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The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Before continuing the consideration of specific proposals I should like to refer to a matter which I mentioned to the Committee at its 2016th meeting on 13 November last, concerning the updating of the publication entitled The United Nations and Disarmament. As a result of informal consultations I understand that the First Committee would consider that the updating, every five years, of that publication, as decided upon by the Committee on 1 December 1960 and agreed to by the General Assembly on 16 December of that year, should be carried out by the Secretary-General's issuing a supplement of some 200 pages which would cover the period from 1970 to 1975, printed in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. As I stated on 13 November, the Secretary-General has informed me that the total cost for printing and external contractual translation would be \$US 765,000, for the supplement in the six languages.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the consensus of the Committee is that this should be done and that consensus will be recorded and transmitted to the General Assembly for approval. Does any member of the Committee have any objection?

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): My delegation is interested in the publication you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, first, because we use it as a reference document, secondly, because we think that it is quite consistent with one of the resolutions which we have adopted that the United Nations should seek in every way to publicize the efforts of the international community in the field of disarmament. However, my delegation would simply like to have an assurance that the proposed supplement would be a separate volume to update The United Nations and Disarmament rather than a sort of addition, merely supplementing the text. My delegation hopes that it would really bring up-to-date the history of disarmament from 1970 to 1975, the period to be covered by the supplement. I should like an assurance that the supplement would not be a substitute for a revised version or new edition of the publication.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The understanding of the representative of Nigeria is perfectly correct, the Secretariat informs me.

Since I hear no objection to the procedure I have mentioned, I shall consider that the Committee so decides and the General Assembly will be informed of the Committee's decision for its approval in due course.
In accordance with the programme of work that I submitted to the Committee this morning, we shall start this afternoon with the consideration of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1 on agenda item 24, entitled "Reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries".

Before calling on those delegations which have asked to be allowed to explain their votes before the vote, I call on the Secretary of the Committee to explain the administrative and budgetary implications of this draft resolution.*

**Mr. RANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee):** Under the terms of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1, the Secretary-General would be requested to make the necessary arrangements to issue, as a United Nations publication, the report of the Group of Consultant Experts "on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council, which should also cover other States with a major economic and military potential, and on the utilization of a part of the funds thus saved to provide international assistance to the developing countries".

The Secretary-General understands that the report which was transmitted to the General Assembly in document A/9770 would amount to approximately 35 printed pages and would be printed in six languages, as follows: Arabic, 5,000 copies; Chinese, 2,000; English, 25,000; French, 11,000; Russian, 6,000; and Spanish, 11,000. Based on those assumptions, it is estimated that the total cost of external printing would amount to $27,000, for which an additional appropriation would be required under section 4 of the Programme Budget for the biennium 1974-1975.

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

* Mr. Neugebauer (German Democratic Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.
Mr. RAMPUL (Mauritius): I am fighting against time. I am working under great pressure. There are many important resolutions in this Committee, some of them sponsored by Mauritius. At the same time, I am the third speaker on the list in the plenary Assembly on the question of Palestine in explanation of vote before the vote. I am more or less in the same position as the Chairman of this Committee, who has just had to leave to go to the plenary Assembly. Since I am a one-man delegation, I may be absent during the voting but I would not like that to be interpreted as intentional absence. As a matter of fact, my intention is to vote on all the draft resolutions that are under consideration in this Committee. I hope that the Secretariat will make a note of this, thus I shall at least be covered.

The CHAIRMAN: The remarks of the representative of Mauritius will be duly reflected in the verbatim records of this meeting.

I shall now call on those delegations which have asked to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. LIN (China) (interpretation from Chinese): We fully understand and sympathize with the good intention of many developing countries in demanding that the major Powers disarm and reduce military budgets. However, it should be pointed out that the super-Powers are intensifying the arms race under the guise of disarmament negotiations so as to carry out aggression and expansion and to contend with each other. In particular, one super-Power under the label of "socialism" is crying out loudest for disarmament while it is most energetic in arms expansion and war preparations. Its proposal for the so-called reduction of military budgets by 10 per cent is an out and out fraud. We have exposed it on many occasions and firmly oppose it. Based on this position, we will vote against the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1.
Mr. ECSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the forthcoming vote on the four-Power draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1, the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement.

As representatives know, it was the Soviet Union which took the initiative at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly concerning the question of the reduction of the military budgets of States members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries. That proposal received the wide support of States Members of the United Nations, not only at the last session, but also at the current session of the General Assembly, including the statements of many delegations during the debate on disarmament items in the First Committee.

We understand the concern expressed by delegations to the effect that the relevant resolution on this question -- 3095 A (XXVIII) -- has not so far been implemented. We share their opinion to the effect that the implementation of the Soviet Union proposal would promote economic and social progress in developing countries and international détente, since the reduction of the military budgets of the most powerful States in the world would be an important contribution in this respect.

The Soviet delegation would like to stress the readiness of the USSR to take appropriate steps to reduce the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council -- if steps are taken simultaneously by all the permanent members of the Security Council, including the USSR.

However, the draft resolution now under consideration departs somewhat from the question of the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council. It proposes further studies on military budgets as such, despite the fact that, in keeping with resolution 3095 B (XXVIII), adopted by the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General has, with the assistance of consultant experts, already prepared a report on the reduction of military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council.
Competent specialists and experts participated in drawing up that report, which has once again confirmed that there is no need to conduct all kinds of studies about military budgets as such, since that leads to unnecessary difficulties in the practical solution of the question of reducing military budgets.
Moreover, as our delegation now knows, a few considerations contained in the addendum to the report do not reflect the opinion of all experts working on that report. We express our regret that the draft resolutions on reducing military budgets sets the whole question in the area of new studies, specialization, studies as to what military budgets are and so on. We are convinced of the fact that efforts should be aimed at implementing the resolution adopted at the last session of the General Assembly, 3093 A (XXVIII), which proposed a reduction of 10 per cent in the military expenditure of the five States permanent members of the Security Council. Instead of conducting new studies on military budgets, the General Assembly should clearly and unequivocally take a stand in favour of last year's proposal on reducing military budgets, since it must be implemented in all its parts. In our opinion, this would be the correct solution of the problem of reducing military budgets in the present conditions.

In the practice of the United Nations, unfortunately, there are frequent cases in which, instead of a practical solution being applied to a given problem, someone is entrusted with the preparation of a study or a report, the results of which do not promote the solution of the problem. In this case, the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution which we are now considering says:

"Noting that Governments have not had the time necessary to study that report with the attention and care which the important and complex questions covered in it merit ..."

The question of course arises: why should the Secretary-General be requested to submit a new report on a wider number of questions, as long as the practical question is not solved? The practical question is posed by the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its last session, to which I have already referred, resolution 3093 A and B (XXVIII).

On the basis of the foregoing, the Soviet delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1.

Mr. THOMSON FLORES (Brazil): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1. I would wish, however, to recall very briefly the position of Brazil with respect to this item.
As my delegation stated at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly and as the Permanent Representative of Brazil, Ambassador Prazao, repeated in the First Committee this year, we believe that this question should be dealt with within the broad framework of international peace and security, disarmament and economic development of developing countries. Although we understand that this draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1 is of a procedural nature, we would have wished it to be more assertive regarding the accepted principle that a substantial portion of the savings derived from measures in the field of disarmament should be devoted to promoting economic and social development in the developing countries.

