



UN LIBRARY

NOV 24 1980

UN/CA COLLECTION

FIRST COMMITTEE  
37th meeting  
held on  
Thursday, 20 November 1980  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 37TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. NAIK (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

Draft resolutions were introduced by:

Mr. Skinner (Canada) - A/C.1/35/L.33  
Mr. Grinberg (Bulgaria) - A/C.1/35/L.44

---

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/35/PV.37  
21 November 1980

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

Mr. SKINNER (Canada): I should like to make a brief statement under agenda item 48 (a) to introduce a draft resolution, which has a number of sponsors, on the subject of fissionable material. In this regard, I am pleased to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.33, entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes", on behalf of the following delegations: Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Sweden, Uruguay and, of course, Canada.

This draft resolution recalls resolutions 33/91 H and 34/87 D, which were also introduced by Canada, both of which were procedural in nature, requesting the Committee on Disarmament to examine this question at an appropriate stage of its consideration of the Programme of Action of the special session on disarmament. The purpose of the present draft resolution is basically the same, that is, to draw the attention of the General Assembly to what has happened to the Committee on Disarmament during the previous year and to remind the Committee on Disarmament of the General Assembly's continuing interest in the question.

The report of the Committee on Disarmament indicates that the matter was discussed again this year but that no agreement was reached on either specific steps, such as the banning of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes or, more generally, on the whole subject of multilateral negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament.

In a period of heightened international tension, we believe it is important to explore every avenue that offers greater control of these weapons. The purpose of this draft resolution could dampen both the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. As in the past, therefore, we are confident that this draft resolution will commend itself to a large number of delegations.

Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria): It is a privilege for me, on behalf of the delegations of Angola, Ethiopia, the Mongolian People's Republic, the USSR and my own country, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.44.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria, itself a non-nuclear-weapon State, attaches great importance to the question of strengthening the security of such States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. It has actively participated in the deliberations on this issue, both in the Committee on Disarmament and its ad hoc working group, as well as in the second Non-Proliferation Treaty review conference of last August. Our views on some basic aspects of this problem appear in document CD/SA/WP.4 of July 1980, entitled "Forms of the arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons," and in NPT/CONF.II/C.1/3 of 25 August 1980, entitled "Working paper on the security of non-nuclear-weapon States".

Our interest in the solution of this problem is based first of all on its considerable potential as a factor for strengthening the political and juridical foundations for the observance of the principle of non-use of force in international relations. The importance of this issue derives also from its being an integral part of the more general problem of averting nuclear proliferation and reducing the danger of nuclear war. Last, but not least, it is our firm belief that non-nuclear-weapon States which have renounced the nuclear option and have no nuclear weapons on their territories have the moral right to seek and obtain guarantees that their populations and territories will never be subjected to the horrors of nuclear conflagration.

Our views on the substance of the problem are consistent. We are in favour of nuclear disarmament and support every action in this direction. Pending the attainment of this objective, we support every initiative aimed at banning the use of nuclear weapons concurrently with the renunciation of the use of force in international relations. Until this comes about, we favour any measure designed to strengthen the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Grinberg, Bulgaria)

As far as the form and nature of the measures to be agreed upon are concerned, we continue to believe that, among the several possible arrangements in this area, the most effective guarantees are those which could be included in a legally binding instrument. In our view, such guarantees should benefit all non-nuclear-weapon States, regardless of whether they are covered by other security arrangements or not.

At first glance, the problem of negative security guarantees should lend itself to an easy and rapid solution: no reduction of arms is called for; no difficult problems such as the balance of forces or verification arise; everybody agrees in principle on the need for such guarantees; there is widespread support for the conclusion of a convention on this subject, and so forth. All that is needed seems to be the political will to take the necessary steps. Yet now, two years after the General Assembly adopted its resolutions on this issue, we are still far from attaining the objectives set forth in those documents.

Having said that, we do not want to minimize in any way the importance of the efforts which have been undertaken so far, both here and in the Committee on Disarmament, and particularly of the in-depth analysis of different aspects of the problem made in the ad hoc working group of the Committee under the able chairmanship of Mr. Elaraby of Egypt. But the fact is that, as is evident from the working group's report, the examination of different formulas with a view to reaching agreement on a common formula for the conclusion of effective international arrangements has been inconclusive. As sponsors of the draft convention submitted by the Soviet Union to the Assembly in 1978, we regret in particular that there still exist difficulties that prevent the elaboration of such an instrument.

What then is to be done about it? The answer to that question was provided by the Committee on Disarmament, which decided, on the recommendation of its working group, to explore ways and means to overcome the difficulties encountered thus far and to continue to negotiate at the beginning of its next session with

(Mr. Grinberg, Bulgaria)

a view to reaching agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

We share the generally accepted view that an international convention would be the instrument best suited to incorporate legally binding and credible security guarantees. In this respect, it is encouraging to note the finding in the ad hoc working group's report that in the course of its deliberations no objections were voiced, in principle, to the idea of such a convention. Nevertheless, in view of the persistent difficulties in the realization of this idea, this year, together with the other participants in the working group, we gave serious consideration to the possibility and usefulness of making some interim arrangements.

At the opening of the current session of the General Assembly, the Bulgarian delegation welcomed the new proposals of the USSR on "Certain urgent measures for reducing the danger of war," which contain specific recommendations aimed at the adoption of steps of this nature. Part III of the Soviet initiative envisages as a first step towards the conclusion of an international convention on negative security guarantees that all nuclear-weapon States make declarations that will be solemn and identical in nature on the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States having no such weapons on their territories. It also contains a recommendation that the Security Council examine these declarations with a view to adopting an appropriate resolution of approval.

Many previous speakers have already referred to various positive aspects of this approach. At this juncture, I should merely like to stress the fact that the new measures are not considered as an end in themselves, but are only an interim arrangement leading towards the broader objective of elaborating an international convention in conformity with the recommendations contained in several resolutions of this Assembly.

(Mr. Grinberg, Bulgaria)

These considerations make it clear why we thought it possible and indeed necessary to incorporate in a draft resolution of a general and mostly procedural nature all the ideas contained in part III of the Soviet initiative.

The draft resolution which I have the honour of presenting now is self explanatory. It is entirely based on the findings and recommendations contained in the report of the Committee on Disarmament and its ad hoc working group. By bringing in new, concrete ideas for interim steps, it seeks to facilitate efforts aimed at overcoming the difficulties encountered so far in the search for a solution to the problem before us. That is why we would like to express the hope that it will command the widest possible support in this Committee. Its adoption will no doubt contribute to the further intensification of efforts aimed at providing effective means for strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States in the interest of international peace and security.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): In the course of the consultations that we held on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.9, on the reduction of military budgets, on which we are going to vote, a number of delegations said that they would like to see the draft resolution reflect the relationship which exists between measures to reduce military budgets and the security of States.

To meet these suggestions, the delegation of Romania, together with the other delegations that are sponsoring the draft resolution, would like to inform the Committee that we shall be inserting after the third preambular paragraph a new paragraph which will read as follows:

"Reaffirming that it is possible to achieve reductions in military budgets without affecting the military balance to the detriment of the national security of any State,..."

The rest of the text would remain unchanged.

I should like to stress that the text of the new paragraph is not controversial, inasmuch as it was included in resolution 34/83 F, which secured a consensus in the General Assembly last year, and in paragraph 29 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

We are convinced that the inclusion of this new paragraph will not pose any problems for any delegation.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to delegations, especially the sponsors of this draft resolution, which have taken part in the consultations and final preparations of this document. I hope that it will command the support of all delegations and that it will be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I trust that all members of the Committee have noted the statement just made by the representative of Romania, who on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.9 has proposed a new paragraph to be added after the third preambular paragraph of that draft resolution. He has also indicated that that new paragraph had been the subject of consultations between the sponsors and other delegations.

