



CONTENTS

Agenda item 39:
Second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament: report of the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 40:
Reduction of military budgets:
(a) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
(b) Report of the Secretary-General
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 41:
Implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/143 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 42:
Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons:
(a) Report of the Committee on Disarmament;
(b) Report of the Secretary-General
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 43:
Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons: report of the Committee on Disarmament
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 44:
Implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/145 B: report of the Committee on Disarmament
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 45:
Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa: report of the Secretary-General
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 46:
Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 47:
Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia: report of the Secretary-General
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 48:
Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Committee on Disarmament
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 49:
Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 50:
World Disarmament Conference: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the World Disarmament Conference
Report of the First Committee

Page

Agenda item 51:
Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session:
(a) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
(b) Report of the Committee on Disarmament;
(c) Programme of research and studies on disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;
(d) Study on the relationship between disarmament and development: report of the Secretary-General;
(e) United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;
(f) Nuclear weapons in all aspects: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
(g) Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war;
(h) Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
(i) World Disarmament Campaign: report of the Secretary-General;
(j) Disarmament Week: report of the Secretary-General
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 52:
United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects: report of the Secretary-General
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 53:
Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons: report of the Committee on Disarmament
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 54:
Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons: report of the Committee on Disarmament
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 55:
General and complete disarmament:
(a) Report of the Committee on Disarmament;
(b) Study on the institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;
(c) Confidence-building measures: report of the Secretary-General;
(d) Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
(e) Study on all the aspects of regional disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;
(f) Study on the relationship between disarmament and international security: report of the Secretary-General;
(g) Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
(h) Review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
(i) Disarmament and international security: report of the Secretary-General;
(j) Strategic arms limitation talks
Report of the First Committee

1605

Agenda item 56:

Israeli nuclear armament: report of the Secretary-General
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 128:

Conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of
weapons of any kind in outer space
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 135:

Prevention of nuclear catastrophe: declaration of the General
Assembly
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 57:

Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness be-
tween States: report of the Secretary-General
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 58:

Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the
Strengthening of International Security:

(a) Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening
of International Security;

(b) Non-interference in the internal affairs of States;

(c) Implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of
Societies for Life in Peace: report of the Secretary-Gen-
eral

Report of the First Committee

President: Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Naik (Pakistan),
Vice-President, took the Chair.*

AGENDA ITEM 39

**Second special session of the General Assembly
devoted to disarmament: report of the Preparatory
Committee for the Second Special Session of the
General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament**

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/740)

AGENDA ITEM 40

Reduction of military budgets:

(a) Report of the Disarmament Commission;

(b) Report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/741)

AGENDA ITEM 41

**Implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/143
concerning the signature and ratification of Addi-
tional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition
of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of
Tlatelolco)**

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/742)

AGENDA ITEM 42

Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons:

(a) Report of the Committee on Disarmament;

(b) Report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/743)

AGENDA ITEM 43

**Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons:
report of the Committee on Disarmament**

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/744)

AGENDA ITEM 44

**Implementation of General Assembly resolution
35/145 B: report of the Committee on Disarmament**

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/745)

AGENDA ITEM 45

**Implementation of the Declaration on the Denu-
clearization of Africa: report of the Secretary-
General**

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/746)

AGENDA ITEM 46

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

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/747)

AGENDA ITEM 47

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

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/748)

AGENDA ITEM 48

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

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/749)

AGENDA ITEM 49

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

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/750)

AGENDA ITEM 50

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

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/751)

AGENDA ITEM 51

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

(a) Report of the Disarmament Commission;

(b) Report of the Committee on Disarmament;

(c) Programme of research and studies on
disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;

- (d) Study on the relationship between disarmament and development: report of the Secretary-General;
- (e) United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;
- (f) Nuclear weapons in all aspects: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (g) Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war;
- (h) Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (i) World Disarmament Campaign: report of the Secretary-General;
- (j) Disarmament Week: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/752)

AGENDA ITEM 52

United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/753)

AGENDA ITEM 53

Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons: report of the Committee on Disarmament

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/754)

AGENDA ITEM 54

Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons: report of the Committee on Disarmament

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/755)

AGENDA ITEM 55

General and complete disarmament:

- (a) Report of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (b) Study on the institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;
- (c) Confidence-building measures: report of the Secretary-General;
- (d) Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (e) Study on all the aspects of regional disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;
- (f) Study on the relationship between disarmament and international security: report of the Secretary-General;
- (g) Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (h) Review of the membership of the Committee on

- Disarmament: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (i) Disarmament and international security: report of the Secretary-General;
- (j) Strategic arms limitation talks

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/756)

AGENDA ITEM 56

Israeli nuclear armament: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/757)

AGENDA ITEM 128

Conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/758)

AGENDA ITEM 135

Prevention of nuclear catastrophe: declaration of the General Assembly

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/759)

AGENDA ITEM 57

Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/760)

AGENDA ITEM 58

Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security:

- (a) Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security;
- (b) Non-interference in the internal affairs of States;
- (c) Implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/36/761)

1. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia), Rapporteur of the First Committee: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the reports of the First Committee on its work. They contain its recommendations on the disarmament and security questions under agenda items 39 to 58, 128 and 135. Those recommendations are to be found in documents A/36/740 to 761. With the exception of items 128 and 135, which are new, all the disarmament items have been included in the agenda of the thirty-sixth session in accordance with previous General Assembly resolutions. Thus, this year, discussion on these items in the First Committee could be considered as a continued expression of concern over the complexities of disarmament problems and of determination to continue exerting efforts to make progress towards the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament.

2. The First Committee, as in previous years, held at this session's combined general debate on all disarmament items, which took place at its 3rd to 26th meetings, be-

tween 19 October and 4 November. The discussion on items 57 and 58 took place at its 45th to 51st meetings, from 27 November to 3 December. The Committee had before it a total of 22 items and took action on 52 draft resolutions. There was wide participation in the general debate, which reflected the general feelings of support by the international community for disarmament, peace and security.