Concern could also have been expressed regarding the persistence of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and over the subsistence of a large segment of mankind in unacceptable conditions of destitution and economic underdevelopment.

We wish finally to acknowledge the good intentions and the efforts which the representative of Mexico has been putting into this matter. As a member of the Special Committee created by resolution 3095 A (XXVIII), Brazil will endeavour to participate actively and constructively in the consideration of this item.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to announce that the United Republic of Cameroon has become a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1.

We shall now start the voting procedure on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1. As the voting machine is broken, the Committee will vote by show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted by 89 votes to 2, with 13 abstentions.
The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. MOGHADAM (Iran): The positive vote of Iran on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1 must be viewed in the light of the procedural nature of the draft. We would nevertheless wish to express our position with respect to the substance of the issues involved in all their aspects.

Mr. MEHDI (Pakistan): I should like to explain the favourable vote that my delegation has cast on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1. In doing so, I wish to recall that at the last session of the Assembly my delegation had abstained on resolution 3093 A (XXVIII) and had voted in favour of resolution 3093 B (XXVIII).

It is the belief of my delegation that the reduction of military budgets, while a most desirable objective, could not come to any meaningful fruition without the creation of a proper international atmosphere and without adequate study and examination. We had therefore favoured the Mexican proposal last year that the question should be studied, and had expressed the hope that such a study would improve our understanding of the issues and make possible a more constructive consideration of this question.

The preliminary study has been submitted to this Committee. We do not feel that all the issues have been resolved or that the stage has been reached which could make an agreement among the principal parties possible. We are therefore in favour of a wider exchange of views, which, we believe, is the primary purpose of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1, which the Committee has just adopted.

I would be less than honest if I did not restate our belief that the proposal for a uniform cut of 10 per cent in the military budgets of permanent members of the Security Council is unrealistic. It does not take sufficient account of the fact that there are wide discrepancies in the military spending of each of those Powers. Also, we are not persuaded that a percentage reduction is a more feasible method than the procedure of stipulating reductions in terms of men and materiel, as is being followed, for example,
in other disarmament negotiations such as the SALT and the mutual and balanced force reduction talks.

We hope therefore that such considerations will be borne in mind by the Member States in communicating their views on this subject to the Secretary-General, and that they will lead to the adoption of recommendations which are realistic and capable of implementation.

These are the beliefs and considerations that have led my delegation to cast a positive vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): First, perhaps I had better explain what my vote was, because, contrary to our usually infallible machine, the United States voted "yes" on that draft resolution. We voted "yes" because of our support for the over-all approach embodied in the resolution. We would like to point out, however, that we have some reservations with respect to some of the items on which States are invited to comment in operative paragraph 3. We would like to state our understanding that subparagraph (b) of that paragraph concerns a possible standardized system of reporting on military budgets rather than standard military budgets themselves.

Finally, with respect to item (f), our delegation would like to add that we continue to question the utility of efforts to link military budget levels to a duty to provide economic assistance.

Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom): My delegation has voted in favour of this draft resolution because we believe that informed discussion of military budgeting might eventually contribute to the development of new techniques of disarmament. We believe that the experts' report has shown that the points covered in paragraphs 3 (a) and 3 (b) of the draft resolution are crucial to further discussion of this subject. Progress on other points will depend on agreement on the intended scope of the term "military budgets" and on substantially greater information being made available by States about their military expenditure. We too had our doubts about the text of paragraph 3 (b) and we wondered whether a system of standardized military budgets really was meant so much as a standardized system for receiving reports of the military budgets.
My delegation also wishes to reaffirm my Government's view that, while the reduction of military budgets as a disarmament measure could, in certain circumstances, be expected to increase the capacity of the countries reducing their military expenditure to devote more resources to development, development is only one of the uses to which any of the resources released could usefully be put. My delegation therefore does not consider that the points raised in paragraphs 3 (f) and 3 (e) are appropriate so far as concerns the United Kingdom.
Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): The delegation of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria has already had occasion to explain the favourable attitude of its Government towards the question of the reduction of the military budgets of the States permanent members of the Security Council and other States with a major economic and military potential and the utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide international assistance to developing countries. At the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly my delegation voted in favour of resolution 3093 (XXVIII). To our great regret, my delegation was not in a position to vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1, for two reasons. First, the draft resolution, in our opinion, departs from resolution 3093 (XXVIII), whereby the vast majority of United Nations Member States have taken a resolute stand in favour of the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent. The text that the Committee has just adopted, in our opinion, takes us back to the stage of the study of the question. Furthermore, the text of the draft resolution is based on the report of the Group of Consultant Experts, which, as the report of the Secretary-General says, does not commit its authors. Despite the fact that the draft says that Governments have not had the time necessary to study that report, the Bulgarian Government is now considering that report, and therefore my delegation would like to make a preliminary comment regarding the information contained in the report. We should like to state that the information regarding the military expenditures of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria mentioned in the report (A/9770) is not in accordance with the facts. The figures in the report are much higher.

Therefore the delegation of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria abstained on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1. This abstention does not at all change the position of the Government of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria, which is always in favour of a reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council and other States with a major economic and military potential.
The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to explain its vote, we have now concluded consideration of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.695/Rev.1.

We shall now turn to the next draft resolution, which is contained in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.1. I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. ROWE (Canada): As my delegation stated during the debate on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.691, under agenda item 27, the Canadian Government supports international efforts which have been made and are being planned to examine carefully and fully the question of certain conventional weapons which may be found to have indiscriminate effects or to cause unnecessary suffering.

My delegation believes that the adoption of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691 yesterday in this Committee has demonstrated clearly that there is wide agreement that these questions should be further examined in the Ad Hoc Committee of the Diplomatic Conference at Geneva in 1975 and at a second government experts' conference which we expect to be held later next year. Therefore we must question the appropriateness of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.1 currently before us, because, in our opinion, it prejudges several of the questions which will be before these future meetings which I have just mentioned. In our view, further study and international discussion will be required before States will be in a position to pronounce themselves with certainty on the legality of or the need for the prohibition of these weapons.

For these reasons the Canadian delegation will abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.*

Mr. LENKH (Austria) (interpretation from French): My delegation attaches great importance to the question of napalm and other incendiary weapons. Austria has joined the efforts undertaken for a number of years

* The Chairman resumed the Chair.
to find ways to limiting the use of these weapons. My delegation has expressed this interest not only in its statement in the general debate on the question of disarmament but also by joining the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.691 which was adopted yesterday. The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.693 reached us only this morning. It was only introduced this morning by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. It has now been revised. My delegation would have wished to have an opportunity to study this text more carefully. For this reason my delegation would have preferred to defer the vote on this text to a later date. However, so as not to hamper the progress of the work of this Committee, I am not formally moving postponement. If we are to vote on it today, the abstention of my delegation is explained by the absence of instructions to it.
Mr. ELIAS (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): I have asked to speak in order to request clarification concerning the Spanish text of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.693/Rev.1. In operative paragraph 1, the Spanish text refers to "troops" whereas in the English text the word used is "personnel".

