could not be more precise in regard to the date as it had to be fitted into the Calendar of Conferences which, we realize, will next year be particularly congested.

There is another operative paragraph in which the draft resolution as it appears in paragraph 3⁴ of the Ad Hoc Committee's report has a blank, to be filled by the names of the countries that are to be added to the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. I should like to fill the blank with the names of the following countries following the words "the addition of": "Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Greece, Mozambique and Oman". Operative paragraph 5 in its amended form would therefore read:

"Decides to enlarge the composition of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean by the addition of Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Greece, Mozambique and Oman".

I should like to conclude my statement by making an appeal to all the great Powers, all the permanent members of the Security Council and to all the major maritime users to co-operate actively with us in our consultations and to support us in an effort that would be a most significant contribution to the cause

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

of international peace and security, and I hope that the draft resolution will receive the widest support.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I should like to remark briefly on agenda item 42 and the amendment to the draft resolution that had been submitted.

The Committee will recall that at our meeting on 11 November the representative of Niger proposed some amendments to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.14. That draft resolution is, of course, sponsored by my delegation as well as other delegations and I had the privilege of presenting it on behalf of its sponsors.

The Committee will also recall that in presenting the draft resolution I stated that the main purpose of the draft resolution was not to review the implementation of the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade nor to elaborate at that stage on some of the elements. Our main focus was on urging the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to continue a process that it had started towards the end of its summer session when it decided to set up at its spring session an ad hoc working group to begin work on a comprehensive programme for disarmament.

I also stated, while introducing draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.14, that we deliberately tried to make the draft as simple and as straightforward as possible because we believe that it would be easier to achieve consensus on it - and therefore to achieve consensus on our main objective which is the continuation of work on the comprehensive programme - if we avoid injecting elements into the draft that may create problems for some delegations.

The sponsors have considered the draft amendment in document A/C.1/32/L.22 submitted by the representative of Niger and have tried jointly and individually to see how that draft could improve, or at least advance, the purpose which the sponsors of the draft resolution had in mind. The sponsors came to the conclusion that it would not be easy to accommodate the proposals contained in document A/C.1/32/L.22 without creating a certain difficulty and without perhaps reducing the consensus which this draft resolution would otherwise have enjoyed.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The sponsors were also of the view that they shared the concern of the representative of Niger, and that if this were a general draft resolution on the Disarmament Decade the paragraphs he had suggested would have been incorporated in it without any difficulty. But since the whole purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.14 is contained in its operative paragraphs 1 and 2 - specifically operative paragraph 2, which enjoins the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to continue its work on the comprehensive programme, we believe that the proposed amendments do not advance that cause. Rather they may create a certain element of woolliness.

We have, in fact, tried to incorporate some of the ideas contained in those amendments in our draft resolution, and those ideas that were not included in draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.14 were deliberately left out because, as I said, we wanted a simple draft resolution and because some of those elements are contained in other draft resolutions which have, fortunately, already been adopted at this session of the General Assembly, and specifically in the First Committee.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

I would, by way of example, draw attention to the first and second preambular paragraphs in document A/C.1/32/L.22, which are to be found also in the resolutions in document A/C.1/32/L.12 and A/C.1/32/L.16, both of which have already been adopted by the First Committee.

The third preambular paragraph, of course, speaks of aid to developing countries. The whole purpose of the study to be undertaken pursuant to draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.16 is to go into the details of this subject, and we think that this would in fact be more appropriate in resolution A/C.1/32/L.16 than in A/C.1/32/L.14.

So far as the operative paragraph suggested in document A/C.1/32/L.22 is concerned, we also believe that this would have been more appropriate to the resolution adopted in document A/C.1/32/L.16, since draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.14 is meant to deal with a specific subject.

I thought it might be useful to the Committee to have some idea of the views of the sponsors of A/C.1/32/L.14 on the amendments proposed. Of course, we are grateful to the representative of Niger for his interest in this subject, and we share his concern. We believe that at the appropriate time all the elements which he has proposed as amendments could be incorporated in a general resolution on the Disarmament Decade, but we also believe that, at this moment, when our main concern is to ensure that we salvage whatever part of the programme of action of the Decade can still be salvaged, we should not create additional difficulties by trying to renegotiate all the elements that should go into the Disarmament Decade.