3. The fact that the discussion in the First Committee took place on the eve of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, scheduled to convene on 7 June 1982, gave an opportunity to a large number of participants to articulate their expectations and to express their hopes about future action in the field of disarmament.

4. The report of the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament, which was contained in one of the recommendations under item 39, was much commented on during the debate and it is no exaggeration to say that there was general agreement that the comprehensive programme for disarmament still under negotiation should be the mainstay of the work of the forthcoming special session.

5. A number of other recommendations have been adopted with regard to the very important and extensive studies which will be submitted at the special session for consideration. I am referring to the study on the relationship between disarmament and development [A/36/356 and Corr.1], the study on the relationship between disarmament and international security [A/36/597] and the study on confidence-building measures [A/36/474 and Corr.1]. The Study on the implications of establishing an international satellite monitoring agency¹ has already been added to the documentation of the Preparatory Committee and will thus be referred to the special session. These studies, which were in preparation for two or in some cases three years, will be important in establishing broad guidelines and general policies on many of the disarmament issues to be considered by the special session.

6. Despite the complexities and difficulties of disarmament problems, the discussion in the First Committee has shown both that there continues to be a spirit of hope and optimism and the conviction that more efforts are needed and that there is no alternative but to press on with the hard work, whether in the deliberative or negotiating bodies, in order to make further progress. Perhaps a sign of this hope is to be seen in the continued adoption by consensus of a substantial number of draft resolutions. This year the Committee adopted 48 draft resolutions on disarmament items, of which 18 were adopted without a vote. This is an indication that the international community still entertains the hope of widening the understanding of the problems and enlarging the areas of agreement in the field of disarmament.

7. With these few remarks I have the honour to submit the draft resolutions of the First Committee to the General Assembly for adoption.

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

8. The PRESIDENT: The positions of delegations regarding the various draft resolutions of the First Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records. I would remind

members that, in its decision 34/401, the General Assembly agreed that

“When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting unless that delegation’s vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee.”

9. I would also remind members that, in accordance with the same decision, explanations of vote should not exceed 10 minutes.

10. We shall first consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 39, contained in document A/36/740.

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

12. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): In order to avoid speaking several times, the delegation of Albania wishes to explain in a single statement the views which will guide it throughout the whole of the voting procedure on the draft resolutions on disarmament.

13. The Albanian delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/36/746 and A/36/757, in order to condemn the nuclear armament of Israel and South Africa. Those affirmative votes will be in line with our well-known attitude in this connection, namely, condemnation of all aggressive actions by those régimes. Our delegation will not take part in the voting on any other draft resolution. We took the same attitude in the First Committee. We explained our position on certain draft resolutions which were adopted by a vote or by consensus and which we did not support. We maintain those explanations and shall not repeat them now.

14. We wish to make the following brief observation in order to explain our attitude on the remainder of the draft resolutions adopted by vote or by consensus which we do not support. The large number of resolutions adopted each year have absolutely no positive influence. Armament and the arms race continue. In our opinion, a certain number of draft resolutions are submitted not in order truly to serve the cause of disarmament, but for political and propaganda purposes. During the voting procedure in the First Committee it was easy to see that several draft resolutions reflecting the interests of the super-Powers or military blocs were presented solely to discredit the adversary. Often the voting board indicated voting by opposing military blocs.

15. We are aware that a large number of draft resolutions are submitted or supported by democratic progressive countries which are seriously disturbed by the terrifying pace of the arms race and sincerely wish to use every possible means to slow it down—even if only slightly—and to alert the world to the dangers of armament. We share their concern and we support their good intentions. But in view of the fact that certain elements slip into these draft resolutions each time to adapt them to the prevailing situation in the United Nations, we also have reservations concerning them.

16. Those are the reasons which prevent us from participating in the voting on some draft resolutions and which force us to dissociate ourselves from the consensus on others.

17. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take decisions on draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 12 of its report on agenda item 39 [A/36/740]. I first put before the Assembly draft resolution A, entitled "Preparations for the second special session". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/36/801. The First Committee adopted draft resolution A without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do so also?

Draft resolution A was adopted (resolution 36/81 A).

18. The PRESIDENT: The First Committee also adopted without a vote draft resolution B, entitled "Prevention of nuclear war". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 36/81 B).

19. The PRESIDENT: We shall next consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 40 [A/36/741]. The Assembly will now take decisions on the two draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 9 of that report. The Committee adopted draft resolution A without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution A was adopted (resolution 36/82 A).

20. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution B.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 19 abstentions (resolution 36/82 B).

21. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 41 [A/36/742]. I invite members to turn their attention to the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 9 of the report. The Assembly will now take a decision on that draft resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted by 138 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 36/83).

22. The PRESIDENT: Since the report of the Fifth Committee on the financial and administrative implications of the draft resolutions under agenda item 42 is not yet ready, I would suggest that the Assembly now take up agenda item 43. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report on this item [A/36/744]. There is a request for a separate recorded vote on operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. I therefore now put that paragraph to the vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Para-

guay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

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

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Hungary, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Samoa, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Spain, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, Zambia.

Operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution was adopted by 95 votes to 2, with 42 abstentions.²

23. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Belize, Canada, China, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Turkey, Zambia.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 118 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions (resolution 36/84).³

24. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item [A/36/745]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of that report.

The draft resolution was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 36/85).

25. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

26. Mr. ESPECHE GIL (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Argentine Republic shares the aim of achieving as early as possible a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapon testing. In conformity with the position taken by the group of 21, Argentina is of the view that the Committee on Disarmament is the appropriate forum in which to negotiate such a treaty. My country is therefore among those which have consistently supported resolutions pursuing that objective.