I should like to ask the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic whether it is the intention of the draft resolution to condemn the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons only when it affects military personnel or is it intended also to include the use of napalm when it affects civilian personnel?

Mr. AL-MAHDI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): What is meant by this phrase is harm done to civilian and military personnel. If this phrase is rather ambiguous or gives rise to certain problems, I should be happy to have an amendment to make it clearer.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to thank the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic for his clarification. I would request the Secretariat to be so good as to amend the wording of the Spanish text accordingly, so that it will read:

"Condemns the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in armed conflicts in circumstances where it directly or indirectly may affect persons."

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): If there is no objection on the part of the sponsor of the draft resolution, operative paragraph 1 in the Spanish text will have the word "persons" instead of the word "troops", as read out by the representative of Spain.
Mr. SCALANDRE (France) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the members of the European Economic Community I request that the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.1 should not take place today. Our delegations have not had time to communicate the text of this draft to our respective Governments. My remarks, of course, in no way prejude the attitude that these delegations may take on the substance of the matter at a later stage.

Speaking on behalf of my delegation, I wish to say that if the Committee does vote this afternoon, we shall be compelled to abstain from voting because of lack of instructions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Before calling on the next name on the list of speakers, I should like to say the following. As Chairman I constantly receive requests, either publicly or privately, to postpone the voting on draft resolutions. We have reached the moment of truth. There can be no further postponement of voting on draft resolutions because the Committee decided that it would conclude consideration of the disarmament items today. Therefore, delegations which have not received instructions or which are not able to take a position on a given draft resolution will, most logically, have to proceed accordingly. Unless the entire Committee so decides, I cannot postpone the voting on any draft resolution. If any delegation desires that the Committee not vote on a specific draft resolution today, it must make a formal motion to that effect. In that way the Committee can decide whether or not it wishes to postpone the vote on any particular draft resolution.

May I graciously but forcefully point out to the representative of France that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698 was distributed yesterday. The revised text in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.1 was distributed today.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I take great exception to the revised text of the draft resolution, and for good reasons. That is why I formally move the postponement of the voting on it. The revision seriously affects the whole context of the draft resolution.
The previous Assembly resolution, 2932 A (XXVII), and the subsequent one, deplores the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in all armed conflicts -- and stops at that. Napalm is primarily an incendiary weapon. If it destroys forests and if it destroys the natural resources of a country is its use to be excused because it does not affect "personnel"? This is absolutely contrary to the whole concept of the General Assembly resolution. Neither resolution 2932 A (XXVII) nor the subsequent one makes any such peculiar exception, and we support those resolutions.

Yesterday a very high United Nations official -- I need not mention his name here -- told me how stunned and sad he was at seeing the destruction of the world-famous cedar forests of Cyprus, a source of wealth and beauty, destroyed unnecessarily by napalm bombs. If that activity is to be excluded, I shall take very great exception and shall reconsider my position with respect to the whole draft resolution.

It is unthinkable that it should even be suggested that the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons is to be condemned only when it may affect so-called personnel. Personnel, of course, is a word that should be used in connexion with military personnel or whatever personnel. Is the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons against forests and natural resources, in the destruction and burning of whole forests, to be excused?

I formally move the postponement of the vote on the draft resolution. It would be unacceptable for the United Nations to adopt a resolution this year that was worse than the previous ones.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Cyprus has formally moved the postponement of the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698/Rev.1. Does he also intend to submit amendments, which he is entitled to do?
Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I proposed my amendment in order to allow time to consider the matter. Because it is a very serious matter, I do not want just to throw in an amendment without preparing the whole scenario of the problem. Therefore, I would request a postponement.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Cyprus has formally moved adjournment of debate on the resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.698. Under rule 116 of the rules of procedure, during the discussion of any matter, any representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. The Chairman may limit the duration of the statements by the speakers under the present rule. This is exactly what I propose to do. I shall permit two speakers in favour of the motion and two against, none more than five minutes.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): Considering the fact that this draft has given rise to certain problems to a number of delegations here present, I should like the voting on this draft resolution to be postponed until next week so that we could have sufficient time for the necessary consultation.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since there are no other speakers, I take it then that the Committee accepts the motion to adjourn the debate.

I should like to ask the representative of Cyprus who has just moved adjournment of debate -- and this has been accepted by the author of the proposal -- whether he would be so good as to indicate to us when he thinks we shall be able to deal with this proposal. Because the Committee had decided to conclude all disarmament items today, and next week, in accordance with the decision of the Committee, we have to deal with the question of Korea, as decided this morning. Therefore, the Chair, in order to organize our work, needs some indication as to whether this is a sine die adjournment of the question or whether there is a specific date.
Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I would suggest that we postpone it until next Monday, the next meeting of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Cyprus surely was not present in the room this morning when the Committee unanimously decided to meet on Monday only to listen to the representative of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea. Therefore, I can tell him as of now it will be impossible to deal with the matter on Monday. I should hasten to add the Committee decided the same for Tuesday.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Mr. Chairman, it is not our fault if all of a sudden a revision is sprung upon us at the last moment. There should have been no revision once the decision was taken that the Committee was going to take another subject on Monday and this was the last day left for the voting. This bringing up at the last moment of so drastic a revision, destroying the whole effort and effect of the resolution, is a sabotage of the resolution itself. And, therefore, it is an unprecedented and unexpected attitude on the part of the sponsors of this resolution to destroy their own resolution by themselves; it is like committing suicide before the Committee.

This was not expected at all and, therefore, the Committee had no such idea in mind, so that it could deal accordingly. Now, this is an exceptional circumstance and exceptional measures are required for it. The matter is very serious, more serious than the Korean question.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The question the Chair has asked has not been answered.

May I suggest, in view of the fact that the revision of the original is not as long as might have appeared to him initially, that the representative of Cyprus meet with the sponsor of the proposal, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, in the room adjoining this conference room. Maybe in a few minutes they will be able to come up with a second revision which would be acceptable, and then we would not need to postpone meeting with this proposal for an indefinite date. I can see
the representative of Cyprus nods assent. I should like to ask him to meet then with the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic and maybe with the representative of Spain who made a comment in this respect, to formulate a text acceptable to all three and which we would then verbally put before the Committee, on the condition, of course, that it does not involve major substantive changes.

So, if there is agreement to this proposal, we could suspend the consideration of this proposal and turn to the next one.

Mr. de Soto (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The revisions introduced in this draft resolution which were submitted only yesterday are already considerable and I have not had time to consult with my Government in this regard. Furthermore, I can see that there is an item on which no draft resolution has yet even been submitted; that is item 34 on the world disarmament conference. In view of the lack of a draft resolution under this item, in any case, it would be impossible to conclude today all disarmament items, which is what we had proposed to do and which is what my delegation would have wished. So that if we can suspend the consideration of the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Syria, we could set as a date for its renewed consideration the day when a resolution on the world disarmament conference is submitted. In other words, since the First Committee has to meet to consider agenda item 34 and the resolution arising therefrom, so that very same day we could consider the Syrian draft.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to point out that the revised draft seems to be giving rise to greater difficulties than could have been concluded from the statement by the representative of Cyprus. In that case, if the Committee agrees with the proposals made, we would then suspend the consideration of this draft until a date to be set later on by the Chair, according to the opportunities our timetable allows, with the understanding that delegations would be given sufficient notice of the date when the vote is to be taken. Is this proposal acceptable? Since there are no objections, we will suspend consideration of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/1658/Rev.1 until a date to be set by the Chair, when we shall continue dealing with this draft resolution.