I have the mandate of the sponsors, in fact, to appeal to the representative of Niger for his understanding, and to assure him that we share his concern and would be willing, as I said, at the appropriate time to support him in including paragraphs of this nature in a suitable resolution.

Mr. GARBA (Niger) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Niger has listened with great pleasure to the views of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.14 on the amendments which we submitted last Friday in this Committee. However, we must say that our delegation showed a desire to

(Mr. Garba, Niger)

co-operate in finding a wording acceptable to the sponsors, to ourselves and to the Assembly. We think that the draft resolutions before us are subject to amendment, and that was why we decided to submit to the Assembly the amendments to which we referred. Those amendments, far from weakening the initial draft, give it concrete form and make it clearer. We did this, on the one hand, because the problems raised in the draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.14 affect us closely and, on the other, because we are convinced that the delegations gathered here are inspired by a genuine desire to make progress.

We certainly do not come back here every year to repeat word for word what we said 20 or 30 years ago. We are trying to bring some influence, however little, to bear on events so that they develop in a direction favourable to our common interests. That is true of all the countries present here, be they powerful or weak, rich or poor. Moreover, we consider that the present situation calls more than ever before for emphasis to be placed on the close relationship between disarmament and development.

We have also become aware of the need to establish a new international economic order. To the extent that the development of the poor countries must take place in interdependence - since autarchy is no longer possible - we must, in my delegation's view, foster the positive elements in that interdependence so that the countries of the third world will not be deprived of the benefits that they expect from it.

Those elements are, among others, the rational use of the technology of the rich countries and international bilateral and multilateral aid, the volume and effectiveness of which depends on the resources available from donors, and those resources are increasingly used in the manufacture of weapons.

In these circumstances, we do not think that our amendments are that far from the spirit of the initial text of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.14 or from the spirit of resolution 2602 E (XXIV) of the General Assembly, to which that draft refers and which recommended eight years ago, in paragraph 6 that:

"... a substantial part of the resources freed by measures in the field of disarmament" should be used "to promote the economic development of developing countries and, in particular, their scientific and technological progress...".

(Mr. Garba, Niger)

Furthermore, in document A/32/100 of 15 June 1977, concerning the provisional agenda of the thirty-second session, we read this concerning item 42:

"At its thirtieth session, the General Assembly, having considered the report of the Secretary-General (A/10294 and Add.1), reiterated the central interest of the United Nations in all disarmament negotiations; reaffirmed that disarmament and development fostered a climate of international understanding and co-operation, deplored the wastage of resources, which could be used, inter alia, to increase assistance for the economic and social development of developing countries, in expenditures on armaments, particularly nuclear armaments; called upon Member States and the Secretary-General to intensify their efforts in support of the link between disarmament and development ... so as to promote disarmament negotiations ..." (A/32/100, p. 72)

The same document adds that:

"At its thirty-first session, the General Assembly ... requested the Secretary-General to ensure a proper co-ordination of disarmament and development activities within the United Nations system ..." (ibid.)

We should be happy to see our amendments included in draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.14, and that is why we would request that they be put to the vote before the vote on the initial draft. In so doing, we hope that we shall have the understanding of the developed countries and the essential solidarity of the fraternal and friendly countries of the third world which, we are sure, share our present concerns.

In conclusion, we would ask the experienced and knowledgeable diplomats present in this room to inspire by their attitude a little more confidence in the young colleagues who have agreed to join with them because they believe in the virtues of constructive dialogue, and are convinced that a voice other than that of weapons and violence can still be heard in the world. The result of the vote, which we shall accept whatever it may be, will be an instructive sign of our determination to make progress and of the spirit which will inspire the special session devoted to disarmament.

We should like a recorded vote to be taken.

Mr. KUBBA (Iraq): My delegation would like to make a few remarks on item 48 of the agenda regarding the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and the draft resolution continued therein.

We have participated actively in the work of the Committee and have managed with its other members to produce the report (A/32/29), including the draft resolution recommended unanimously to the General Assembly.