27. However, although there is merit in the general direction taken by the resolution just adopted, it leaves a shadow of doubt about the right of nations to have access to peaceful applications of nuclear power, since operative paragraph 6 is not sufficiently clear about the scope of the treaty on the cessation of all nuclear test explosions—unlike the draft resolution in document A/36/744, on which my country cast an affirmative vote a few moments ago. Consequently, my delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/36/745.

28. Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution recommended in document A/36/745. Under this resolution, and specifically paragraph 9, members of the Committee on Disarmament and in particular the nuclear-weapon States, including France, are urged to co-operate with the Committee in fulfilling its mandate; in other words, according to the resolution, to negotiate a nuclear-test-ban treaty.

29. While the French Government does not wish to oppose any possible consensus in the Committee on Disarmament with regard to dealing with this question in a working group, it cannot consider participating in such a negotiation itself. It does not, indeed, consider that the prohibition of tests should be a prior and specific measure, not linked in any way with nuclear disarmament. As the overwhelming number of nuclear weapons are possessed by the two greatest Powers, the prohibition of tests can be considered only if real, balanced and verifiable progress is made in the reduction of the nuclear weapons of those States. An agreement on prohibition that did not come within that framework would not represent real progress, with respect to either nuclear disarmament or non-proliferation. In view of the number of tests—about 1,200—that have been carried out in the past 25 years by the two main nuclear Powers, the actual effect of such an agreement would be to consolidate the advantages which they already have.

30. In those circumstances, the new French Government, in conformity with its policy of peace in security, cannot consider any commitments that would be incompatible with the maintenance of the conditions for that security, and therefore the conditions for deterrence.

31. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 45 [A/36/746].

32. The Assembly will now take a decision on the two draft resolutions recommended in paragraph 9 of its report. First I put to the vote draft resolution A, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 129 votes to 4, with 10 abstentions (resolution 36/86 A).⁴

33. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique,

Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

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

Draft resolution B was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 12 abstentions (resolution 36/86 B).⁵

34. The PRESIDENT: The next report of the First Committee is on agenda item 46 [A/36/747]. In this connection, a draft resolution has been submitted by Iraq in document A/36/L.53. The representative of Iraq will introduce the draft resolution. I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

35. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The General Assembly is now considering and taking action on 22 items which deal with disarmament and international security matters. All these items were allocated by the General Committee of the General Assembly to the First Committee. In the course of its 53 meetings the First Committee discussed extensively all the items which were allocated to it for consideration. About 60 draft resolutions were adopted by the Committee on these items, and all of them without exception are contained in the report of the Committee now before us. One draft resolution, and one draft resolution alone, was not submitted and considered, for reasons that are well known, at any of the 53 meetings of the First Committee. Iraq, the sponsor of the draft resolution, has spoken several times on the item and even explained its vote on the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee [A/36/747]. To admit draft resolution A/36/L.53 for consideration at this late stage would make a mockery of the whole system of allocation of items to the Main Committees and would fly in the face of the orderly and rational conduct of business in the General Assembly. Perhaps, Mr. President, you would wish to give this matter your consideration.

36. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the usual practice, the draft resolution contained in document A/36/L.53 has been circulated and, also in accordance with that practice, I think it would be appropriate for the delegation of Iraq to introduce it formally in plenary meeting. As I announced earlier, therefore, I call upon the representative of Iraq to introduce draft resolution A/36/L.53.

37. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): On behalf of the group of Arab States, I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution in document A/36/L.53. My delegation sees nothing in the rules of procedure that would not allow a delegation to submit a draft resolution to the plenary meeting of the General Assembly. When the First Committee adopted, on 25 November, draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.34/Rev.1, my delegation stated its views to the effect that the Committee had not dealt with the item in a satis-

factory manner. The draft resolution was a purely procedural one, which did not take due account of the very dangerous developments in the region since the Assembly had adopted a resolution on this item last year. These developments were the direct result of the unprecedented Israeli act of aggression last June against the safeguarded Iraqi nuclear installations. The draft resolution did not take into account the effects of that act of aggression on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373, annex] or on the IAEA safeguards régime, which should constitute the basis for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that or any other region.

38. The Director-General of IAEA was the first to draw the attention of the international community to the fact that the Israeli military attack against the Iraqi installations was also an attack on the Agency's safeguards régime, which is a basic element of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. In his statement at the twenty-fifth session of the General Conference of IAEA, on 21 September, he said "A blow has been inflicted on the Treaty with the recent air attack on the Iraqi research reactor centre." The Director-General reiterated his deep concern in the statement he made in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 10 November last, when he said:

"the Treaty, and by extension the Agency's safeguards régime, suffered a blow in June of this year when a non-treaty country, Israel, carried out a military attack against the research reactor in Iraq, a party to the Treaty and thus subject to IAEA safeguards on all its nuclear activities." [50th meeting, para. 21.]

39. The draft resolution before us takes these views and legitimate concerns into consideration. The first two preambular paragraphs are self-explanatory.

40. The third preambular paragraph recalls Security Council resolution 487 (1981) of 19 June 1981. That resolution is pertinent to the present item, as the Security Council expressed therein its deep concern "about the danger to international peace and security created by the premeditated Israeli air attack on Iraqi nuclear installations on 7 June 1981, which could at any time explode the situation in the area, with grave consequences for the vital interests of all States". In paragraph 3 of its resolution, the Security Council further considered "that the said attack constitutes a serious threat to the entire safeguards régime of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which is the foundation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons". The Security Council, further, in paragraph 5 of its resolution, called upon Israel "urgently to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency".

41. Now, the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution before us takes into consideration the resolution adopted on 12 June 1981 by the IAEA Board of Governors⁶ and the resolution adopted on 26 September 1981 by the General Conference of IAEA,⁷ which expressed, *inter alia*, grave concern over the far-reaching implications of such a military attack on the peaceful nuclear facilities in a member State and on the Treaty and the safeguards régime.