It was so decided.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We shall then turn to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1. This draft resolution refers to agenda item 103, "Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health". It was presented by the delegation of the Soviet Union and is sponsored by a number of countries.

I shall call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. LIN (China) (interpretation from Chinese): During the general debate at the plenary meeting and in this Committee, the Chinese delegation already stated its views on the Soviet proposal on the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes. As pointed out by many representatives in the debate on the disarmament question this year, the armaments of the super-Powers have greatly increased instead of being reduced despite their empty talk about disarmament. This is the stark reality before the people, and no one can deny it. The Soviet Union has been most active in trumpeting about "detente" and "disarmament". Nevertheless, in recent years it has redoubled its efforts to carry out aggression and expansion abroad in contention with the other super-Power for hegemony in various parts of the world. With its own actions it has laid bare its true intent of accelerating its arms expansion behind the empty talk about disarmament.

This year, the Soviet Union has again pretended to be active and racked its brains to produce a so-called proposal on the "prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health". One cannot help asking: Since the Soviet Union has refused to undertake obligations in regard to the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America, since it has abstained every year on the establishment of the Indian Ocean peace zone, why has it put forward such an all-embracing and sensational proposal? To tell the truth, this is nothing but a new trick to divert the attention of the world's people and to camouflage its acts of accelerated arms expansion and war preparations. We are not interested in such a cheap fraud of the Soviet "disarmament" proposal. Consequently, the Chinese delegation has decided not to participate in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1.
Mr. YANGO (Philippines): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/6/L.675/Rev.1, "Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health". We are appreciative of the clarification agreed to by the sponsors of the draft resolution, particularly by the Soviet Union, on the proposal made to them by the Philippines to the fourth preambular paragraph that the profound interest of States and peoples is expressed not only in the adoption of measures to preserve and improve the natural environment but also in measures for the modification or the moderation of the climate solely for peaceful purposes for the benefit of present and future generations.

The position taken by the Philippines on this matter was supported by Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand -- the other Member States of ASEAN, the Association of South East Asian Nations -- and I have no doubt that they share the feeling of gratification of the Philippines for the spirit of co-operation and goodwill shown by the sponsors.

Mr. THOMPSON FLORES (Brazil): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/6/L.675/Rev.1. We will cast this vote in spite of the reservations our delegation holds with respect to various points relating to this matter.

To begin with, the subject we are dealing with is very complex, and further preliminary consideration ought to have been given to its presentation which we consider to be too vague as now set out. This imprecision remains in the text, even with the changes made to qualify as hostile the actions which may affect the environment.

Furthermore, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is being entrusted with a task which lies beyond its field of competence.

Finally, we consider as rather premature a decision at this stage on the necessity of concluding a convention on this specific item. I wish also to make it clear that in voting for this draft resolution we, in one of its paragraphs, simply take note of the fact that the Soviet Union has presented a draft convention on the subject without in any way passing judgement on the text of that draft, with respect to which my delegation would have many observations and reservations to make.
Mr. Martin (United States of America): After considerable consideration of this item my delegation will be constrained to abstain in the vote. Our statement of 30 October made clear the considerable importance the United States attaches to the study of effective measures to overcome the dangers of the use of environmental modification techniques for military purposes. We stated at that time that we would support referral of this question to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament if that were the general view and if it were accomplished without prejudging how the Committee would consider the question.

Even with the commendable changes accepted by the Soviet delegation the resolution as it now stands still appears to prejudge important aspects of the subject.
For example, we believe it is premature to conclude that a convention would necessarily be feasible or effective. We believe that at this stage of our exploration of the problem what is needed is serious study of the issues involved in possible restrictions. In our view, we must define the problem and formulate the measures which will effectively deal with it before we can consider the advisability of adopting an international instrument on the subject. In any case, we are not persuaded that the Soviet draft convention annexed to the present draft resolution provides a suitable basis for the discussion of this question.

I would emphasize that in considering the question of environmental warfare we shall be entering into uncharted territory, where we shall have to proceed with serious intent but also with the recognition of how little is known. It is a complex question. Scientific understanding is advancing, but is still quite limited. Conclusions relevant to conceivable future developments are difficult to draw. How to define and implement effective measures will require the most careful and thoughtful consideration. My delegation is convinced that if we proceed in that manner we shall be able not only to bring about new understanding but also to develop effective measures to deal with the serious problem of environmental warfare.

Bearing the foregoing considerations in mind, we shall participate actively and positively in further discussions of this matter in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since no other delegation has expressed a wish to explain its vote before the vote, I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1, sponsored by the Soviet Union and other countries.

A recorded vote has been requested, but I am informed by the Secretariat that although the machine has been repaired it does not yet function well enough to record the vote; therefore we shall have to proceed to a roll-call vote.
Rule 128 of the rules of procedure, relating to explanations of vote, will apply.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Algeria, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

**In favour:** Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameran, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, 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, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan

**Against:** None

**Abstaining:** Burundi, Chile, France, Gabon, Mali, Paraguay, United States of America

China did not participate in the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 102 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1 because we agree with the objectives of that draft and with the need for a prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes.

The delegation of Spain has no objections to the idea of an international convention, nor do we object to the general content of the text included in the annex to the draft resolution. However, my delegation has some reservations with regard to the language used: for example, the word "necessary" in operative paragraph 1 of the resolution, and the phrase "incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health" -- a phrase which may be unnecessary in this context and which also appears in the third preambular paragraph, as well as in article I of the annex.

With those reservations, on which we shall have occasion to express ourselves further in the appropriate forum, my delegation had no objection to supporting this important and timely draft resolution.

Mr. MENGATTI (Italy): The Italian delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1. In fact, we believe that the initiative for the prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military purposes is a timely and interesting one. Italy is ready to participate constructively in the future careful study which will be carried out by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on this very complex and technical subject.

We wish now to record that we would have preferred a different and more flexible formulation of operative paragraphs 1 and 5; but, looking forward to the careful consideration of this question by the CCD, we believe it is premature at this stage to anticipate the form of the instruments that will eventually be worked out by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.
Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom): We have supported the draft resolution. As a general rule, we believe that there is advantage in seeking agreed constraints or prohibitions on possible new weapons and military techniques before they have developed so far as to present immediate danger. Some new techniques -- such as those of environmental modification -- might have both deleterious and beneficial applications, and it is certainly desirable to make sure that they are used for beneficial purposes only. But, precisely because environmental modification is so largely a matter of future technological development, there are major problems of definition in attempting to regulate specifically in this area.