However, we would like to refer to Section IV, paragraph D of the report concerning the letter from the representative of the Zionist entity. It is our belief that the purpose of the Committee's deliberation is to bring an atmosphere of peace and stability to the Indian Ocean.

The policy of the Zionist entity is in complete contradiction with the aims and principles of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The Zionist entity has repeatedly shown its aggressive nature, which in turn has been condemned time and again by this Organization.

There is a precedent to be cited here concerning a similar aggressive racist entity, namely, South Africa, which has been excluded from the work of the Committee. Our position regarding that point is well reflected in the work of the Committee, as may be seen from document A/AC.159/SR.51. Having this in mind, we participated in the drafting of the resolution in the Committee with the clear understanding that no decision had been taken with regard to the Zionist representative's letter. This viewpoint is shared by most delegations members of the Ad Hoc Committee and is also reflected in the summary records.

Furthermore, we view operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution as linked to operative paragraph 4 regarding the preparation for the meeting referred to.

The Zionist entity should in no way be allowed to take part in any meeting aimed at implementing the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

Mr. SATTAR (Pakistan): Like the preceding speaker, I also wish to deal with agenda item 48. The Pakistan delegation wishes to express its warmest appreciation to Ambassador Amerasinghe of Sri Lanka for his characteristically able and lucid introduction of the draft resolution on the Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. His country has made persistent and resolute efforts over many years to advance first the concept and more recently the implementation of that noble objective of a peace zone in the Indian Ocean. The establishment of that zone will contribute substantially to the strengthening of peace and security in the region. Ambassador Amerasinghe himself has made a creative contribution to the advancement of that objective, which entitles him to the deep gratitude of all the States concerned.

Also, with respect to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, Pakistan shares the understanding in regard to the other States which may attend the Conference on the Indian Ocean. In our view divisive elements should not be introduced so that that Conference may achieve its noble purpose expeditiously. In that respect we share the view that has just been expressed by the representative of Iraq.

Mr. YANG Hu-shan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): With regard to the statements made by the representatives of Iraq and Pakistan expressing their opposition to the participation of Israel and South Africa in the Conference on the Indian Ocean, the Chinese delegation supports their view.

Mr. AL-SAIDI (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to speak on behalf of my delegation concerning the item on the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. My delegation, as a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, which is responsible for implementing that Declaration, would like to state that it fully supports the views expressed by the delegation of Iraq. The Zionist racist entity must not be permitted to participate in the work of that Committee or in any meeting convened on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

Mr. HASSAN (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): At the beginning of my statement I should like to express our thanks to Mr. Amerasinghe, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, for having introduced to us so eloquently the report on that matter. My country has participated in the work of that Committee as an observer and we have had an opportunity to state our opinion as a littcral country of the Indian Ocean.

We welcomed the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, since we were convinced that that was an essential condition for ensuring stability in that part of the world and for promoting co-operation among the countries of the region and the utilization of their resources for economic and social development. We are among the poor countries where the population problem is endangering economic development, but we are sure that our goals will not be attained unless an end can be put to the existence of aggressive military bases in the region.

We note with concern the presence of military bases on Diego Garcia, and we think that those bases could be the point of departure for acts jeopardizing the security of the region. The need to protect the Indian Ocean should be entrusted to the countries of the region which should decide on their own destiny without fearing intervention by foreign forces or the presence of military bases. We are sure that the countries of the region are capable of protecting the Indian Ocean through co-operation and the application of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. We want the necessary basis to be laid to implement the Declaration.

The Zionist and racist régimes should not be allowed to participate in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. We refer here to South Africa and Israel. We welcome the decision to increase the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee so that we can have a constructive dialogue and take the measures which will ensure the security and prosperity of the countries of the region - the security and stability that will enable us to achieve our common goals, namely, peace and security, not only of our region but also of the whole world.

Mr. KONDE (Guinea) (interpretation from French): First of all, I should like to thank the Chairman for having been kind enough to call on me to correct our vote.

Yesterday we were unable, owing to the fact that we had to leave the room, to participate in the voting; but I would be very happy if it could be noted that the delegation of the Republic of Guinea would have voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/32/L.17, L.18 and L.27. I request that the Secretariat take note of that.