42. The fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution recalls the report of the Secretary-General concerning Israeli nuclear armament which established the fact that all the known nuclear facilities in the territories of the

Middle East States are subject to international safeguards—except the Israeli reactor in Dimona and its related facilities [A/36/431, annex, para. 73]. The report also concludes that “there is no doubt that Israel has the technical capability to manufacture nuclear weapons and possesses the means of delivery of such weapons to targets in the area” [*ibid.*, para. 78], and further states that the Group of Experts that prepared the report “wishes to emphasize that they do not doubt that Israel, if it has not already crossed that threshold, has the capability to manufacture nuclear weapons within a very short time” [*ibid.*, para. 82].

43. The sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution takes into consideration the request made by the General Assembly in its previous resolutions on this item for the parties concerned to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

44. The seventh preambular paragraph reiterates the deep concern expressed by organs of the United Nations and other international organizations about the future of the Non-Proliferation Treaty because of the Israeli attack.

45. Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution is based on all the resolutions recalled in the preambular paragraphs, particularly the General Assembly resolutions concerning this item which call for adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and for the placing of all nuclear activities in the region under IAEA safeguards as a means of promoting the objective of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region.

46. Israel has not only refused to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to submit all its nuclear facilities to international inspection, it has bombed facilities which were under IAEA safeguards and belonging to a State which is a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Paragraph 49 of the annex to the Secretary-General's report to which I have referred makes the following highly pertinent comment:

“After the Israeli Air Force's bombing attack on the Baghdad nuclear facility, it is unlikely that the world community will be content to accept unilateral judgement by Israel of the nuclear intentions of States in the Middle East, while exempting itself from offering greater reliability on this point. In the opinion of the Group of Experts, the raid on Iraq's reactor amounted to a unilateral veto on the acquisition of a nuclear capability by a State particularly distrusted by Israel, even though that State had accepted IAEA safeguards.”

47. Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution should be viewed in the context of the passage I have just quoted. It aims at establishing the fact that Israel, by attacking an internationally safeguarded nuclear facility, has gravely harmed the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the safeguards régime, which are the basic international instruments for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, and has thus also adversely affected the prospects for the establishment of such a zone. In other words, Israel, having taken the law into its own hands, should not be allowed to repeat such destructive actions—as it openly threatens to do—nor is it to be allowed to try to dictate, at the same time, its own formula for what it considers to be the proper modalities for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region.

48. Operative paragraph 2 states an incontrovertible fact, especially in view of the Secretary-General's report,

and it also reflects the Security Council's position on the question of Israel's nuclear facilities.

49. Operative paragraph 3 is procedural, requesting the Secretary-General to transmit the text of the draft resolution to the General Assembly at the second special session devoted to disarmament.

50. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote on these draft resolutions.

51. Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): This draft resolution is improper and disruptive. The item was before the First Committee, where Iraq, as its representative just stated, joined in the consensus for a procedural resolution on the Middle East nuclear-free zone.

52. If there were merit to the ideas contained in the draft resolution before us, quite at variance with the one we all considered in the First Committee, it should have been introduced and debated in the First Committee. That is what the Committee is, after all, there for. Since this draft resolution does not introduce any new facts, any facts not known at the time the matter was dealt with in the proper Committee, there is therefore no excuse for it being raised here and now. One can only regret the contempt shown for orderly procedure. It serves no legitimate interest to destroy the structure of the orderly handling of the Assembly's business. As far as the United States is concerned, the unhelpfulness of this draft resolution is not limited to its procedural impropriety. The United States supports the concept of the establishment of the Middle East nuclear-free zone. It has been and continues to be ready to support serious initiatives towards that goal.

53. This draft resolution is no such initiative. It is unbalanced, in that it focuses on the failure of one country in the Middle East—of course, Israel—to apply IAEA safeguards, whereas several other States of the region have not ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

54. Finally, this draft resolution again focuses upon the attack of last June, a matter which the appropriate body of the United Nations, the Security Council, dealt with at length, and on which it reached a consensus agreement. Nothing has happened on this matter in the real world since the Council's lengthy deliberations. No good purpose is served by harping on this issue again, as we have done too often already during this session of the Assembly: three times, I believe, during the plenary meeting, of which I am aware. At some point, the repetition of this one item ceases to be a farce only to the sponsors and becomes, in fact, a farce to the process and to the General Assembly itself.

55. For all these reasons, the United States will vote against this draft resolution. We urge others who respect the orderly functioning and the seriousness of the General Assembly also to distance themselves from this draft resolution.

56. Mr. THORNE (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community.

57. The attitude of the Community to the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear facility has been made clear on successive occasions. We believe that that attack was a clear violation of the principles of the Charter of the United

Nations and the rules of international law and have strongly condemned it.

58. We have before us today two draft resolutions on the subject of the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. The draft resolution contained in document A/36/747 was adopted by consensus in the First Committee. On that occasion, the 10 members made clear their support for the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. We are content to see this draft resolution adopted once again by consensus in the Assembly.

59. In addressing ourselves to the draft resolution contained in document A/36/L.53, we agree with the position expressed in operative paragraph 2, concerning the acceptance of IAEA safeguards by Israel, but we would like to underline that all States in the region should place their nuclear facilities under the same safeguards.

60. However, concerning operative paragraph 1, we remain unconvinced that the Israeli raid on the Iraqi nuclear facility can necessarily be said to have the consequences suggested in this part of the draft resolution. Indeed, the 10 members of the Community would hope that the States of the region will continue to pursue the objective of creating a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East with undiminished vigour.

61. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Last year, at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, Israel joined the consensus in support of resolution 35/174 despite certain reservations entertained by us. We did so in order to demonstrate goodwill and support for the proposal to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

62. In addition, Israel submitted its own draft resolution stressing that it was essential for the nuclear-weapon-free zone in question to be established in a manner most likely to assure each State in the region of compliance by all other States with the terms of a convention freely negotiated on the model of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).⁸

63. With that in mind, Israel advocated the conclusion of a multilateral convention through direct negotiations by all States of the region. Israel was forced to withdraw its draft resolution because of the opposition expressed by some Arab States, led by Iraq, to the idea of a negotiated agreement.

64. This year, Israel has again indicated in the First Committee its readiness to support the consensus on the original draft resolution, A/C.1/36/L.34, submitted by Egypt, while raising certain questions concerning the modalities proposed by the Egyptian draft resolution.

65. We all know what happened subsequently in the Committee. Qatar, acting on behalf of Syria and Iraq, submitted amendments which were presented with the obvious purpose of introducing, maliciously and unnecessarily, elements designed to cause considerable opposition and reservations.

66. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic on a point of order.

67. Mr. HAYDAR (Syrian Arab Republic): Just to set the record straight, Qatar was acting on behalf of the group of Arab States, not Syria and Iraq.

68. The PRESIDENT: I would request the representative of Israel to continue his statement.

69. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Qatar, acting on behalf of countries including Syria and Iraq, submitted amendments which were presented with the obvious purpose of introducing, maliciously and unnecessarily, elements designed to cause considerable opposition and reservations, as evidenced in the discussions and voting on items 24 and 130. It is clear that those amendments were drafted to break the consensus of the General Assembly on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

70. Qatar's amendments in committee were withdrawn and then revived by Iraq in the form of draft resolution A/36/L.53, which is now before the plenary meeting. It represents a renewed effort on the part of Iraq to shatter the consensus of the General Assembly on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Without a consensus there can be no way of achieving what paragraph 60 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, termed "the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among States of the region" [resolution S-10/2].

71. Iraq's rejection of Israel's proposal last year, coupled with the Iraqi draft resolution before us, raises grave doubts about Iraq's true intentions with regard to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

72. This, of course, is not very surprising. Last year, Iraq refused Israel's offer to negotiate together a treaty on the lines of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. This year it has gone further and has impaired the movement in the United Nations, however tenuous, towards an understanding to create a nuclear-weapon free zone in our region.

73. It takes much time and patience, and above all good faith, to achieve some sort of concurrence, however general, on a disarmament measure. It takes very little time, patience or talent to destroy it. This is always easy. In this, Iraq has been successful. The responsibility lies with Iraq for having prevented the General Assembly from concluding by consensus its deliberations on the item regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone attained last year.

74. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will take a decision first on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 9 of its report [A/36/747] and then on draft resolution A/36/L.53.

75. The First Committee adopted the draft resolution in document A/36/747 without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do so also?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 36/87 A).

76. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/36/L.53. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kam-

puchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 107 votes to 2, with 31 abstentions (resolution 36/87 B).⁹

77. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

78. Mr. ESPECHE GIL (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Argentine republic did not participate in the voting on draft resolution A/36/L.53. That does not imply disapproval of the ultimate aim of making the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone, since Argentina joined the consensus on the adoption of the relevant resolution at this session of the General Assembly.

79. However, we in no way share the principal operative criterion of the resolution, because it aims at imposing full-scope safeguards on a country by means of a General Assembly resolution.

80. Similarly, we object to the political orientation of the resolution with regard to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, whose ineffectiveness has already been demonstrated.

81. Finally, we wish to put on record our rejection of attacks upon nuclear facilities, which has already been expressed in previous statements and votes.

82. Mr. NAMBIAR (India): India has been clear and unequivocal in its condemnation of the reprehensible, unprovoked and unjustified military attack by Israel on the Iraqi nuclear research centre near Baghdad early in June this year. We have made our position on this matter abundantly clear in numerous forums and more than once in the course of the present session of the General Assembly. We consider that the basic point at issue is the aggression committed by Israel and its violation of the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and the threat that such action has posed for international peace and security.

83. We note, however, that the introduction of this question into the consideration of agenda item 46, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", has been accompanied by certain formulations, explanations and concepts which are not directly related to the substance of the argument being put forward and carry implications which we find unacceptable. My delegation wishes to reiterate its principled position against discriminatory and inequitable agreements such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] and to full-scope and other safeguards deriving from them. Consistent with that position, my delegation abstained on draft resolution A/36/L.53, which has just been adopted by the General Assembly.

84. Mr. LEHNE (Austria): Austria's position on the Israeli air attack against the Iraqi nuclear installation is quite clear. The Austrian Government has strongly condemned the Israeli action, which in its view constitutes not only a violation of basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations but also an assault against the IAEA safeguards system. Without doubt such actions are incompatible with efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone, which must be based on the consent and good will of all States of the region.

85. On the other hand—and this is our understanding of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution—the incident of 7 June 1981 has underlined the urgent need for further efforts to reduce the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, and in this context the desirability of the early establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. We regret that the General Assembly at its present session was unable to take further steps in that direction.

86. As the host country of IAEA, Austria welcomes the repeated references in the resolution to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to the IAEA safeguards system. We share the conviction that adequate safeguard arrangements for all nuclear installations in all States of the Middle East would greatly facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

87. For those reasons the Austrian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.53.

88. Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.53 as a whole. Brazil has supported the condemnation of the attack on Iraqi nuclear facilities as a violation of international law. Our position is very clear on that account. Brazil also supports the general concept of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones with the consensus agreement of States in the region and with the commitment by nuclear-weapon States to respect the status of such zones. By signing and ratifying the Treaty of Tlatelolco,⁸ which created in Latin America the first, and so far the only, such zone in the world, Brazil gave concrete expression to its position with regard to this matter. We would welcome the taking of similar steps elsewhere in the world.