It is nevertheless the duty of the Chair to ask the Committee whether it would agree to waive rule 120 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, under which proposals or amendments have to be circulated 24 hours before they are actually put to a vote. Since the representative of Romania indicated that the proposed amendment, which has been made on behalf of all the sponsors, was the subject of informal consultations with other delegations, it is the hope of the Chair that the Committee will agree to waive rule 120 and would accept the other amendment just made by the representative of Romania.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to waive rule 120.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed further, may I make some announcements with regard to the sponsorships of draft resolutions.

The following countries have become additional sponsors of draft resolutions: Philippines, A/C.1/35/L.2; Morocco, A/C.1/35/L.14; Bahamas, A/C.1/35/L.16; Zaire, A/C.1/35/L.31; Philippines, A/C.1/35/L.33; Ecuador, A/C.1/35/L.41; Singapore, A/C.1/35/L.42.

The Committee has heard the last speaker on the list and will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions. It is my intention to begin the decision-making process with regard to those draft resolutions listed by the Chair at the previous meetings of the Committee. May I note, however, that some of those draft resolutions contain financial implications and

(The Chairman)

will not be taken up today since information must be provided by the Conference Services in Geneva relating to possible dates and costs of sessions of the groups referred to in draft resolutions A/C.1/35/L.10, A/C.1/35/L.16 and A/C.1/35/L.19.

I also wish to announce that consultations are proceeding on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.7, and consequently I suggest that we postpone action on it in the hope that those consultations will conclude shortly and successfully.

The Committee will therefore take action on the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/35/L.9, as amended a moment ago by the representative of Romania, A/C.1/35/L.11, L.13, L.14, L.15/Rev.1, L.17/Rev.1, L.12, L.21, L.29 and L.6.

Before we proceed, may I recall the relevant provisions of the rules of procedure. Rule 125 states that the decisions of Committees shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting, and according to rule 126 the phrase "members present and voting" means members casting an affirmative or negative vote. Members that abstain from voting are considered as not voting.

In accordance with rule 127 b, any representative may request a recorded vote. Rule 128 of the rules of procedure provides that no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of voting.

May I also draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that it is a long-standing practice to consider that voting in the sense used in rule 128 consists of and encompasses explanations of vote before the vote and after the vote. Therefore, it should be understood that a vote on a draft resolution begins when the Chairman calls on the first speaker wishing to explain his vote before the vote.

Rule 128 also states that the Chairman shall not permit a representative who has presented a proposal or an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment.

(The Chairman)

Under rule 131, if two or more proposals relate to the same question the Committee shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted.

We shall now proceed to the consideration of the specific draft resolutions. The Committee will first take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.9. This draft resolution, which has 11 sponsors, was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1980, and was further modified a few minutes ago by him.

I call on the representative of the Netherlands, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): I wish to make an explanation of vote on behalf of the Nine States of the European Community concerning the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.9, and at the same time concerning that contained in document A/C.1/35/L.10 although that will not be voted on at this moment.

The Governments of the Nine have stated time and again that it is one of the foremost aims of arms control and disarmament negotiations to halt the arms race and stop the increase of world military expenditures. This must take place on a mutually agreed basis and with adequate verification, without affecting the military balance to the detriment of the security of any State concerned.

The question of the reduction of military budgets is this year being dealt with in two different draft resolutions. They are before the Committee as documents A/C.1/35/L.9, now under discussion and introduced by Romania, and A/C.1/35/L.10, introduced by Sweden. The two proposals, as was rightly stated by the representative of Sweden, Ambassador Lidgard, on 7 November 1980, complement each other. Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.9 reaffirms the need to reinforce the endeavours of States with a view to reaching international agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain military expenditures and provides for further pursuance of this aim through any other ongoing activities within the framework of the United Nations. Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.10 complements this text by stressing the important element of

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

a systematic reporting of military budgets, which is the basis for meaningful negotiations on limitations and reductions of military expenditures.

In this connexion, I should like to recall paragraph 89 of the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly, which has been adopted by consensus and is the basis of all efforts aimed at the limitation and reduction of military expenditures. Paragraph 89, which is alluded to in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.9, states:

"Gradual reduction of military budgets on a mutually agreed basis, for example, in absolute figures or in terms of percentage points, particularly by nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States would be a measure that would contribute to the curbing of the arms race, and would increase the possibilities of reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries. The basis for implementing this measure will have to be agreed by all participating States and will require ways and means of its implementation acceptable to all of them, taking account of the problems involved in assessing the relative significance of reductions as among different States and with due regard to the proposals of States on all the aspects of reduction of military budgets." (resolution S-10/2, para. 89)

I should like to take this opportunity also to draw attention to the report of the Ad Hoc Panel on Military Budgeting, which is before the Committee as an annex to document A/35/479. The practical test of the reporting instrument, in which Member States of the European Community participate and for which the Nine have expressed support, shows clearly that such reporting, if it were adopted by States belonging to different regions of the world and representing different economic and budgetary systems, would strengthen international confidence by contributing to greater transparency in military matters. Without generally accepted procedures for the comparison of military expenditures it would be most difficult to arrive at meaningful agreements to restrain or reduce such expenditures.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

It is in the light of these considerations that the Nine will join in a consensus or vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.9 and later on will do the same on that contained in document A/C.1/35/L.10 when it is put to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: A few minutes ago the representative of Romania proposed a new paragraph to be inserted after the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.9. To make sure that the members of the Committee are quite clear concerning the modified text, I shall read out the new paragraph again:

"Reaffirming that it is possible to achieve reductions in military budgets without affecting the military balance to the detriment of the national security of any State".

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution, as amended, without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.9, as amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who have expressed the wish to speak after the adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): India has in the past supported proposals calling for the reduction of military budgets and continues to support them. However, my delegation has its own views concerning the best way to achieve this objective. It is our firm conviction that the question of the reduction of military budgets is primarily a political matter that can be best resolved through parallel action based on a policy of mutual example among the States concerned.

Also, it is unfortunate in the view of my delegation that the concept of the maintenance of military balance has just been introduced into the resolution by the sponsors. My delegation cannot accept that reduction of

(Mr. Venkateswaran, India)

military budgets should be carried out on such a basis. Reduction of military expenditures should clearly be on the basis of ensuring equal security for all States rather than the maintenance of a military balance or a balance of power, which are concepts that we consider untenable.

Secondly, if a reduction of military budgets is to have any significance and credible impact on the disarmament process, efforts must be concentrated among the five or six most heavily armed States, which account for more than 80 per cent of the total global military expenditures. The call for a reduction of military budgets must, therefore, first and foremost take this reality into account.

(Mr. Venkateswaran, India)

Finally, my delegation has some reservations regarding operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, which appears to suggest a codification of the principles governing reduction of military budgets. The implications of such a suggestion must be carefully considered.

As we have already stated, the phenomenon of rising military expenditures is essentially manifest in the huge military budgets of a handful of militarily significant States. It would be quite erroneous, in our view, to suggest that all, or even a majority of, States are equally responsible and that a set of international guidelines applicable to all States is therefore a suitable or even a wise way of trying to solve the problem.

Despite these reservations, my delegation did not wish to stand in the way of a consensus on this resolution, particularly since India has supported the idea of a reduction in military expenditures.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.9, in its general content, responds to the purpose of furthering agreement on the practical reduction of military budgets, and we did not object to its being adopted without a vote.

At the same time, we must express a reservation with regard to the fourth preambular paragraph, which contains a reference to the provisions of the resolution adopted last year on this subject.

If this draft had been put to the vote, the delegation of the Soviet Union would have abstained in a separate vote on the fourth preambular paragraph, for reasons we have repeatedly stated.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded action upon the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.9.

The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.11. This draft resolution has 31 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany at the thirtieth meeting of the First Committee on 10 November 1980.

I call on the representative of India, who has asked to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): India has supported the proposal to request the Secretary-General to carry out a study on confidence-building measures. However, we should like to make some brief comments on the proposed study.