The CHAIRMAN: I assure the representative of Guinea that the Secretariat has taken note of his request.

I should like to announce that the delegation of Morocco has joined in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.8 and the delegation of Bangladesh has joined in sponsoring draft resolutions A/C.1/32/L.21 and L.29.

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.8 under agenda item 51, entitled "General and complete disarmament". The draft resolution has no financial implications. It is sponsored by Pakistan and was introduced in the Committee on 9 November 1977.

I call on the representative of Pakistan on a point of order.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): We appreciate the desire to see an expeditious decision taken on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.8. However, it was the understanding of the Pakistan delegation that that draft resolution would be put to a vote at our meeting this afternoon. We would be most grateful if the Committee could find its way to postpone the vote on that draft until this afternoon's meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: I must say to the representative of Pakistan that some of these draft resolutions have been before the Committee for a long time. I expect that those representatives who wanted to negotiate on them have already done so. If I am not going to be allowed to carry on the work as I propose, I must tell the Committee that tomorrow there will be a night meeting.

(The Chairman)

In addition, after the meeting tomorrow, if the disarmament items are not completed, I shall postpone discussion on them until some future date and take up the outer space items until representatives are ready to allow me to continue the work.

I appeal to the representative of Pakistan to allow us to proceed.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): In response to your appeal, Mr. Chairman, we agree to allow the voting process to go forward.

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

Mr. FLOWERREE (United States of America): The United States Government is receptive to the need for effective measures to enhance the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States. Some type of assurances regarding the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States could very well complement global non-proliferation efforts. We join in the hope that at the special session on disarmament it will be possible to find an approach to this problem that is broadly acceptable to the international community.

In our view, a satisfactory approach to the question of nuclear security assurances would be one which increases the confidence of all countries that their security is adequately protected and which promotes the stability of the international system as a whole. Such an agreement must not undermine existing security arrangements. The particular formulation reaffirmed in the draft resolution now before us does not fully meet our concerns regarding the maintenance of existing security arrangements. In addition, there are imprecisions in the formulation that would make it difficult to follow in practice. We thus find it necessary to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): I wish to explain the positive vote we shall cast on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.8 submitted by the delegation of Pakistan.

In essence, this draft resolution is very similar to resolution 31/189 C which we supported last year. Already at that time the Netherlands delegation voiced the opinion that the proposal was not completely satisfactory and that we should have preferred a resolution which would have left open for further discussion how nuclear security guarantees vis-à-vis non-nuclear-weapon States should be formulated. We still hold that opinion and therefore regard the first operative paragraph of the present draft resolution reaffirming the provisions of last year's resolution as not adequately reflecting our position.

Indeed, we feel that the particular formula contained in resolution 31/189 C gives rise to some pertinent questions. We wonder, for example, whether negative nuclear security guarantees should be considered as a first step towards a complete ban on the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. In our view, such a ban is desirable but only in the context of real nuclear disarmament. By stressing this long-term goal we are in danger of losing sight of the pressing need to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. Precisely for this reason, we deem it to be a shortcoming of the formula proposed by the delegation of Pakistan that it asks for constraints on the part of the nuclear-weapon Powers without even mentioning that those non-nuclear-weapon States which are seeking security guarantees should forgo the nuclear option for themselves.

We acknowledge, of course, that it refers to those non-nuclear-weapon States that have established a nuclear-weapon-free zone. We share the view that nuclear-weapon States should undertake in an appropriate way not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against States which have established with other countries a viable and foolproof nuclear-weapon-free zone. However, we cannot regard this as a more or less automatic obligation falling

(Mr. Meerburg, Netherlands)

upon the nuclear-weapon States, as implied by the formula used by Pakistan. As the delegation of Pakistan may be aware, this very idea caused the Netherlands to vote against resolution 3472 B (XXX) on the definition of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The present draft resolution seems to carry this idea even a little further by calling in operative paragraph 3 for binding guarantees by the nuclear-weapon States to non-nuclear-weapon States in general, without any commitment on the part of the latter.