When the original draft of the resolution was circulated, we shared the difficulty which several other delegations evidently had in understanding exactly what was meant by the phrase "military and other purposes"; so we are glad to see that in the revised text the word "hostile" has been inserted between "other" and "purposes". That is a definite improvement.
On the other hand, I am bound to say that so far as my delegation is concerned, we think that even the revised draft does rather force the pace. It seems to us slightly to prejudge two questions: first, whether environmental warfare is best dealt with by an international convention or by some other means and, second, what should be the content and scope of the final measures of control. We believe that a great deal of further domestic and international examination of the subject will be necessary before we can all reach definite conclusions. It will be important to make sure that the measures which are agreed do not prohibit activities with a legitimate purpose. It will be equally important to make sure that appropriate verification procedures can be established. And in the course of any examination of the subject, we shall of course want to examine not only the draft convention submitted by the Soviet Union but also the points of view and the suggestions which will no doubt be forthcoming from other Governments and other sources.

Our support of the draft resolution is therefore without any commitment to the form or the substance of whatever effective measures may prove to be necessary. We shall want to play our full part in consideration of the dangers inherent in the use of environmental modification techniques for military purposes and in working out effective measures to overcome them.

Whilst we have voted in favour, we recognize that certain major interested parties have been unable to do so. We sympathize with them, because we recognize that certain amendments which could have improved the draft and clarified it have not been accepted and we trust that, in the discussions in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, proper account will be taken of the views of all interested parties.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation feels that the subject proposed in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1 is a very interesting one indeed, and that its study is timely. The revision of this draft represents in some ways a marked improvement on the original version. The final text, however, still has some imprecisions, especially the referral of the entire question to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in operative paragraphs 3 and 4,
which provoked the abstention of my delegation, since our attitude to that body is well known. This does not, however, prejudge the approach of my Government to the substance of the problem. If a draft convention should be elaborated, my Government reserves the right to judge it on its own merits, whatever its origin.

Mr. ANDREAE (Federal Republic of Germany): We also have voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1 because we agreed with its final objectives. We also share the opinion that the variety and complexity of the issues involved need the attention and consideration of a body of experts. We feel that in asking CCD to take up those questions, the Committee has chosen the right instrument to deal with the issues raised by the Soviet proposal. We are of the opinion, however, that the completely new task of CCD in this respect should not have been prejudged by a prepared draft convention. In our view, it would have been preferable not to tie the deliberations of CCD to such a draft convention. We therefore regard CCD as completely free to discuss and, as a result of its deliberations, eventually to propose adequate solutions to the problems involved.

Mr. MANKOU (Congo) (interpretation from French): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1 because my country is really in favour of peace. But my delegation is not hoodwinked by the manoeuvres of the super-Powers. The prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health affects really only the small and medium-sized Powers which have not yet conducted research in those areas. We simply revert to the problem of horizontal non-proliferation.

Since my country is in favour of real peace, my delegation cast an affirmative vote.
Mr. de SOTO (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): In the course of the general debate, my delegation has already explained its position on the question of the priority to be given this matter within CCD, but as regards this point and as regards the comments made by several delegations on paragraph 1 of this draft resolution, my delegation would like to point out that there is a discrepancy between the English and Spanish texts. Indeed, the English text says "Considers it necessary", whereas the Spanish text says "Considers it indispensable". To illustrate the difference between the two words, I should like to say that, in the opinion of my delegation, whereas a readjustment in the text in these two languages would not be indispensable, it would however be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Peru. Perhaps the correction to which he is alluding can be introduced when the draft resolution is dealt with in the plenary Assembly.

As no other delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote after the vote, I declare that our consideration of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.675/Rev.1 is concluded.

We shall now turn to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.702 on item 35, "General and complete disarmament", a draft resolution submitted by Pakistan and entitled "Strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

In explanation of vote before the vote, I shall now call on the representative of China.
Mr. LIN (China) (interpretation from Chinese): When the super-Powers are frantically engaged in the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and are carrying out interference, subversion, aggression and expansion everywhere, it is fully understandable that the numerous non-nuclear countries are concerned about their own security and wish to be free from the threat of nuclear war. It is completely just and reasonable for them to demand that the nuclear countries not use nuclear weapons against them.

The Chinese Government always deeply sympathizes with, and firmly supports, the numerous non-nuclear countries in their just struggle against the policy of nuclear threat and blackmail of the super-Powers and for the defence of their independence, territorial integrity and State sovereignty.

After our first successful nuclear test in 1964, the Chinese Government issued a solemn declaration that at no time and in no circumstances would China be the first to use nuclear weapons. Subsequently, the Chinese delegation has solemnly stated on many occasions that China will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones. We have already undertaken such an obligation regarding the nuclear-free zone in Latin America and we are ready to undertake due obligations regarding nuclear-free zones in South Asia and the Middle East. We believe that this is the obligation nuclear countries should undertake for the security of non-nuclear countries and we hope that the other nuclear countries will do the same.

On the basis of the above-mentioned position and understanding, we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.702.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): No other delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the vote. Judging by the consultations I have had and the information I have received, I am under the impression that it will not be necessary to take a formal vote on this draft resolution. It would, of course, require the request of only a single delegation for a formal vote to be taken. However, since that is not the case and no delegation has requested a formal vote, I take it that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.702 has been adopted unanimously.

The draft resolution was adopted.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.702 raises the important question of the need to strengthen the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. The Soviet Union has always sympathized with the efforts of the non-nuclear States to strengthen their security, and to protect themselves against nuclear aggression and against the threat of such aggression. This question was discussed in detail during the talks leading up to the signing of the non-proliferation Treaty in 1968, to which the overwhelming majority of United Nations Member States have subsequently acceded. The obligations then undertaken by the three nuclear States parties to the non-proliferation Treaty on the basis of Security Council resolution 255 (1968), of 19 June 1968, in our opinion sufficiently guaranteed security to the non-nuclear States parties to the Treaty should they become victims of acts of aggression or should they be threatened with the use of nuclear weapons. The further strengthening of the non-proliferation Treaty and the widening of the circle of its adherents can effectively be promoted by the consolidation of the security of the non-nuclear States. In this way loop-holes for the spread of nuclear weapons would be closed and consequently the possibilities of the outbreak of nuclear war would be lessened.

In the years following the conclusion of the non-proliferation Treaty, efforts were undertaken to curb the arms race and in the field of disarmament, efforts aimed at a further strengthening of the security of all States in the world, including of course the non-nuclear-weapon States. A whole series of treaties and agreements was elaborated on curbing the arms race and on disarmament, thus narrowing the scope for the build-up of nuclear armaments and limiting the sphere of their emplacement. Among those agreements may be mentioned the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and the Treaty concluded between the USSR and the United States on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear-Weapon Tests. The significance of those agreements and their effectiveness in terms of strengthening the security of all States would be even greater if all the
militarily powerful States and above all the nuclear States, were to accede to them and participate in the elaboration of new agreements in this area. One of the ways of ensuring the security of the non-nuclear States from the nuclear danger, as the discussion just concluded in this Committee has shown, is the creation of denuclearized zones in different regions of the world. At the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1972 an important decision was adopted on the non-use of force in international relations and the simultaneous, permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. As is known, the General Assembly recommended that the Security Council take a decision whereby the solemn declaration of the General Assembly would be embodied in a document that would have binding force. The Security Council as a result of the position taken by some of its permanent members, has not yet done that. The inclusion of the provision concerning the non-use of force and the simultaneous prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons in bilateral and multilateral documents should strengthen their international significance.