89. We cannot, however, fail to express our disagreement with some of the ideas contained in the preambular part of draft resolution A/36/L.53 with respect to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We consider that instrument to be discriminatory in character and therefore not conducive to the establishment of a genuine and lasting régime designed to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. For that reason, the Non-Proliferation Treaty cannot, in our view, constitute the

basis for serious steps to achieve the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

90. Mr. KERGIN (Canada): My delegation wishes to place on record that its abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/36/L.53 does not indicate any wavering in Canadian resolve or interest in the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

91. The Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear facilities is a fact—a deplorable fact—which my Government has condemned before at the appropriate time. In the view of my delegation, the attack should not, however, itself affect adversely the future of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in the region or the prospects of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone as suggested by draft resolution A/36/L.53. To subscribe to that opinion would be to appear to espouse a policy of defeatism, to run the risk of pursuing a self-fulfilling prophecy. Indeed, we believe that the Israeli attack provides an important immediate reason for initiating the process of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. In this connection, we deeply regret that the original proposal contained in document A/36/747 and submitted by Egypt was not able to come to fruition this year.

92. My delegation looks forward to working on a constructive proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East at the next session of the General Assembly.

93. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): The position of the Finnish Government on the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear centre is clear and has been expressed in several contexts. We concur with Security Council resolution 487 (1981) adopted on 19 June 1981. In that resolution the Security Council strongly condemned the military attack by Israel as a clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct.

94. The General Assembly has already concluded consideration of agenda item 130, which dealt exclusively and explicitly with that event. In addition, the attack and its consequences have been dealt with in a number of other contexts, including that of the IAEA. We therefore consider that draft resolution A/36/L.53, which has just been adopted, adds little to what has already emerged from the debate on the subject. Furthermore, we doubt that the adoption of that resolution will contribute to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. This is a goal, we believe to which we, as indeed the General Assembly as a whole, have attached and continue to attach overriding importance.

95. As to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, it is our view that the Israeli attack has, if anything, made efforts towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone even more urgent. While we supported draft resolution A/36/L.34/Rev.1, we regret that it did not prove possible at this time to adopt a substantive resolution on the subject of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

96. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The Albanian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.53 for the reasons that we gave earlier in this meeting, that is to say, specifically to condemn the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear facilities. But we wish to reaffirm that that affirmative vote in no way changes the reservations that we have always had with respect to the concept of so-called nuclear-weapon-free zones.

97. That affirmative vote does not in any way mean that we have changed in the least our position with respect to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which we have always considered and will always consider to be the result of bargaining by the two imperialist super-Powers to serve their own hegemonistic ends.

98. We therefore have reservations concerning the paragraphs of the resolution just adopted which refer to nuclear-weapon-free zones and the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

99. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Costa Rica has always supported initiatives aimed at the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones throughout the world, because we are parties to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which prohibits nuclear weapons in Latin America, and we would wish other regions to enjoy the same safeguards. That is why we participated in the consensus by which the draft resolution in paragraph 9 of document A/36/747 was adopted.

100. However, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/36/L.53 because we are not in agreement with the procedure by which that text was introduced at this stage or with the content of some of its paragraphs. We have deplored the Israeli attack on the nuclear facilities of Iraq but we do not believe that that is the only reason why the Non-Proliferation Treaty is endangered in that region. There are many other reasons which are not referred to in the resolution.

101. Therefore, my delegation reaffirms its full support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

102. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn its attention to agenda item 47. The report of the First Committee is contained in document A/36/748. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bhutan, India, Mauritius.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic,

Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary,² Indonesia,⁴ Israel, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Norway, Poland, Samoa,¹⁰ Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 93 votes to 3, with 44 abstentions (resolution 36/88).¹⁰

103. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to agenda item 48. The report of the First Committee is contained in document A/36/749. The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 116 votes to none, with 27 abstentions (resolution 36/89).¹¹

104. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to agenda item 49. The report of the First Committee is contained in document A/36/750.

105. The representative of Seychelles wishes to explain his delegation's position before the Assembly proceeds to take action on the draft resolution on this item.

106. Mr. ALBERT (Seychelles): The delegation of the Republic of Seychelles wishes to express its reservations

with regard to operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution contained in document A/36/750.

107. It is regrettable that the conference which was to have been held in 1981, as mentioned in resolution 34/80 B, adopted unanimously at the thirty-fourth session, was prevented from taking place this year. The Republic of Seychelles believes that the urgency of the situation in the Indian Ocean calls for the holding of the conference at a much earlier date than is mentioned in the present draft resolution—and at least before the end of the first half of 1982.

108. Arguments about the necessity for the harmonization of views and faulty and outmoded declarations harbour ill-intentioned manoeuvres.

109. Foreign military exercises in the region, such as operation Bright Star, constitute a threat to the peace, security and stability of the region. The concept of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, in accordance with the Declaration contained in resolution 2832 (XXVI) of 16 December 1971, and not a zone of war, as is envisaged by some, will continue to be emphasized by the Republic of Seychelles. Tension in the region has recently been further heightened by the foreign mercenary invasion of the Republic of Seychelles on 25 November last.

110. The Republic of Seychelles appeals to the members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean to condemn this foreign aggression against a peace-loving littoral State in the region.

111. The Republic of Seychelles firmly believes that the sooner the conference to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean is held, the sooner will views on the question be harmonized.

112. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report in document A/36/750.

113. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution is contained in document A/36/803.

114. The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 36/90).

115. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of India, who wishes to explain his position on the resolution that has just been adopted.

116. Mr. NAMBIAR (India): My delegation would have preferred a consensus resolution that reflected more appropriately the concerns of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to see the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace in accordance with the Declaration contained in resolution 2832 (XXVI).