I have expounded at some length our views on some basic questions involved in order to indicate that the Netherlands had to overcome serious doubts before deciding to support the present text. We shall vote in favour of this draft resolution in order to give expression to the view, which we share with the delegation of Pakistan, that a new consensus is urgently needed on how to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is our considered view that some kind of nuclear security guarantees should emerge from further serious deliberations among nuclear-States and non-nuclear States, aligned countries and non-aligned countries alike, on how to stem the danger of nuclear proliferation. We regard such guarantees as a highly desirable incentive for non-nuclear-weapon States not to acquire nuclear weapons.

However, I feel bound to say that a new consensus on non-proliferation policies has to take into account all the aspects of the problem. Although we shall have the opportunity to discuss this matter under another item of our agenda, I wish to emphasize now our view that non-nuclear-weapon States also should be willing to accept restraints and, for instance, should be reluctant to claim unhampered access to nuclear technology in all its forms.

I mention this question only to stress that the positive vote of my delegation on the draft resolution now before us should be seen against the background of the necessity for a comprehensive approach to solving the problems of non-proliferation. Such an approach requires constraints in different fields on all parties concerned.

Mr. JAY (Canada): Canada too believes that continuing and active consideration should be given to ways of strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, particularly those that have acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or otherwise made binding non-proliferation commitments - for example, to the solely peaceful, non-explosive use of nuclear energy. It was for this reason that my delegation participated in the unanimous adoption in 1974 of resolution 3261 G (XXIX). However, my delegation abstained last year on resolution 31/189 C because of the ambiguities we saw in it, as explained at that time. Some of these have been mentioned this morning already.

Once again this year, for the same reasons, we shall abstain on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.8.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.8. A recorded vote has been requested by the delegation of Pakistan.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierre Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia

The draft resolution was adopted by 86 votes to 0, with 36 abstentions.

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

Mr. ASHE (United Kingdom): My delegation has just abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.8 on "Strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States", thus maintaining the position we took last year on resolution 31/189 C. It remains our view that the widest possible accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons would provide the best security assurance for all parties. However, we note the continued interest of many States in this matter and we undertake to keep our policy in this regard under regular review.

Mr. MISTRAL (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to give a very brief explanation of the considerations which prevented it from supporting draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.8 which has just been adopted.

France understands the concern of non-nuclear-weapon States to obtain guarantees from the nuclear-weapon States. The French delegation wishes to recall that the French nuclear force was conceived solely as a deterrent and is not directed against, nor does it threaten, anyone.

The French position on this matter was defined by the President of the Republic at a press conference on 24 October 1974. I should like to recall here the most significant parts of that statement:

"I consider that the French nuclear deterrent can be used only against another nuclear Power - which, I hasten to say, is a very unlikely possibility; but we must cover all possibilities - that might threaten our own soil. The purpose of our nuclear deterrent, which would indeed have to be used in that case, would be to oppose a nuclear threat to our soil on the part of a nuclear Power, or a threatened invasion of our country. In contrast, as far as non-nuclear Powers are concerned, I do not think that France should either use or threaten to use its nuclear arsenal, and I would hope that this attitude will gradually be adopted by others so that the nuclear option shall be considered only in the event of nuclear threats and not in other types of conflicts."

Mr. ABSOLUM (New Zealand): New Zealand abstained from voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.8. We did so with some reluctance.

We consider that countries that have renounced the nuclear-weapon option are entirely justified in seeking credible assurances that nuclear weapons will not be used against them. We recognize that such assurances lie at the foundation of the non-proliferation régime. They are an essential part of the bargain and, if the régime is to be adequately strengthened, the existing security assurances must also be strengthened.

Despite this position, we found ourselves unable to support the draft resolution, primarily because the terms of the undertaking it sought to endorse were, in our view, imprecise and likely to call into question the status of existing regional security arrangements.

We do not think that this is or should be the end of the road, however. On the contrary, we think it important that further efforts should be made to devise assurances that are both acceptable to the nuclear-weapon Powers and valuable to the non-nuclear-weapon countries. We think this can be done, and we think it should be done.

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): Sweden abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.8 just voted upon, and I wish to explain the main reason for this position.