Of no little importance to the strengthening of general security, that is of the security of both nuclear and non-nuclear States are the agreements reached between the United States of America and the Soviet Union in the area of strategic arms limitation -- on which talks are still continuing -- and the Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War concluded in 1975. In the latter agreement, the two Powers have committed themselves to exert efforts to eliminate completely the risk of conflict, including nuclear conflict, between the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as between each of the parties and other States.

We note, to our regret, that in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.702 the above-mentioned fundamental international acts and agreements are not mentioned, even though they have made a substantial contribution to the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear States. In our opinion, this is an essential short-coming of this draft resolution. In the process of further consideration of the question of strengthening the security of all States, among them the non-nuclear countries, the provisions of all those documents, including the decision of the General Assembly on the non-use of force in international relations and on the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons should be taken into consideration and implemented.
We are convinced that the efforts of all States to further the process of the relaxation of international tensions, to extend it to all parts of the world and to make it irreversible will contribute to the strengthening of international security and, consequently, the security of all non-nuclear States as well as that of States possessing nuclear weapons. For its part the Soviet Union will continue to strive for the limitation and eventual prohibition of the arms race and for the achievement of general and complete disarmament. Each new step towards the limitation of the arms race and towards disarmament will strengthen the security of the non-nuclear countries and of all the States of the world.

Mr. SARCENO (Grenada): The Government of Grenada supports, as a matter of firm policy, all initiatives aimed at complete disarmament, not only because we are sincerely committed to the cause of international peace, but because we feel that the armaments race poses a real danger to world peace from the economic as well as from the military point of view. We therefore have welcomed this initiative of the Government of Pakistan and we are glad to have voted in favour of it.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since no other delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote after the vote, we have thus concluded consideration of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.702.

We shall now proceed to the last draft resolution before the First Committee this afternoon, which is the one contained in document A/C.1/L.700, submitted by the delegations of Egypt and Iran in connexion with agenda item 101, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East."

Mr. MQUITADELI (Iran): On behalf of the sponsors, the delegations of Egypt and Iran, I should like to propose a very small modification to the sixth preambular paragraph, which has been suggested by the delegation of Cameroon. This is simply to avoid a minor inconsistency between this paragraph and the third preambular paragraph. The change is simply to delete the word "ultimate" in the fifth line of the sixth preambular paragraph, so that the paragraph would read:

"Considering that the establishment of zones free from nuclear weapons, on the initiative of the States situated within each zone concerned, is one of the measures which can contribute most effectively to halting the proliferation of those instruments of mass destruction and to promoting progress towards nuclear disarmament, with the goal of total destruction of all nuclear weapons and their means of delivery,"

The reason for this change is that in a previous paragraph we have indicated that the ultimate goal would be general and complete disarmament, and this has given rise to some objection -- in our opinion justified. So we are proposing this change, and since it is not of any substantial importance we hope it will not create any problem for anyone.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee has duly taken note of the insertion of the word for the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution we are considering.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.
Mr. ERELL (Israel): The Government of Israel has studied with interest and attention the proposal of His Imperial Majesty the Shah of Iran now before the Committee for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. This initiative is worthy of the most serious consideration by all the States concerned and indeed by all peace-loving States. The issues involved in this initiative are exceedingly complex and can be solved only by the concerted action of all parties concerned. My delegation holds the view that the best way to achieve progress would be to follow in the Middle East the same method as was adopted in the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in Latin America and which is also proposed for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.682, namely, the holding of direct consultations between the States of the region and ultimately the convening of a regional conference on this matter. For that reason my delegation regards the procedure proposed in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution before us in document A/C.1/L.700 -- namely, a preliminary process of consultation between the Secretary-General and the States of the region -- as not practical and indeed self-defeating, since without full and frank consultation between all States concerned, conducted in an atmosphere of mutual trust and good will, the proposal cannot be realized.

The Government of Israel will co-operate with any diplomatic moves designed to contribute to the cause of peace in the Middle East and will readily participate in any direct multilateral consultations of the States of the region to further the goals of the proposal before the Committee, but for the reasons stated we cannot support the present draft and will abstain in the vote.

Mr. LIN (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Easing ourselves on China's principled position on the question of nuclear-free zones, we will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.700 presented by Iran and Egypt on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. The root cause of the turbulence and unrest in the Middle East lies in the contention between the two super-Powers for
hegemony and the Israeli Zionist aggression. Therefore, in order to realize
the desire of making the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone, it is imperative
to oppose firmly the super-Power hegemonism and the Zionist policies of
aggression and expansion. We also wish to point out that we have our own
views and reservations on the references to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation
of Nuclear Weapons and the question of general and complete disarmament
contained in the preambular and operative parts of the draft.

Mr. CHAVES (Grenada): The delegation of Grenada again wishes to
say that we give our whole-hearted support to this initiative of the Imperial
Government of Iran and the Government of Egypt, as we feel that this is a
very constructive step towards our general aim of securing peace in the world.

Mr. BLAKCO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Being in favour
of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.700 for the establishment
of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, just as at past
meetings we were also in favour of the draft resolutions contained in document
A/C.1/L.694, regarding the denuclearization of the African continent, the
Revolutionary Government of Cuba considers that this not only does
not imply any change in the traditional attitude but is part of the context
of that position.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since no other delegation wishes to speak, I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/C.1/6700.

A separate vote has been requested on the last paragraph of the preamble and on operative paragraph 3.

Mr. MISHRA (India): I would also request a separate vote on the penultimate paragraph of the preamble.

Mr. THOMPSON FLORES (Brazil) (interpretation from Spanish): I would like to suggest that we have one separate vote on the last two paragraphs of the preamble and on operative paragraph 3.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since there is no objection to the suggestion just made by the representative of Brazil, we shall have a single separate vote on those paragraphs. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Botswana, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand,
Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium

Against: None
Abstaining: Brazil, France, India, Indonesia, Israel, Spain, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Argentina

Algeria and China did not participate in the vote.

The last two paragraphs of the preamble and operative paragraph 3 were adopted by 93 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/C.1/1700 as a whole. A roll-call vote has again been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Cyprus, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Seneegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba

Against: None

Abstaining: Israel, Norway, Sweden

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 103 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.
Mr. ELIAS (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): In addition to nuclear proliferation we are witnessing a proliferation of invitations addressed to States which have not yet done so to accede to the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty. These appeals, evidently well-intentioned and reflecting a concern which we certainly share, seem to be so insistent in various contexts — during the disarmament debate as well as in some draft resolutions, such as the one we have just voted on — that my delegation deems it proper to set forth its opinion that the invitations to States that have not yet done so to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty are premature as long as the international community does not have proof that the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty is being complied with in all its parts including, naturally, article VI.

This question will be studied by the conference of States Parties in Geneva in May 1975. As long as we do not know the result of this study or as long as these results are not satisfactory as regards the effectiveness of the non-proliferation Treaty, Spain cannot support this type of invitation, nor can my delegation accept the thesis that proliferation should have priority over prevention of an increase in the already existing nuclear arsenals. This priority is quite clearly accepted in the thirteenth preambular paragraph.