The outline of the study, contained in the annex to document A/C.1/35/422, refers throughout to "arms control", rather than to the more appropriate term "arms limitation". We are of the view that the study should use the internationally accepted expression "arms limitation", rather than the controversial term "arms control". The latter term has certain unacceptable connotations. It implies, for instance, controls even without working for genuine disarmament. Secondly, the expression carries overtones of control exercised by one group of countries over another in the name of disarmament. Finally, the term "arms control" has the connotation of manoeuvring, moderating or regulating the arms race for a purpose or purposes unrelated to the goal of genuine and real disarmament.

I might add that the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament uses the expression "arms limitation", rather than "arms control". Even in the bilateral negotiations between, for instance, the USSR and the United States, the term "Strategic Arms Limitation Talks" has been used.

(Mr. Venkateswaran, India)

My delegation therefore sees no reason why a different expression - namely, "arms control" - should be used in multilateral negotiations or talks on disarmament matters, especially since it carries with it certain controversial and discriminatory connotations. We therefore earnestly hope that our views in this regard will be taken into account in the proposed study on confidence-building measures.

My delegation nevertheless intends to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution (A/C.1/35/L.11) have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.11 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Action on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.11 has thus been completed.

It is now my intention to begin the voting procedure on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.13. This draft resolution has 17 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the thirty-first meeting of the First Committee on 13 November 1980. I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation will vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.13.

My delegation believes that under the current circumstances in the world, any measure imposing restrictions on the deployment of nuclear weapons, as proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13, will not only be of doubtful effectiveness but will destabilize the international military balance and, therefore, prove detrimental to the maintenance of international peace and security.

My delegation is convinced that it is more important that the nuclear-weapon States should proceed step by step to realize concrete and effective nuclear disarmament measures, and my delegation would therefore like once again to appeal to the nuclear-weapon States to adopt such a realistic approach.

As a matter of national policy, the Government of Japan has upheld the three non-nuclear principles of not possessing, not manufacturing and not permitting the entry into Japan of nuclear weapons. In the global perspective, however, my delegation, for the reasons I have just stated, is not able to support the draft resolution before us.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): Last year my delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution regarding the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. At that time we explained our reasons for taking such a stand. This time I should merely like to recall some of those reasons.

It is beyond doubt that the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States can be an important step forward in the efforts to limit the nuclear arms race geographically and to prevent further vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. Consequently, Yugoslavia has always supported all initiatives and actions aimed at achieving those objectives. It was among the first countries to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to other international instruments in the field of disarmament. It also endorsed the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones or zones of peace in various parts of the world where the conditions necessary for such zones existed and it advocates the establishment of a similar zone in the Mediterranean, an area where the incessant stockpiling of nuclear weapons poses an ever more dangerous threat to peace and security in the world.

Under operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13, the Committee on Disarmament is requested to proceed without delay to talks with a view to elaborating an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. However, we interpret the concept of non-stationing more broadly than is implied there. The non-stationing of nuclear weapons cannot be limited only to the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States where there are no nuclear weapons. It should also encompass the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States where there are such weapons at present. Otherwise, it would mean that we accept the status quo with regard to the stationing or allowing of nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States.

Non-stationing should extend to all other areas and spaces where there are no such weapons at present such as international air and maritime spaces. Only thus will it be possible to contribute effectively towards the achievement of the objectives which the draft resolution has in mind.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

Otherwise precisely those areas which are the object of the most intense nuclear-arms race would remain outside the purview of international legal regulation and would be exposed in the future to a constant accumulation of nuclear weapons and their further unhampered geographical proliferation.

Therefore the framework for non-stationing as laid down in operative paragraph 1 of the draft, calling for the international legal regulation thereof, is inadequate and too narrow. The convention under consideration should deal with all aspects of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons and not solely with one of them. The convention should provide for the obligations of nuclear-weapon States with regard to the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States and in other areas and spaces where there are no such weapons at present as well as with respect to the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States where such weapons are stationed at present.

For those reasons my delegation is not in a position to support the limited approach to the consideration and solution of the question of non-stationing suggested in operative paragraph 1. It will therefore abstain, as it did last year, in the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I should like to explain the position of the Ghana delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13, which is before the Committee. While Ghana would normally welcome any initiative aimed at strengthening the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, such a move, in the view of my delegation, should be concerned not only with horizontal proliferation but equally with the vertical spread of nuclear weapons.

In that connexion my delegation has certain reservations about draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13. We think that the draft is unbalanced in the sense that, while it addresses the problem of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons in the countries where there are now no such weapons, it is silent on the nuclear weapons now in existence in the hands of their possessors. Furthermore, the draft resolution also lacks forthrightness in calling for the immediate and parallel removal of those weapons from the territories of States where they are already installed, especially from territories where

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

they have been placed by Powers other than the authorities in those territories. Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13 would seem in its present form to have in effect conferred legitimacy on the possession and stationing of nuclear weapons in countries which now have them. We believe that those aspects of the problem should be given equal attention before proceeding to the elaboration of an international agreement as called for in the draft. The practical effect of the draft resolution in its present wording would not, in our view, help attain the over-all objective of general and complete disarmament. The Ghana delegation will, therefore, abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): The international instrument referred to in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13 aims at making it illegal under international law to station nuclear weapons in the territories of States where there are no nuclear weapons at present and a contrario sensu would confer legality on the existence of nuclear weapons on the territories of countries that already possess them. The draft lacks a specific requirement for the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territories of countries that already have them and the elimination of those weapons in the territories of nuclear-weapon States themselves within the context of effective measures of nuclear disarmament.

For those reasons it is impossible for the delegation of Brazil to support this draft and it will therefore abstain in the vote.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): The Swedish Government attaches great importance to measures aimed at preventing the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territory of States where there are no such weapons at present. We consider that such measures can constitute a significant contribution to the non-proliferation efforts and to progress in the field of nuclear disarmament.

In conformity with this view we strongly support existing international instruments by which the parties concerned are committed to refrain from actions that would lead to the stationing of nuclear weapons on territories where there are no such weapons at present.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

The question of non-stationing is, however, extremely complex since it concerns the general military situation in the world, fundamental aspects of existing security arrangements and the doctrines and false postures of the leading military Powers. It seems to us that progress in that field can be achieved only in the context of real disarmament agreements. Against that background the Swedish Government has some doubts and reservations as to the idea of seeking the solution of a complex problem by dealing with only one of its aspects in an international agreement.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

For similar reasons we doubt whether it is useful to request the Committee on Disarmament to deal with it at this stage, taking into account the consensus here that the Committee on Disarmament should in the first place deal with the items on its agenda that are of highest priority.

In the view of my delegation specific questions of non-stationing could best be dealt with in the context of regional disarmament arrangements.

The Swedish delegation will therefore abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): Ireland will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13, entitled "Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present", introduced by Hungary on 13 November.

Ireland has no wish to see nuclear weapons spreading more widely or being stationed in countries where they are not now stationed. I believe our general position on disarmament issues and other draft resolutions in this Committee will have made that quite clear. We are, however, aware that the question of where the weapons of the two major Powers should be stationed, and under what kind of control, is a matter of contention between the alliances of which those major Powers are members.

We note that the sponsors of the present draft resolution are almost entirely members of one of those alliances, and we feel that the draft resolution itself must be seen against the general background to which I have referred.

For that reason, and notwithstanding our strong general position on the spread of nuclear weapons to other areas, we feel it necessary to abstain on this draft resolution since we feel that voting in favour of the resolution could be seen as taking sides in a way which we would consider unacceptable in this connexion on strategic issues between the two alliances, given that Ireland is not a member of either or of any other military alliance. Ireland in fact abstained on comparable draft resolutions in 1978 and in 1979.

Mr. TAVARES NUNES (Portugal) (interpretation from French): My delegation is opposed to the stationing of nuclear weapons on its territory. States have the sovereign right to allow or to refuse to allow the existence of weapons or armed forces on their territory. That is a right the exercise of which is closely linked with the right it has to defend its territorial integrity. Nevertheless, draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13 is adopted by this Committee, and if its logical consequences are implemented, its practical result will be a limitation of the freedom of States to exercise their sovereign right to defend their territories. Moreover, the adoption of this draft resolution would have results dangerous for the maintenance of international peace and security. First, its implementation would lead to a limitation of the right of a State to determine how it should guarantee its defence against a possible enemy attack. Secondly, it would create discrimination between those States which already have nuclear weapons on their territories and those which have not. That discrimination would work against the latter category of States.