My Government favours a general pledge on the part of nuclear-weapon States not to use nuclear weapons and not to threaten to use such weapons against any group of States which have specifically abstained from the possession of nuclear weapons. This can be characterized as a guarantee, to the effect that States that have refrained from acquiring nuclear weapons will not be attacked with such weapons. This is what we call a negative guarantee.

For our part, we regard this question in connexion with the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Sweden is therefore in favour of a general pledge by the nuclear-weapon States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and not members of military alliances possessing nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Hamilton, Sweden)

With reference to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, I wish to say that the Swedish delegation generally supports the idea of taking up the matter of improving the security of non-nuclear-weapon States at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, next year. This is an important matter which should be considered by the special session as part of the urgent issues of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons to additional States.

Mr. CHAMPENOIS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to explain its abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.8.

My country is, in principle, in favour of the establishment of denuclearized zones, provided that certain basic criteria are fulfilled. My country also understands the reasons behind Pakistan's submission of its draft resolution on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. Indeed, the security of those States, and the non-proliferation régime, could be considerably strengthened by so-called nuclear guarantees. My country is ready to give serious consideration to the implications of such guarantees, notably with regard to the security requirements of all States or groups of States.

However, we think it would be difficult at this stage of our consideration of this item to adopt a position of principle that would lend itself to general and absolute application. It seems to us that the **complex** question of negative guarantees should be viewed in terms of regional considerations, which, by their very nature, are extremely variable.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to explain its vote after the vote, I shall consider the consideration of this draft resolution concluded. The Committee will now turn its attention to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.14, pertaining to agenda item 42, entitled "Effective Measures to Implement the Purposes and Objectives of the Disarmament Decade". The draft resolution has no financial implications. It is sponsored by 11 delegations and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria on 10 November 1977.

I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the amendments contained in document A/C.1/32/L.22, proposed by the delegation of Niger.

(The Chairman)

As there are no representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on the amendments, the Committee will now vote on them. The delegation of Niger has asked for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Surinam, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Barbados, Botswana, Finland, Guyana, India, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Uganda, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

The amendments were adopted by 96 votes to none, with 22 absentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Tunisia on a point of order.

Miss FAROUK (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): I want to say something about the way in which I just voted. Mr. Chairman, you put both amendments to the vote at the same time, the first dealing with the preamble and the second dealing with the operative part. I wish to say that my delegation would have voted in favour of the second amendment of Niger had it been voted on separately.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement of the representative of Tunisia has been noted.

As no representatives wish to explain their votes before the voting, we shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.14 as a whole, as amended.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 121 votes to none.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Speaking on behalf of the nine countries members of the European Community, I should like to make some comments on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.14, which has just been adopted.

First of all, the States members of the European Community are pleased by the adoption of this resolution, in particular its operative paragraph 1 which takes note of the decision of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) to set up an Ad Hoc Working Group to elaborate a comprehensive programme for disarmament. This initiative has been taken and supported by certain States members of the European Community. Furthermore, as last year, the Nine would like to recall the link between disarmament and development as expressed in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Elliott, Belgium)

We believe that effective disarmament measures and measures to control armaments would make it possible to release vast human, technological, economic and financial resources. It is also the opinion of the Nine that a part of these resources could be used to satisfy other needs, more particularly in the developing countries. It is in this perspective that they can accept the establishment of such a link between disarmament and development. In this context the Nine support the draft resolution on which we have just voted, and which, inter alia, requests the Secretary-General to set up an ad hoc group made up of government experts to elaborate the framework and terms of reference to study the link between disarmament and development. We believe that in this way the many problems in these two fields would be clarified and thus make it possible to deal concretely with the solution of these questions.

We can therefore accept a link between disarmament and development, but, on the other hand, we cannot accept an automatic link between the two. Each has its own characteristics and its own dynamics. We cannot subscribe to the conclusion according to which a lack of progress on disarmament and armament control would prevent countries from contributing to development, as they are bound to do in any case.

In conclusion, the nine countries members of the European Community intend to insist on the great importance they attach both to disarmament and to economic and social development. But progress in one field does not depend on the progress made in the other. So, while continuing to negotiate agreements on disarmament and arms control, the Nine will continue their efforts to release financial resources, at the same time intensifying their co-operation with the developing countries.