117. As it is, we have gone along with the present consensus in the *Ad Hoc* Committee and in the First Committee in the hope that the *Ad Hoc* Committee will in fact be able to complete its preparations to convene the conference well before the first half of 1983.

118. The deteriorating situation in the Indian Ocean area has caused the Government of India grave concern, and the serious developments affecting the sovereignty of an Indian Ocean littoral State, as was just explained by the representative of the Seychelles, only heightens this concern which my delegation feels.

119. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 50, which is contained in document A/36/751. The draft resolution recommended by the First Committee is contained in paragraph 8 of its report.

120. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution appears in document A/36/804.

121. The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do so also?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 36/91).

122. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 51, which is contained in document A/36/752.

123. The Assembly will now take a decision on the 13 draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 32 of its report [A/36/752].

124. Draft resolution A is entitled "United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament". The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution A was adopted (resolution 36/92 A).

125. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution B is entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission". The First Committee adopted draft resolution B without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 36/92 B).

126. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution C is entitled "World Disarmament Campaign". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nic-

aragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel, United States of America.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 143 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 36/92 C).¹²

127. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution D is entitled "International co-operation for disarmament". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

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

Draft resolution D was adopted by 116 votes to none, with 26 abstentions (resolution 36/92 D).¹³

128. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution E is entitled "Nuclear weapons in all aspects". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Greece, Israel, Mali, Morocco, Zaire.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 118 votes to 18, with 5 abstentions (resolution 36/92 E).¹³

129. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution F is entitled "Report of the Committee on Disarmament". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

public, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution F was adopted by 136 votes to none, with 9 abstentions (resolution 36/92 F).¹³

130. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution G is entitled "Study on the relationship between disarmament and development".

131. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution G was adopted (resolution 36/92 G).

132. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution H is entitled "Status of multilateral disarmament agreements". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Draft resolution H was adopted by 115 votes to none, with 23 abstentions (resolution 36/92 H).¹²

133. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution I, entitled "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Austria, Comoros, Finland, Greece, Israel, Sweden.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 121 votes to 19, with 6 abstentions (resolution 36/92 I).

134. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution J, entitled "World-wide action for collecting signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, to curb the arms race and for disarmament". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda,

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against: Brazil, Canada, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Central African Republic, Colombia, Comoros, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Draft resolution J was adopted by 78 votes to 3, with 56 abstentions (resolution 36/92 J).¹⁴

135. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution K, entitled "Prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Jamaica, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Draft resolution K was adopted by 68 votes to 14, with 57 abstentions (resolution 36/92 K).

136. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution L is entitled "Programme of research and studies on disarmament".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution L without a vote. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to adopt draft resolution L in the same way?

Draft resolution L was adopted (resolution 36/92 L).

137. The PRESIDENT: We now come to draft resolution M, entitled "Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session". This draft resolution was adopted without a vote in the First Committee. May I take it that the General Assembly also adopts it without a vote?

Draft resolution M was adopted (resolution 36/92 M).

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

139. Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria): I wish to make a statement in interpretation of resolution 36/92 A on the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament, which has just been adopted.

140. On 6 November my delegation was privileged to introduce in the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.1. It was subsequently adopted by the Committee by consensus on 20 November. We are encouraged to note that the General Assembly also has been able to adopt by consensus the recommendation of the First Committee on the United Nations programme of fellowships contained in document A/36/752.

141. The import of this decision is that the Secretary-General is authorized to make adequate arrangements relating to the programme for 1982, in accordance with the guidelines approved by the General Assembly at its thirty-third session. In other words, he should make the necessary arrangements to award 20 disarmament fellowships in 1982.

142. However, my delegation's attention has just been drawn to document A/36/658 of 2 December 1981, currently in circulation, relating to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983. In this document it is proposed that the number of disarmament fellowships be reduced from 20 to 10.

143. It is, however, our understanding that the resolution just adopted enjoins the Secretary-General to make available the usual 20 disarmament fellowships, to be awarded to candidates nominated by Member States in 1982.

144. Mr. MEGALOKONOMOS (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): Greece has constantly emphasized the importance of nuclear disarmament. The ideas it has expressed are contained in resolution 36/92 E, which we have just adopted.

145. However, the resolution suffers, on the one hand, from the presence of a certain number of too wide and unbalanced elements concerning the doctrines and intentions of the nuclear-weapon States and, on the other, from the absence of any reference to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Indeed, the principles of the Charter which condemn the threat and use of force in international relations and confirm the right to self-defence of all States are not mentioned in the preambular paragraphs of resolution 36/92 E. That is why, while we recognize the positive aspects of that draft resolution, my delegation was compelled to abstain in the vote on resolution E.

[*The speaker continued in English.*]

146. I should now like to refer to two other resolutions which the Assembly has adopted and on which we abstained in the votes.

147. The first is resolution 36/92 I. Greece is and has always been in favour of nuclear and conventional disarmament. Thus we welcome any move to put an end to armament in general and the nuclear arms race in particular, any move aimed at the ultimate objective of complete disarmament.

148. Thus we agree with the general lines of the objectives of the resolution just adopted. Nevertheless, we were unfortunately unable to support it because of its proclamatory character, which is not in our view the best approach to attain our objectives.

149. We had one more hesitation regarding this resolution which concerns paragraph 1. In our view, this paragraph, declaring the use of nuclear weapons a violation of the Charter and thus prohibiting it alone, leaves a serious vacuum and a vagueness of interpretation. In fact, we all know that the Charter, in its preambular part, prohibits without any exception or qualification whatsoever any use of force save in the common interest. These are the reasons which obliged our delegation to abstain in the voting on that resolution.