Finally, my delegation believes that this draft resolution is based on a false premise. According to that premise, the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territory of a State or in a region has a destabilizing effect on international peace and security. But in reality there are situations where the introduction of nuclear weapons in a territory or region can contribute to the political or military stability of the entire region and, consequently, to peace and the maintenance of international security. That is true where there is an imbalance of forces threatening peace which could be speedily corrected by the introduction of additional weapons, even nuclear weapons.

For all those reasons, my delegation, which voted against General Assembly resolution 33/91 at the thirty-third session, will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13, on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territory of States where there are no such weapons at present, just as it voted against resolution 34/87 C last year. I shall briefly give the reasons for this.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

My Government is firmly committed to the aims of arms control and disarmament. Those aims must, however, be pursued in a realistic manner taking into account the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Paragraph 49 of the Final Document states that

"The process of nuclear disarmament should be carried out in such a way, and requires measures to ensure, that the security of all States is guaranteed at progressively lower levels of nuclear armaments, taking into account the relative qualitative and quantitative importance of the existing arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States and other States concerned."

(resolution S-10/2, para. 49)

Any one-sided approach concentrating on certain measures without at the same time taking into account the possible effects on the security relationships of States is inconsistent with that principle.

In the region of the world in which my country is situated, nuclear weapons help to offset an existing imbalance in the conventional field and are therefore an indispensable prerequisite for peace and stability. Any measure that is aimed at reducing nuclear weapons or, as in the draft resolution before us, at restricting the freedom of States to accept the stationing of these particular weapons on their territories as a means of ensuring their security in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter must therefore be seen in connexion with the over-all security situation of that region.

Nuclear disarmament can only lead to greater stability and security at a lower level of armaments if it is based on concrete and ultimately verifiable measures with a view to achieving a stable balance.

In that spirit my Government welcomes any realistic approach - for example, the recent first round of talks for the mutual limitation of land-based nuclear medium-range missiles within the framework of the SALT process, which are an important step towards the mutual limitation of those weapons systems.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.13.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13 was adopted by 69 votes to 19, with 44 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Cuba voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13, entitled "Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present", for we recognize that the principle of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons as an effective means of non-proliferation meets an aspiration of all States. The perfection and dissemination of nuclear weapons constitute a threat to all mankind. Any measure to avert a nuclear catastrophe is welcomed by my delegation.

The conclusion of an international agreement prohibiting the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would benefit international peace and security, but such measures should not constitute formal acceptance of the existence of nuclear weapons on the territories of States which already possess them.

We reiterate the right of all States to have whatever weapons they deem necessary to defend their sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. The renunciation of that right cannot be conceived of unless there is respect for the right of all States to determine their future and choose the economic, political and social systems that most suit their peoples.

My delegation considers that to reach international agreements on non-stationing it is necessary to call a halt to military threats, to put an end to the cold war, to dismantle foreign military bases, not to impose unjust economic sanctions and to lift such sanctions where they are now in force.

We are in favour of an agreement, but if one is to be reached it is necessary, in addition to the aforesaid, that the imperialist Powers put an end to their acts of aggression against other States and cease their damaging policy of interference in the internal affairs of other States.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): Having voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.13, my delegation would like to place the following statement on record.

India's affirmative vote on the draft resolution is without prejudice to its consistent and well-known position of total opposition to nuclear weapons as such and to the deployment of nuclear weapons anywhere in the world. India firmly stands for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and has consistently called for urgent negotiations for the achievement of nuclear disarmament. It is in the context of India's over-all position with respect to nuclear weapons that we support the proposal contained in the draft resolution on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.

However, the question of taking up this proposal for consideration in the Committee on Disarmament will, of course, depend upon the priorities assigned to the various agenda items by the Committee itself. We cannot pre-empt the decisions of the Committee on Disarmament in this regard at this stage.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): I wish to make the following points in explanation of vote. First, we support the general objective of achieving a world-wide zone of countries which are permanently free of nuclear weapons. That is, however, an objective that requires a carefully considered and balanced arrangement of obligations and responsibilities, including appropriate security assurances. In view of the over-all goal of nuclear disarmament as the ultimate priority, in both global and regional terms, we believe that there should be no new owners of nuclear arms, that no new types of nuclear weapons should be developed, and that no new deployment should be undertaken in areas where they have not existed.

Secondly, in our view it follows from the concept of State sovereignty that only the Government of the country concerned, be it small or big, allied or non-allied, can be qualified to interpret its own security needs. This should be kept in mind in particular when the possibilities of an international agreement are examined, as mentioned in operative paragraph 1.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

Thirdly, Finland for its part has forgone the option of nuclear weapons and has consistently worked for their prohibition. Consistent with its national position as a small neutral country, Finland will not receive nuclear weapons on its territory on behalf of other countries. My Government has endeavoured to strengthen the non-proliferation régime and has supported the concept and practice of nuclear-weapon-free zones, as well as other measures aimed at lessening the dangers posed by nuclear weapons. Furthermore, my Government has made proposals that aim at entirely excluding the Nordic countries from any nuclear speculation.

The talks envisaged in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution would inherently involve a wide range of issues. We hope that those talks would reflect the principles that I have just mentioned and would be conducted in accordance with the order of priorities already agreed upon and without prejudice to other items on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.13.

The Committee will now take a decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.14, entitled "United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament."

The draft resolution has 24 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the thirty-first meeting on 13 November 1980.

I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey)(interpretation from French): Before taking a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.14, which will certainly receive the support of all delegations, I should like very briefly to present our views on the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament, which was established at the General Assembly's special session on disarmament.

At first glance, it may appear to be a modest undertaking aimed at giving training on disarmament matters to some 20 young people each year. This, however, is not the case. On the contrary, this programme has a significance that goes far beyond the scope of its application, for in fact it is a very valuable investment in the future. At the same time, it is a very positive contribution to the creation of the infrastructure needed to promote the cause of disarmament on a world-wide scale. Finally, this programme is an excellent example of a specific action which the United Nations can undertake in this field.

Indeed, the majority of fellows will be young diplomats from the developing countries who will most probably have the chance in the near future to become leaders in matters of disarmament within their respective administrations. Thanks to this programme, these young diplomats will have an extremely valuable opportunity to observe at close range the work on disarmament in the principal multilateral organs that exist today. In other words, they will have direct contact with the whole of the international machinery dealing with all the aspects of disarmament.

(Mr. Ersun, Turkey)

As for the organization and implementation of the programme during the last two years, we must acknowledge quite objectively that they have clearly been a success from every point of view, thanks to the dynamic guidance of the Assistant Secretary-General, Mr. Jan Martenson.

I should also like to mention the devoted and untiring efforts made by the co-ordinator of the programme, Mr. Ogunbawo, to ensure the successful continuation of this work.

In an environment of frustration and uncertainty, we felt it our duty to pay a tribute to this programme which, albeit modest, is nonetheless very important for the future. We will certainly not build that future on rhetorical statements referring to destabilizing measures or on solemn discussions with regard to the philosophical aspects of the concept of nuclear disarmament, but rather by small concrete steps such as this fellowship programme.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors have asked that draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.14 be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.14 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.15/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations Conference on prohibitions or restrictions of use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects."

This draft resolution has 27 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the thirty-first meeting of this Committee on 13 November 1980.

I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): The nine States members of the European Community will whole-heartedly support draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.15 on the United Nations Conference on certain conventional weapons introduced by

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

the representative of Nigeria. They welcome, indeed, the successful conclusion of the United Nations Conference on Weapons which adopted a convention and three protocols on certain conventional weapons. In the view of the Nine, these results represent an important development of humanitarian law applicable in armed conflict. This successful outcome of long and difficult negotiations represents a considerable encouragement for our continuing efforts to implement the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament.