Mr. MELESCANU (Romania) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the delegations of India, Nigeria and Yugoslavia and my own delegation, I wish to explain the votes of those delegations on the amendments submitted by Niger in document A/C.1/32/L.22, which have been incorporated in the draft resolution on effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade just adopted by the First Committee.

AW/an

A/C.1/32/PV.35
59-60

(Mr. Melescanu, Romania)

It is a well known fact that one of the fundamental objectives of the Disarmament Decade was to prepare a complex programme of disarmament measures, a task entrusted to the CCD in paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV), in which the Disarmament Decade was proclaimed.

(Mr. Melescanu, Romania)

This year, that is to say some seven years after the proclamation of the Disarmament Decade, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) in Geneva decided to establish a working group to prepare a comprehensive disarmament programme. In welcoming these positive developments, the sponsors of the draft resolution thought that at this session the very purpose of the resolution on this item should contain the idea of the continuation of the activities of the CCD, and we are pleased that by the adoption of the resolution that idea of the sponsors has been approved by the First Committee.

At the same time, we should like to express our satisfaction at the fact that by the adoption of this draft resolution the objectives and goals of the Disarmament Decade have been reaffirmed yet again, and I refer particularly to the idea of the close link which exists between the First United Nations Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade, the idea of which is to stress the need to put an end to the waste of resources in the arms race with its harmful effects on peace and security as well as on the development of all peoples.

This idea has also been included in the draft of the four sponsors, both in the preamble and in the operative part. As some delegations have just indicated, operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.14

"Calls upon Member States and the Secretary-General of the United Nations to intensify their efforts in support of the link between disarmament and development ...".

Consequently, in the view of the sponsors, the text of the draft that we submitted is a balanced one, which is sufficient in itself since it takes into account practically all the main elements. That is the reason why the sponsors abstained in the vote on the amendments submitted by the delegation of Niger, which are to be found in document A/C.1/32/L.22, in the belief that the French are sometimes right when they say that the best is the enemy of the good.

The vote of our delegations should not be interpreted in any way as implying fundamental opposition to the substance of the ideas contained in the amendments submitted by the delegation of Niger, ideas which our delegations fully support and which they did their best to incorporate in the draft resolution they submitted.

Mr. GARBA (Niger) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Niger, after the adoption of the amendments which it submitted to draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.14, wishes to express its gratitude and its wholehearted appreciation to the delegations which have indicated that they share the views and concerns of the delegation of Niger by supporting our amendments. We should like this initiative to be followed up and hope that it may be possible to give it concrete form in the years to come, in particular on the occasion of the special session devoted to disarmament.

Mr. FERNANDES (Guinea-Bissau): I was not present in the room during the voting. If I had been present I would have voted in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement of the representative of Guinea-Bissau has been noted.

The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 42.

I now call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. ELIAV (Israel): I wish to register the regret of my delegation that some representatives saw fit this morning to revert to the sterile recantation of hatred towards Israel at a time when momentous events are taking place in our region. I leave it to the judgement of the Committee, the overwhelming majority of which, I am sure, strongly supports this historical momentum, to gauge the real motives of the representatives of Iraq, Democratic Yemen and Yemen in their unbridled attack on my country.

With respect to the issue in connexion with which those attacks were made, I should only like to say that Israel has a geographical dimension which is a fact and which cannot be challenged, and that dimension will find its natural expression also in its participation in the relevant activities and bodies of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN: I intend, with the consent of the Committee, to put all the draft resolutions to the vote at the three meetings to be held this afternoon and tomorrow, and thus to conclude the consideration of the disarmament items. I therefore once again request those delegations that are sponsors of draft resolutions still pending kindly to contact me so that I may organize the Committee's work for its 36th, 37th and 38th meetings.

In the event that the Committee is not able to conclude its work on time, I shall schedule a night meeting on Friday, 18 November, to conclude consideration of the disarmament items. If the disarmament items are not concluded at Friday evening's meeting, I shall postpone consideration of them and take up the item on outer space.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.