For these reasons Spain was forced to abstain in the separate vote on the thirteenth and fourteenth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 3 despite the resolute and sincere support we gave to the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. OTEGUI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation should like to make it clear that the positive vote of Argentina on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.700, sponsored by Egypt and Iran, does not mean any change whatsoever in our position regarding the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty.

Mr. SIKAIUIU (Zambia): I shall confine my brief explanation of vote by referring only to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution just adopted.

When introducing the draft resolution yesterday afternoon, the representative of Iran stated the following in explanation of the intentions of the sponsors in operative paragraph 3:
"With regard to the Treaty" -- meaning the non-proliferation Treaty -- "I am well aware that there are divergent views in the Assembly. But I would draw the attention of my colleagues to the fact that, in our draft resolution, Egypt and Iran are not asking all the members of the Assembly to accede to the Treaty. Our request is confined to our own region."

(Mr. Sikulu, Zambia) (2026th meeting, p. 6)

Later on in his statement the representative of Iran stated:

"I can readily understand that, in view of certain positions, some countries outside the region may have some reservations on certain paragraphs, in particular operative paragraph 3. But I should like once again to draw the attention of those countries which are outside the region to the fact that, in our text, we are speaking exclusively about the interested parties in the region and that we are not trying to force the hand of countries in other parts of the world which have particular attitudes." (Ibid., p. 7-10)

Indeed, my country is one of those countries outside the region of the Middle East which have "particular attitudes". Our position of principle with regard to the non-proliferation Treaty is well known. I shall therefore not repeat it here. I wish to state for the record, however, that we voted for the draft resolution just adopted by the Committee strictly on the understanding that operative paragraph 3, as explained by the representative of Iran, referred exclusively to countries in the region of the Middle East. Our vote does not in any way compromise our position regarding the non-proliferation Treaty which, needless to say, remains unchanged.

Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden): Sweden has often expressed its support for regional approaches to disarmament, including the establishment of nuclear-free zones. The draft resolution just adopted by the Committee seems to us to be very well prepared and we congratulate the co-sponsors on their successful efforts. It is gratifying to note that there seems to be considerable support for the substantive idea of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. We support that goal.
It has been our long-standing belief, *inter alia*, that the basis for any such regional measure must be the active co-operation and agreement of all countries concerned in the region itself. The Swedish delegation sincerely hopes that the initiative taken by important countries in the region will facilitate a future agreement on a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East.

We have, however, felt obliged to abstain today on the draft resolution relative to this item because regretfully there does not at present seem to exist any agreement on all necessary prerequisites for the establishment of such a zone.

**Mr. LENNYK (Austria)** (interpretation from French): The debate on disarmament this year has borne the imprint of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects. My delegation took account of this in its statement in the general debate and at that time emphasized the primary importance which my delegation attaches to this question. More particularly, Austria has made known once again that we consider the non-proliferation Treaty to be the most important instrument in this field without thereby failing to recognize its shortcomings. Within the framework of our efforts to strengthen that Treaty Austria is convinced that the establishment of nuclear-free zones might constitute a very useful support, and my delegation therefore wished to support the principle of the establishment of denuclearized zones and voted in favour of the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.681, A/C.1/L.682 and A/C.1/L.700. At the same time, my delegation believes that in each case it is indispensable for the establishment of such zones that the countries concerned follow adequate procedures which are not prejudicial to the establishment of these zones.

In this context my delegation was particularly happy with the draft resolution presented by Finland in document A/C.1/L.701. Implementation of this draft resolution will no doubt contribute to shedding light on the question of denuclearized zones.
Mr. Menegatti (Italy) (interpretation from French): During our meetings which considered questions of disarmament the delegation of Italy has repeatedly had occasion to express its support for the principle of denuclearization in all regions of the world under certain economic and political conditions which we consider valid for the success of work in this area. It was in that spirit that we voted in favour of the draft resolution proposed by Egypt and Iran. We can only appreciate the enthusiasm of the co-sponsors and encourage their efforts.

Having said that, we believe that any positive development aimed at the creation of denuclearized zones in the world depends closely on the fulfilment of certain conditions. First, we believe it is always necessary to hold consultations in depth and to have the agreement of all countries in the region, in order for any initiative of this kind to be successful. This would also permit a clear definition of the zone which it is intended to denuclearize, which we feel is the primary concern in the matter. We can only hope that the initiative that the First Committee has just taken will develop on the basis of the principles I have just mentioned.

Mr. de Soto (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation has to pronounce itself regarding paragraphs which have been voted upon separately, since this is a draft resolution which we considered as a whole. In a similar case relating to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690, which we voted on on 20 November, my delegation explained its vote. The explanation I am referring to is contained in the provisional record, A/C.1/FV.2025, and it is applicable in this case also.

Mr. Mishra (India): The position of the Government of India regarding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is well-known and there is no need for us to repeat our objections at this stage. In view of that position we joined the delegation of Brazil in asking for separate votes on two preambular paragraphs and one operative paragraph which referred to that Treaty, and we abstained on those paragraphs.
Nevertheless we supported the draft resolution as a whole basing ourselves on two considerations: first, that no country in the area has voiced opposition to the idea of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East; secondly, we believe, and we have explained this before, that conditions and procedures for the establishment of such zones differ from region to region.

I should like to clarify that our support of the resolution as a whole should not be construed as meaning that we agree with all ideas in the draft resolution. For example, there is in the third preambular paragraph a reference to the idea that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones could accelerate the process towards nuclear disarmament. In the sixth preambular paragraph, again, the idea is expressed that the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons is one of the measures which could contribute most effectively to halting proliferation of those instruments of mass destruction, and so on. Our views, which have been stated in the past in this Committee, are quite clear on this subject: we do not believe that nuclear disarmament can be brought about by those who do not possess nuclear weapons.

Finally, the request to the Secretary-General in operative paragraph 5, relating to operative paragraphs 2 and 3, also seems to be somewhat out of place. Nevertheless, as I have just stated, conditions and procedures for the establishment of such zones differ from region to region; therefore we did not object to that particular paragraph.

Mr. RONE (Canada): As other Member States are aware, Canada is strongly sympathetic in principle to the concept of nuclear-free zones where they are feasible and where they would promote stability. We are as sympathetic to the idea of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East as we are to the efforts made to create such zones in Latin America, South Asia and Africa, and it is for that reason that we voted in favour of the draft resolution.

However, we do have difficulty with the wording of operative paragraph 2, which states:

"... to advance the idea of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, it is indispensable that all parties concerned in the area proclaim solemnly and immediately their intention to refrain, on a reciprocal basis, from producing, testing, obtaining, acquiring or in any other way possessing nuclear weapons,"

Consistent with the position we have always adopted on the concept of nuclear-free zones, we recognize that a nuclear-weapon-free zone can have maximum effectiveness if all parties in the area concerned are prepared to make such affirmations but, equally consistent with our long-standing position that nuclear-free zones should be created on the basis of consensus within the region, Canada, as a State outside the area, is reluctant to instruct the parties of the region concerned as to the specific measures they should take.
We would of course be happy to see such affirmations if they would facilitate the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, and that objective would be still further advanced, in our view, if, following the example of several parties of the region, still others would adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

It has long been Canada's view that, for the creation of nuclear-free zones to be fully effective, each of the parties concerned should have grounds for assurance that its provisions will be observed by all other parties. We believe that ratification of the non-proliferation Treaty would provide a formalized and verifiable basis for such mutual assurance; and we therefore note with satisfaction that the resolution calls upon the parties concerned in the area to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): The United States supports the concept of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East and believes that it could make a considerable contribution to stability and non-proliferation in the area. We have therefore voted in favour of this draft resolution.