What is important now is that these new international instruments should enter into force as soon as possible and be scrupulously observed on a universal scale.

We have not yet fully lived up to our responsibilities by reaching a consensus on the text of a convention and three protocols. Our task of reducing the sufferings of victims of armed conflict will be accomplished only if we can be assured that these agreements will be implemented and if we have made sure that the obligations on which we have achieved agreement will be honoured in times of actual conflict.

Pursuing the objective of assuring the observation of the substantial results of the weapons Conference, we should like to call upon States to give further study to the question of an appropriate and effective mechanism facilitating implementation of, and assuring compliance with, the convention and three annexed protocols and to recommend that this question be further examined in future discussions and negotiations.

It is our firm conviction that an adequate mechanism to assure compliance with the convention and its three protocols would deter possible violations and would significantly contribute to the strict and effective observance of the agreed prohibitions and restrictions of use.

Mr. BALETA (Albania)(interpretation from French): The delegation of Albania would like to put forward a few considerations to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.15/Rev.1. In many of its aspects, this draft does not change the provisions of other resolutions that have been adopted previously, resolutions that were put to the vote and on which we abstained. In the case of the present draft resolution, however, we should like to state that we cannot note with appreciation the Final Report of the Conference on Prohibitions and Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. Nor can we welcome the three protocols that emerged from that Conference.

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

It is difficult for us to agree that the limitations inherent in this convention and this protocol can really be regarded as a genuine disarmament measure or that these measures may have any tangible effects on armaments and the arms race in which the imperialist Powers and super-Powers are engaged, and above all in the case of war or aggression.

The idea that the aggressors in an armed conflict would not use the weapons described in this document remains merely hypothetical. No agreement of this kind has ever prevented aggressors from using all weapons and all methods of warfare indiscriminately against both combatants and civilian populations. This is above all true with regard to the wars of aggression launched by the imperialist super-Powers today. Consequently, these agreements will not in our view provide any additional guarantee that the defence of the civilian population will be strengthened in the event of the outbreak of a war of aggression.

With regard to the prohibition of the use of mines or booby traps, we can only raise the following question. By what right and on what humanitarian grounds could one, for example, have asked the Vietnamese fighters not to set booby traps or lay mines against the American aggressors? And how can we now ask the Afghan and Palestinian fighters not to lay mines or set booby traps if Soviet or Israeli tanks and armies, heavily equipped with all types of modern weapons, are marching against them in order to crush them?

It is for these reasons that the delegation of Albania will not participate in the vote on this draft resolution if there is a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: Since there are no further explanations of vote before the vote, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.15/Rev.1.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed their hope and wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee so decides.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the United States, who would like to make a statement following the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States of America): The United States welcomes the adoption of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons and hopes that all States will give the most serious consideration to early signature and ratification of the Convention and its three Protocols. We believe that the Convention can serve real humanitarian interests in minimizing unnecessary injury or damage to the civilian population in times of armed conflict.

We want to emphasize, however, that formal adherence by States to agreements restricting the use of weapons in armed conflict would be of little purpose if the parties were not at the same time firmly committed to taking every appropriate step to ensure compliance with those restrictions after their entry into force.

In particular, the provisions of the present Convention and its Protocols would have little humanitarian value if the parties were inclined to tolerate breaches in the future by States which are bound to comply with them. In this connexion, it would be useful to note that States parties would have a variety of actions open to them to deal with any situation in which significant doubts might arise as to compliance with this Convention. For example, they might request the State or States in question to consult promptly and fully regarding any such situation and to act responsibly to cease any violations - which is, of course, the duty under international law of States party to any treaty. In the case of any violations by any adversary, the right of reprisal, as defined and limited by the international law of armed conflict, would be available. They might raise compliance problems at any conference of parties convened under article 8 of the Convention and agree on appropriate action to deal with them.

(Mr. Floweree, United States)

They might also invoke the provisions of article 90 of Protocol I to the 1949 Geneva Conventions, to the extent that the fact-finding procedures of that article might apply to the case in question. And finally, in serious cases, they might call upon the appropriate bodies within the United Nations system to take suitable action in accordance with their particular mandates to address and resolve the situation.

While, on the whole, we believe that this range of remedies provides adequate means for States parties to ensure compliance with the Convention, the United States also supported the adoption by the United Nations Conference of a provision proposed by a number of States for the creation of a special consultative committee of experts to assist in dealing with specific compliance questions under this Convention. We regret that such a provision was not adopted and, of course, reserve our right to return to this idea at a later date.

In any event, we trust that States which become party to this Convention will do all in their power to see to it that its provisions are fully observed. This is, of course, the firm intention of the United States. If States adhere to the Convention with this determination, we believe that it can be an important and useful step in advancing the humanitarian cause of giving the maximum feasible protection to civilian populations in time of armed conflict.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.17/Rev.1. This draft resolution has 19 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Belgium at the thirty-second meeting of the First Committee on 17 November 1980.

I now call on the Secretary of the First Committee, who will make a statement regarding the financial implications of this draft resolution.

Mr. BERASATEGUI (Secretary of the Committee): In accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure, the Secretary-General shall keep all committees informed of the detailed estimated cost of all resolutions which have been recommended by the committees for approval by the General Assembly. May I note that, once that information is provided to the First Committee, the financial implications of any draft resolution must be examined first by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and later by the Fifth Committee.

As stated in rule 153 of the rules of procedure, no resolution in respect of which expenditures are anticipated by the Secretary-General will be voted by the plenary unless its financial implications are considered by those bodies.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.17/Rev.1, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for the report and study on all aspects of regional disarmament to be issued as a United Nations publication and widely distributed. The Secretary-General wishes to state that the publication of the above-mentioned report will have to be carried out externally and will involve \$11,100 in respect of printing, reproduction and distribution costs.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.17/Rev.1. The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee so decides.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the representative of India who wishes to make a statement following the adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): My delegation has agreed to go along with the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.17/Rev.1. However, had the draft resolution been put to the vote, we would have abstained, as our position on the question of regional disarmament is already well known. Therefore, our participation in the consensus is not to be interpreted as a change in our position.

Furthermore, we cannot share the hope expressed in the draft resolution that the study would encourage Governments to take initiatives and to consult within the different regions with a view to agreeing upon appropriate measures of regional disarmament. Our consistent view has been that questions of regional disarmament cannot be divorced from the over-all process of achieving general and complete disarmament under effective international control on a global scale. Partial measures of the kind recommended in the study on regional disarmament are, therefore, in our view, at best of limited value and could distract attention from priority issues of disarmament, particularly the achievement of nuclear disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: It is now my intention to begin the voting procedure with regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.12. This draft resolution has 15 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the Soviet Union at the thirty-first meeting of the First Committee, on 13 November 1980. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil has always maintained that disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, is a special responsibility of the nuclear-weapon Powers but that at the same time it is of paramount interest and concern to all nations, nuclear and non-nuclear alike. We welcome the readiness of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.12 to intensify efforts with a view to initiating negotiations within the Committee on Disarmament on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament. However, as long as the draft requires the participation of all nuclear-weapon States before the negotiations can be initiated it will defeat its own purpose.

Moreover, this requirement amounts to conferring virtual veto power on individual nuclear-weapon States by enabling them to block the negotiating process within the negotiating body.

For this reason, the delegation of Brazil will abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.12.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): Sweden will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.12 on nuclear weapons in all aspects. However, I wish to make the following explanation of vote.

Sweden has in principle supported the initiative submitted in the Committee on Disarmament by seven socialist States concerning negotiations on nuclear disarmament, as set forth in document CD/4. We have also contributed to efforts in the Committee on Disarmament to establish the appropriate framework for the initiation of negotiations under that Committee's agenda item, "Nuclear weapons in all aspects". However, we have made it clear that the nuclear-weapon States, which possess the most important nuclear arsenals, bear a special responsibility for the achievement of the goals of nuclear disarmament.

Disarmament measures in the nuclear field must take into account the relative qualitative and quantitative importance of the existing arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States. Consequently we attach particular importance to the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, where the particular responsibility of the major nuclear-weapon States is emphasized.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

With regard to the fourth preambular paragraph, I have been instructed to emphasize in this context that Sweden reacts against all formal doctrines as well as against all other measures taken by the nuclear-weapon States in terms of weapon development, deployment and so on, which are apt to make them more likely to resort to the use of such weapons in the event of war. However, one-sided and inaccurate descriptions of these complex matters are of little value in promoting the cause of nuclear disarmament, and therefore we should have preferred the deletion of that specific reference.

Furthermore, with respect to the operative part, we consider that the words "with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States" in operative paragraph 2 are superfluous and should in no way be construed as contradicting or diminishing the particular responsibility of the major nuclear-weapon States.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish):

With regard to agenda item 44 (i), as members are aware we have two draft resolutions, which will be voted on successively. They are to be found in documents A/C.1/35/L.12 and L.21. Those two drafts essentially coincide, and both refer to the establishment by the Committee on Disarmament of an ad hoc working group under the agenda item concerning the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

In many respects it can be said that they are complementary, but there are certain substantive differences as regards the establishment, the functioning and the definition of terms of reference of that ad hoc working group. The establishment, functioning and terms of reference are dealt with in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of document A/C.1/35/L.12, and in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of document A/C.1/35/L.21.

As will be recalled, my delegation had the honour, on behalf of the 13 sponsors to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21 to the First Committee.

That is why, as a result of consultations held yesterday at the conclusion of the morning meeting, my delegation now wishes, on its own behalf and on behalf of the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21 that plan to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.12 - and, of course, without prejudice to supplementary explanations such as the one just made on behalf of his delegation by the representative of Sweden - to state that our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.12 should be understood as in no way whatsoever affecting the meaning and scope of operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21, which, in our view, define most adequately the establishment, functioning and terms of reference of the ad hoc working group on nuclear disarmament which we hope to see created as soon as the 1981 session of the Committee on Disarmament begins.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.12. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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 Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Ireland, Japan,  
Malawi, Morocco, New Zealand, Paraguay, Spain, Turkey  
Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.12 was adopted by 105 votes to 14, with  
13 abstentions.

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

Mr. WILLOT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): My delegation has just  
given expression to its opposition to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.12, and plans to  
abstain during the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21. Both relate to  
nuclear weapons in all their aspects.

Our negative attitude on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.12 stems essentially from  
what to us is the unacceptable nature of the fourth preambular paragraph. The  
supposedly new doctrine of the use of nuclear weapons referred to in that draft  
resolution is in reality neither new nor disproved by the specific capabilities of  
the nuclear-weapon States - and in any case, of the two most powerful among them.

Hence we cannot go along with any judgement, explicit or implicit, which in  
our view is, at the very least, hasty and unilateral.

For completely different reasons of an essentially methodological nature,  
we shall abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21, the factual and  
non-controversial nature of which I would nevertheless stress. We agree with the  
sponsors of that text that the working groups created within the Committee on  
Disarmament have proved the advantage of this working method. We believe, however,  
that it is the Committee on Disarmament itself which is the most appropriate body  
to determine how it wishes to conduct its work.

That having been said, I do not feel that the questions of halting the nuclear  
arms race and of nuclear disarmament lend themselves to the establishment of a  
working group. The resumed intensive consideration of this matter, which has been  
taken up by the Committee on Disarmament, can better proceed on the basis of precise  
elements of which it is constituted, and which, at the appropriate time, will of  
course be the subject of appropriate procedural decisions by the Committee on  
Disarmament.

Mr. LEHNE (Austria): My delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.12. That vote reflects the considered opinion of the Austrian Government that the Committee on Disarmament, as the multilateral negotiating body of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, would be a most suitable forum for the preparation and for the conducting of negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

We are fully aware of the fact that nuclear-weapon States, particularly those with the most important nuclear arsenals, bear special responsibility for nuclear disarmament and we welcome any action taken by them, regardless of its forum or framework, that might lead to progress in that respect. We firmly believe, however, that the utilization of the Committee on Disarmament for substantive talks on nuclear disarmament issues would open a promising approach to the problem.

I should like to add that the Austrian Government has serious reservations concerning the formulation of the fourth preambular paragraph. We share the concern about technological developments and changes in strategic thinking which might destabilize the balance of terror and increase the likelihood of the use of nuclear weapons in the event of war but we regret one-sided and imprecise references to these matters.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): Finland voted in favour of the draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.12 just adopted and we will do likewise in the vote on the draft resolution in A/C.1/35/L.21. We did so because, in our view, nuclear weapons pose the gravest danger to mankind and because we believe that the ongoing efforts to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race should be intensified. We also believe that further aspects of the nuclear arms build-up should be brought within the scope of negotiations including, in particular, the nuclear arms build-up in Europe.

It is of particularly grave concern that the nuclear arms race seems to be assuming new dimensions, technologically, conceptually and geographically.

With regard to the point dealt with in the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.12, Finland rejects all concepts of nuclear war as well as any other nuclear doctrines which make a nuclear war more possible and therefore more probable. To quote the statement of the

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

Foreign Minister of Finland in the general debate of the plenary Assembly on 22 September:

"The increased sophistication of nuclear weapons should not delude anyone into believing that nuclear war could be kept limited or made winnable." (A/35/PV.5, p. 32)

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): Last year Turkey abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on the same subject; this year Turkey took the same position. But I want the record of the Committee to show the very serious reservations of the Government of Turkey with regard to the language of the fourth preambular paragraph.

Mr. SKINNER (Canada): Canada would like to associate itself with the remarks of the representative of Turkey.

The CHAIRMAN: It is my intention to begin now the voting procedure with regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.21. That draft resolution has 19 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 34th meeting of the First Committee on 18 November 1980.

In connexion with the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.21, I should like to point out that, as requested by the representative of Mexico, editorial changes will be made with respect to the Spanish text of the second and fourth preambular paragraphs.

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

Mr. PFELFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to make a few remarks on the draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21, entitled "Nuclear weapons in all aspects".

My delegation has stressed time and again that it is prepared to support any realistic effort aimed at achieving arms control and disarmament in the nuclear and conventional fields. I stress the word "realistic" because in evaluating those efforts we must take into account existing realities.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament states in paragraph 48:

"In the task of achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament, all the nuclear-weapon States, in particular those among them which possess the most important nuclear arsenals, bear a special responsibility."

(resolution S-10/2, para. 48)

Meaningful measures leading towards nuclear disarmament can indeed be achieved only if the nuclear-weapon States agree on measures which guarantee their security at progressively lower levels of nuclear armaments.

That is why, in the opinion of my delegation, it is first and foremost their responsibility to reach agreement on how to reduce the balance, in a verifiable manner, in their nuclear arsenals.

In that connexion, my Government welcomed the beginning of the Geneva talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on the mutual limitation and reduction of long-range theatre nuclear weapons. We learned with appreciation and encouragement that at the end of the first round the two parties were determined to continue the talks and would, at an appropriate time, consult on the specific date of their resumption. In the view of my Government those talks represent an important step on the road to the limitation and reduction of long-range theatre nuclear weapons in accordance with the principles of parity and equality.

Those talks contribute to the continuation of the SALT process, which is of primary importance for global stability and the preservation of peace. In a climate of increased international tensions all ongoing efforts undertaken by the nuclear-weapon States to reach agreement on clearly defined issues in the field of nuclear arms control and nuclear disarmament should be encouraged.

My Government has reservations as to whether the measures proposed in the draft resolution before us, while pursuing that aim, are really adapted to the complex process of nuclear disarmament and, after careful consideration of the contents of the draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21, my delegation has therefore decided to abstain in the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.21. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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 Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21 was adopted by 115 votes to 3, with 18 abstentions.