At the same time, we are dubious of the approach taken in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which urges States in the region to undertake immediate commitments with regard to the zone, in advance of actual negotiations and the conclusion of an agreement. Frankly, we do not believe this is an approach that will advance the purposes of the draft resolution.

Notwithstanding that reservation, we are prepared to lend our full co-operation to efforts to realize the aims of the draft resolution. We assume that in the further formulation of the zone it will be made clear that the prohibitions of the zone apply to the development of nuclear explosive capability for any purpose.

Mr. YANNAKAKIS (Greece): I would like to say a few words in explanation of our vote. We voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.700 because we took into consideration the very grave conditions prevailing in the Middle East and the desire of some friendly countries to see taken any measures which could avert a conflagration.
We would like to underline, however, that generally in cases of nuclear-free zones we deem indispensable prior consultations and agreement between all the interested parties.

My country does not belong geographically to the area of the Middle East, but I would like to stress in a general way on this occasion that in similar cases the limits of such zones should be precisely defined in advance and before further consideration of the substance of the matter.

Mr. SUTOWARDYO (Indonesia): I just want to make it clear that Indonesia's abstention in the separate vote on the thirteenth and fourteenth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 3 should be taken as an abstention on operative paragraph 3 only.

As I have stated in explaining my delegation's vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690, Indonesia is not a party to the non-proliferation Treaty. We therefore feel that we cannot sincerely call on others to accede to that Treaty.

Mr. SCALABBE (France) (interpretation from French): The positive vote cast by my delegation does not imply that we approve of every single provision in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.700. Our vote during the separate votes on the non-proliferation Treaty would demonstrate, if necessary, that our approval could not be given without serious reservations.

We also have reservations on other parts of the draft resolution, in particular the third and sixth preambular paragraphs, as well as operative paragraph 2.

The scope of the application of the nuclear-weapon-free zone is very vague, and we must formally reserve any position we may want to adopt in the future following the studies to be undertaken on a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. However, we wish to indicate by our vote that France does not intend to go against the will of the countries of the zone concerned which, freely and in complete sovereignty, intend to accept a status of denuclearization. Our vote must also be considered as an expression of our wish to see complete agreement on this question among the States concerned.
Mr. GUVEN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): Turkey voted in favour of all draft resolutions concerning the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the world. The six positive votes of the Turkish delegation on the subject should not be taken as a precedent with regard to other votes that we might cast.

Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union has supported the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, on the basis of our position of principle in favour of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world.

We should also like to point out that our vote in favour of the draft resolution does not mean that the Soviet Union agrees with the eleventh preambular paragraph, which refers to a nuclear-free zone in Latin America. The position on this question, repeatedly set forth by the Soviet Union, remains unchanged.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since no other delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote, I shall now call on the delegations of States which sponsored draft resolutions and have asked to make statements.

Mr. OSHAN (Egypt) (interpretation from French): In view of the gravity and importance of the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee, my delegation would like to make a brief statement.

First, we should like to thank sincerely all delegations which voted in favour of our draft resolution. Indeed, Iran’s initiative is a praiseworthy attempt to spare the Middle East a burdensome nuclear arms race and the danger to the region which is a cradle of civilization. That is why, the people of Egypt, as a part of the Arab nation, and the people of Iran, which have had their roots in this region for thousands of years and whose civilization and culture have developed over centuries, are naturally prompted by a common, legitimate and sincere desire to do their very best to put an end to any adventurist and irresponsible policy that might expose the Middle East region
to the nuclear danger. We consider as a positive achievement the draft resolution just adopted as it can pave the way for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

The delegation of Egypt would now like to comment on Israel's abstention on the draft resolution today. We consider that abstention to be characteristic of Israel's policy in the Middle East. Each time that Israel has to take a position on the substance of a solution in keeping with the United Nations Charter and its resolutions, it hides behind considerations of procedure.
If the delegation of Israel, by its abstention today, imagines that it can hide behind procedure and form to reserve its right to use nuclear blackmail against the Arab nations, I should like to say, on behalf of the delegation of Egypt, that Israel is committing a grave error, and the error it commits will be even graver by reason of all the faults it had committed before 6 October.

Mr. NOVETDA (Iran) (interpretation from French): I take the floor to thank the members of the First Committee for the spirit of co-operation which they have been so good as to display in regard to the draft resolution we have had the honour to present, together with the delegation of Egypt. I consider today's vote to be an encouragement for us to pursue the idea which we introduced this year. I simply wish to say thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): With this statement we have concluded consideration of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.700.

Mr. KAM ESUNG IFER NGALABIER (Zaire) (interpretation from French): My delegation has asked to speak in order to say that, if we had been present when the Committee adopted the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690, my delegation would have voted in favour of the text as a whole, as amended.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I regret that my duties in the plenary Assembly kept me away from this Committee for much longer than I had anticipated. I therefore wish to inform you, Sir, and through you the members of the Committee, that if I had been present I would have voted in favour of all the drafts which were put to the vote during my absence. Accordingly, I request that the Secretariat be good enough to reflect the position of my delegation in the official records of the United Nations. I have made notes of the explanations of vote of delegations, especially that of India, and I shall take them into account when the report of this Committee is taken up to the plenary Assembly.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): "The positions of the delegations of Mauritius and Zaire will be reflected in the records. I have no more speakers on my list. Does any delegation wish to speak?"

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I notice that we still have a few minutes on your time schedule, and I would just like to say, on behalf of myself and of the other members of this Committee who come from Geneva, that we want to thank you for your kind consideration. We want to compliment you on the way that you have presided over our deliberations and we are delighted that we have had the opportunity to serve under your wise guidance.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of the United States for his very cordial words. I should particularly thank all members of the Committee, without whose invaluable co-operation we should never have reached the completion of the items on disarmament, although 25 minutes late, within the deadline we had set for ourselves. In this connexion, I should like to say that there remain only two draft resolutions, one in document A/C.1/L.698 which was postponed this afternoon, and the other, on the world disarmament conference, the text of which was submitted to the Secretariat a short time ago and which will be distributed soon. I believe that the latter has been the subject of intense consultations on the part of the countries concerned, and therefore I would foresee that its adoption will not give rise to major difficulties. To consider those texts, in principle the Committee will have to begin thinking of meeting on Wednesday afternoon.

I am closing the meeting today, and on the disarmament items I wish publicly to express my appreciation to all delegations but, if I may be permitted to do so, I should like to make a very special reference to my friends and colleagues from the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, who have come to New York to cover these items, and with which colleagues, besides my ties of close friendship and co-operation, I have had occasion