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

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The delegation of France wishes to explain its negative votes on the two draft resolutions on agenda item 44 (i), on nuclear weapons in all aspects.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.12, we believe that the conditions necessary for the opening of negotiations with the participation of all nuclear States on the question of nuclear disarmament do not exist. We do not, therefore, feel that a working group should be set up under the Committee on Disarmament. I wish to add that the French Government believes that responsibility for negotiations on nuclear disarmament at the present historic stage rests with the two Powers possessing the most sizable nuclear arsenals. Since the disproportion between those arsenals and those of the other nuclear-weapon States is so great, they must between them negotiate a substantial reduction of their nuclear weapons. Only when that disproportion has changed will the French Government in turn be able to consider entering into commitments.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21, the recommendation contained therein that the Committee on Disarmament create a working group to consider nuclear disarmament is objectionable to us on two counts. In our opinion it is not up to the General Assembly to act in the organization of the work of the Committee on Disarmament and in the choice of its methods. In addition - and this is the essential point for us - the question of nuclear disarmament does not at this stage seem to lend itself to consideration, and still less to negotiation, in a working group. Yet this question does appear

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

on the Committee's agenda, and we do not object to the principle of there being a debate on the problem mentioned in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21. Such a debate might very well contribute to the study of the global programme on disarmament, which the Committee will continue to consider at its next session.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): I should like to say a few words about draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21, which has just been voted on. My comments apply also to the preceding draft resolution, A/C.1/35/L.12.

My delegation voted against those two draft resolutions. My Government of course attaches great importance to the urgent task of the limitation of nuclear weapons. We believe, however, that the relationship between nuclear weapons and the fundamental security concerns of some States means that a general approach to the issue of nuclear disarmament, as reflected in these resolutions, is unlikely to produce tangible and positive results. Furthermore, as regards draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21, my delegation cannot accept that it is correct procedure for this Assembly to give what amounts to directions to the Committee on Disarmament about the nature and responsibilities of its subsidiary bodies. My Government's commitment to the objectives of nuclear disarmament is reflected in the fact that the United Kingdom is participating in the tripartite negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban. We look forward to the successful conclusion of those negotiations, and to further specific measures which will contribute to achieving adequately verified nuclear disarmament and therefore to achieving disarmament in a manner which protects the security of all States concerned.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21 on nuclear weapons in all aspects. We share the general thrust of that draft, which is that practical work in the Committee on Disarmament should begin as early as possible on the most vital and urgent problem in the field of disarmament, namely the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. In that context we believe that the creation in the Committee on Disarmament of a special working group with a very clearly defined mandate would serve that cause.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

However, we have definite reservations on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. We believe that the General Assembly is not entitled to tell the Committee on Disarmament how to organize the work of its subsidiary organs or to determine their mandate and the practical tasks that they should tackle. The solution of such problems is definitely a prerogative of the Committee on Disarmament itself, and exclusively so, since it is an independent organ with a very special status vis-à-vis the General Assembly.

We are convinced that as a result of the adoption of draft resolutions A/C.1/35/L.12 and L.21 the Committee on Disarmament will at long last move to embark on negotiations on nuclear disarmament - and the Soviet Union is definitely and consistently in favour of such negotiations.

Mr. NOLAN (Australia): The Australian delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/35/L.12 and L.21, entitled "Nuclear weapons in all aspects". The Australian delegation is concerned at the number of issues being assigned to the Committee on Disarmament to be given substantive consideration. It is not possible for that Committee to give equal priority to all issues assigned to it. To assign a large number of issues to the Committee on Disarmament will create confusion over which of them should in fact be given priority. Such confusion should and can be avoided by exercising greater selectivity in the assignment of issues.

The draft resolutions just voted on attach, in the Australian delegation's view, too high a priority to a proposal which is yet to be given a specific form. The Committee on Disarmament has already had assigned to it more specific and pressing matters, the consideration of which should not be impeded.

Finally, I should like to recall Australia's serious reservations on the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.12.

The CHAIRMAN: I intend now to begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.29, which has 22 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 33rd meeting on 18 November 1980.

Since no delegation has asked to be allowed to explain its vote at this stage I shall put the draft resolution to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, 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, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam,  
Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Cuba, France, Guyana, Malawi,  
United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.29 was adopted by 129 votes to none, with  
6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who have  
asked to be allowed to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The delegation  
of France regrets that this year it had to abstain in the vote on the draft  
resolution on the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the  
Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. The draft  
resolution specifically names France, and we are surprised that it was  
submitted without prior consultation between the sponsors and the delegations  
of those countries which are urged to take action within their sovereign  
powers.

Last year, in its resolution 34/71, the General Assembly welcomed France's  
signing of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. That act was  
performed in Mexico City on 2 March 1979 by the President of the French Republic  
and clearly showed France's desire to fulfil the obligations of the Treaty for  
the territories in Latin America for which it bears international responsibility.  
However, France cannot agree to its responsibility being challenged in respect  
of a treaty which has not been signed and ratified by all the countries of the  
area to which it applies.

In this connexion, my delegation can only remind the Committee of the terms  
of the communiqué issued on 17 May 1980 in Paris by the President of the French  
Republic and the President of the Republic of Mexico, which states:

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

"Stressing the contribution that the Treaty of Tlatelolco makes to peace and security in the area, the two Presidents expressed the desire that the countries concerned sign and ratify, as necessary, the Treaty and its additional protocols to allow them to be implemented broadly and rapidly."

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

Finally, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.29 are certainly no less respectful than my delegation of the procedures incumbent upon all States with regard to the ratification of international treaties. Like my delegation, they doubtless feel that it is not for the General Assembly to interfere in those procedures or to reiterate with special urgency, as the draft resolution states, invitations which in the present instance are addressed to national parliaments that deliberate and legislate in accordance with their respective constitutional provisions.

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States of America): My delegation regrets very much that, in contrast to previous years, it had no choice but to abstain on the draft resolution dealing with the Treaty of Tlatelolco as presented this year.

This draft resolution focuses attention in critical terms on two countries, France and the United States, which are deeply committed to the success of that Treaty and have taken concrete steps to demonstrate this commitment. At the same time, it completely ignores the failure of several States in the region to sign the Treaty or to take action necessary to bring it into force.

The United States is following its internal parliamentary procedures, procedures common to all States having parliaments. The President has signed the Protocol and it has been submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent. My Government has consistently demonstrated its strong support for this Treaty as a valuable contribution to non-proliferation and as an example worthy of consideration in other regions.

Just yesterday, in fact, speaking at the opening session of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States, the President of the United States said:

"It is imperative that those nations that have not signed the Treaty banning the spread of nuclear weapons in the Western Hemisphere do so, to set an example for other nations in other regions of the world."

(Mr. Floweree, United States)

Our goal has been and continues to be to bring the Treaty into force for all countries in the region. It is unfortunate that because of the unbalanced nature of the approach taken by the authors of this year's draft resolution, my delegation was unable to support a draft resolution on a Treaty which my Government values highly.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.29.

The Committee will now take a decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.6, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

The draft resolution was submitted by the delegation of Egypt and introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 30th meeting of the Committee on 10 November 1980.

I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): I should just like to say that Israel will explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6 when that draft resolution is considered in the plenary of the General Assembly.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil has no problem in supporting this draft resolution, either by vote or if it is approved by consensus.

However, we would like to place on record our reservations concerning operative paragraph 1 and its reference to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Mr. PFELFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to make a few remarks concerning draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

My delegation intends to support the draft resolution and to participate in what it hopes may be a consensus on it. My delegation has on several occasions pointed out that it considers the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones as highly desirable. The establishment of properly conceived nuclear-weapon-free zones in appropriate areas can lead to the enhancement of the security of States in those areas. It can stimulate efforts aimed at achieving results in negotiations on arms control and disarmament, and it can further the aim of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones can bring about greater stability and enhance security in the region concerned. In this connexion, I should like to recall paragraphs 60 to 63 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, where it is stated, inter alia:

"The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned constitutes an important disarmament measure." (resolution S-10/2, para. 60)

My delegation therefore welcomes draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6, which urges all parties directly concerned seriously to consider taking the practical and urgent steps required for the implementation of the proposal to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and invites the countries concerned to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. My delegation will encourage and assist all parties directly concerned in the Middle East to take the steps required in order to set up a properly conceived nuclear-weapon-free zone. We hope that this will eventually be achieved and we welcome recent encouraging signs of movement towards this end. In particular we welcome the decision by Israel to support the Egyptian draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that area. At the same time, we regret that Israel felt it had to withdraw draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.8. We therefore consider it politically important that the draft resolution before us be adopted, if possible by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other representative wishes to speak in explanation of vote at this stage, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6. The sponsor has expressed the wish - which was endorsed a few minutes ago by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany - that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to make statements at this stage.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): Although draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6 has been adopted by consensus, my delegation would like to place on record its position with regard to paragraph 1, in which reference is made to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

India's principled stand on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is well known. That Treaty, in our view, is unequal and discriminatory in character. While we sympathize with the concerns of the States of East Asia, we should like to make it clear that India's affirmative position is without prejudice to its well-known stand in regard to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Mr. DORJI (Bhutan): The delegation of the Kingdom of Bhutan was happy to join in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", which has just been adopted.

It has always been the position of my delegation firmly to oppose the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to support the principles and objectives which motivated the sponsors in submitting that draft resolution. However, my delegation would like to reserve its position with regard to paragraphs 1 and 3 in which reference is made to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This relates to the fact that my Government has not yet considered acceding to that Treaty.

Mr. CORDERO DE MONTEZEMOLO (Italy) (interpretation from French): With reference to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, the Italian delegation wishes to express satisfaction at its adoption by consensus.

The position of Italy on the general problem of nuclear-weapon-free zones is well known. We believe that the fact that this year all the States of the region of the Middle East have joined in the consensus on the draft resolution is indeed a step in the right direction, which deserves to be stressed and encouraged.

We are also aware of the fact that the efforts to set up a nuclear-weapon-free zone can be made only if the complex and difficult political problems in the Middle East are put aside. The position of my Government with regard to those problems is well known.

Mr. SKINNER (Canada): I should like to join other speakers in supporting draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6.

The unstable situation prevailing in the Middle East is of deep, continuing concern to all of us, and the possibility of the development of nuclear weapons capability in the region is especially disturbing and has ominous consequences for the cause of peace. It is gratifying, therefore, that two Governments in the Middle East have made positive proposals to try to contain the threat of nuclear confrontation. I should like, therefore, to express my Government's appreciation for draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6, proposed by Egypt, and welcome the decision by the Government of Israel this year to join in support of this worth-while initiative.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): I should like to make some brief remarks on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, which we have just adopted by consensus.

The United Kingdom supports the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones provided that all the States in the particular region concerned are in agreement on the proposed zone. We therefore welcome efforts towards establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. In particular, we are pleased that this year all the States in the region have been able to participate in the consensus adopted on this draft resolution. The change of position by the Government of Israel is a welcome sign that further consideration can now be given to resolving the differences of approach to this question among the countries concerned.

The United Kingdom remains convinced that the best approach to follow in establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East would be for all States in the region to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and accept full-scope safeguards, thus at the same time strengthening the international non-proliferation régime.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): Ireland has been very happy to participate in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", introduced by Egypt.

It would be a source of satisfaction to all of us, as it is to Ireland, that for the first time in the First Committee of the General Assembly a draft resolution on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East should have been adopted with the consent of all the States of the region, thus fulfilling what we consider to be an essential condition for the formation of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Ireland has also noted Israel's decision to withdraw its draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.8, calling on the States of the Middle East and non-nuclear-weapon States adjacent to the region which are not signatories to any treaty providing for a nuclear-weapon-free zone to convene at the earliest possible date a conference with a view to negotiating a multilateral treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Ireland is pleased to note that that proposal represents a very significant change on the part of Israel in relation to the denuclearization of the Middle East, having regard to the fact that Israel has consistently abstained in the past on draft resolutions on the subject of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that area.

It should be our hope that the adoption of Egypt's draft resolution today by consensus will herald a new age in the achievement of positive progress in the denuclearization of the Middle East, provided the States of the area show the necessary goodwill to work towards that end.

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States of America): My delegation is pleased that for the first time this Committee has been able to adopt by consensus a draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. The United States remains a strong supporter of non-proliferation, and we believe that the establishment of an effective nuclear-weapon-free zone would be particularly significant in the Middle East.

(Mr. Floweree, United States)

In this connexion, we welcome the position taken by the delegation of Israel in putting its own views before the Committee in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.8 and in joining in the consensus on the draft resolution we have just adopted. One aspect of the Israeli formulation that drew our attention was the recognition that a nuclear-weapon-free zone could come into being only with the full and free co-operation of the States in the region.

(Mr. Floweree, United States)

This approach conforms to our long-held belief that an essential attribute of an effective nuclear-weapon-free zone is participation by all States deemed important to the zone's operation. The consensus here today will, we hope, lay the foundation for the establishment of a Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone with the necessary universal participation.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): On behalf of the delegations of the five Nordic countries, Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Finland, I should like to welcome draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6, which has just been adopted by consensus.

For the first time a draft resolution calling for the implementation of the proposal to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East has been adopted without a vote. It is most significant that all parties concerned are now committed to that idea. The Nordic countries have consistently supported efforts to strengthen the security of States on a regional basis, including the establishment on a voluntary basis of nuclear-weapon-free zones with the consent of the States concerned. We further welcome the fact that the General Assembly by this draft resolution with the concurrence of the countries concerned, would invite those countries to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

In document A/C.1 /35/10 the Nordic countries have expressed their views on the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, including the further steps needed to promote international confidence that additional States are not seeking to achieve nuclear explosive capability. Adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which we consider the best available tool to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, could significantly enhance trust among the States referred to in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6 and thereby contribute to a peaceful settlement of the unresolved issues in the area.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation has participated in the consensus on the draft resolution sponsored by Egypt and contained in document A/C.1/35/L.6. It is a source of satisfaction to my delegation that a draft resolution on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East has for the first time been adopted with the consent of all States in the region.

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

We have also noted that this morning Israel decided to withdraw its draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.8. As I stated a few days ago, we considered the introduction of that draft resolution a constructive contribution to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. We would have suggested, however, certain improvements to that draft resolution had it been put to the vote; in particular, preambular paragraph 3 could have stood some redrafting. We would have submitted that the accession of all States in the region to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and/or acceptance of full-scope safeguards would have been another, if not the most effective, way of proving the intention to prevent proliferation in the region.

Mr. ELARABY (Egypt): Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6 has just been adopted without a vote. Egypt, as the sponsor, wishes to express its appreciation and gratitude to all States of the region. The unanimous support that draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6 has commanded reflects the importance that the international community attaches to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in our region. My delegation wishes to address its appreciation in particular to those States which contributed to the achievement of this important consensus. They were all motivated by a common conviction that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East is of the utmost importance and should enjoy the highest priority.

The adoption of a draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East by consensus for the first time is a significant development which is greatly welcomed by Egypt. If that development is pursued faithfully and seriously it will ensure that our region will be spared the hazards, havoc and destruction of nuclear weapons. The draft resolution aims at the achievement of an objective and it also recommends certain interim practical measures. They are clearly spelled out in operative paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 and there is no need for me to repeat them.

The draft resolution, moreover, recognizes the interrelationship between the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and the maintenance of international peace and security. It calls upon the States concerned to deposit their declarations with the Security Council for consideration as appropriate.

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

That clearly reflects the organic and direct link between the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone and the enhancement of peace and security in our area. In our view, that is completely in line with the characteristics and realities of the Middle East.

We have entered a new phase, a phase which my delegation hopes will lead to an atmosphere conducive to the achievement of a comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East. The clear obligations emanating from the provisions of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.6 should in our view be carried out fully and expeditiously. This applies to the States of that area; it applies to the nuclear-weapon States; it applies also to the Security Council, whose responsibilities under this draft resolution are central and essential.

On behalf of the Government of Egypt I wish to reiterate in very clear terms our readiness and our total willingness to carry out all the obligations emanating from this draft resolution on the basis of reciprocity.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.