150. Finally, referring to resolution 36/92 K, which we have adopted, I should like to state again, as I said before, that my country is consistently in favour of nuclear and conventional disarmament. We welcome any move towards putting an end to armaments in general, and especially to the nuclear arms race, thus aiming at the ultimate objective of complete disarmament.

151. We are certain that continuation of either quantitative or qualitative development of nuclear armaments will not fail eventually to bring about destructive consequences for the whole of humanity, but singling out, condemning and prohibiting just one kind of nuclear weapon could in our view be interpreted as meaning, *a contrario*, the legalization and moral acceptance of the rest of them.

152. We firmly believe that if an international forum is to negotiate the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of nuclear armaments, this should be done in a comprehensive way and should contain all types of nuclear armaments. We have to admit that we must adopt a global approach to the question of disarmament, otherwise, in our view, we shall not be able to attain our objectives.

153. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to say a few words with regard to resolution 36/92 H. During the consideration of the draft resolution in the First Committee, our delegation voted in favour of it when it came up for adoption. However, we felt it necessary on that occasion to explain our vote so that it should be fully clear for the record that our vote in no way altered Mexico's stand in connection with the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques adopted in New York, on 12 October 1976, generally known as the "En-Mod" Convention.

154. At the 40th meeting of the First Committee, held on 23 November of this year, my delegation's position was made clear. I shall not repeat it today, and it seemed

to me necessary only to provide this sort of bibliographical information at this stage.

155. Mr. ERSUN (Turkey): The representative of Nigeria has just made a statement concerning the programme of fellowships on disarmament. I should like to put on record that my delegation strongly supports what was said by him and it is also our understanding that this coming year—in 1982—the number of fellowships to be awarded will be 20.

156. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 52 [A/36/753]. The draft resolution recommended by the First Committee appears in paragraph 7 of its report.

157. This draft resolution was adopted by the First Committee without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly also adopts it without a vote?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 36/93).

158. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 53 [A/36/754]. May I invite members to turn their attention to the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Austria, Burma, Greece, Guatemala, India, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Morocco, Sweden, Tunisia, Zaire.

The draft resolution was adopted by 115 votes to 17, with 12 abstentions (resolution 36/94).¹⁵

159. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 54 [A/36/755]. May I

now invite members to turn their attention to the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 145 votes to none, with 3 abstentions (resolution 36/95).¹⁵

160. The PRESIDENT: It will be recalled that I announced earlier, in regard to agenda item 42, that the Fifth Committee was still considering the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee. The Fifth Committee has finished that consideration, and its Rapporteur will now read out to the Assembly its report on agenda item 42, and also its report on agenda item 55.

161. Mr. MARTORELL (Peru), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have the honour to present the report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in its reports on agenda items 42 and 55. The reports of the Fifth Committee on these items will be issued as documents A/36/802 and A/36/805 respectively. The recommendations of the Fifth Committee on these items are as follows.

162. With regard to draft resolution C recommended by the First Committee in its report on item 42 [A/36/743], the Fifth Committee, by 40 votes to 16, with 18 abstentions, decided to report to the General Assembly that if it

adopts this draft resolution an additional appropriation of \$125,000 will be required under section 2B of the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983. The conference-servicing costs, estimated not to exceed \$125,800 on the basis of the total costs at present rates, will be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing costs to be submitted to the General Assembly at a later stage of this session.

163. With regard to draft resolution A recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 38 of its report on agenda item 55 [A/36/756] the Fifth Committee decided without a vote to report to the General Assembly that if it adopts this draft resolution an additional appropriation of \$55,000 will be required under section 2B of the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983. The conference-servicing costs, estimated not to exceed \$1,141,900, will be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing costs for 1982 to be submitted to the General Assembly at a later stage of this session.

164. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the three draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 14 of its report [A/36/743] on agenda item 42. We shall first take up draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 147 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 36/96 A).¹⁵

165. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Upper Volta, Zaire.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 109 votes to 1, with 33 abstentions (resolution 36/96 B).¹⁶

166. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to draft resolution C. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/36/802. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu,¹⁷ Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, Seychelles, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahrain, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Finland, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Sri Lanka, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 86 votes to 20, with 34 abstentions (resolution 36/96 C).¹⁷

167. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to explain his vote after the vote.

168. Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): The Assembly has just adopted one of the most important—perhaps the most important—resolutions before the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. Though this simple, procedural resolution merely extends the mandate of the Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons to complete its investigation into allegations of the use of chemical and biological weapons, the implications of this move and this subject are incalculable; for the use of these barbaric weapons which have inflicted so much harm—in Laos, Kampuchea and, according to growing evidence, also in Afghanistan—which cause an early onset of violent itching, vomiting, dizziness and distorted vision, eventually ending in people choking on their own blood, a most painful death—is an ominous sign of barbaric practices loose in the world.

169. This world body has recognized the repercussions of such a development. For this reason, the resolution was adopted by an overwhelming number of countries, including an overwhelming number of non-aligned countries.

170. That is altogether fitting and proper, since this is a topic of primary concern to small, non-aligned nations. These are the nations today afflicted with this inhumane practice. The poorest, the most desperate people in these non-aligned nations are precisely the ones suffering; for these weapons, outlawed by mankind and successfully banned from the battlefields of the industrialized world for over five decades, have been and are being used against unsophisticated, defenceless people, in the campaigns of mounting extermination in Laos, Kampuchea and, more recently, in Afghanistan.

171. Of these facts the world has taken note, and the United Nations took note, just now, by extending the mandate of the Group of Experts.

172. By so doing, the General Assembly also placed before the Group of Experts and the United Nations itself a significant challenge. Many groups and individuals around the world are watching carefully to see how this issue, of such profound importance, is handled by the Organization.

173. To illustrate the breadth and depth of feeling on this score, allow me to quote from three of the leading newspapers in the United States—one considered conservative, another in the centre, and a third often considered quite liberal.

174. All three newspapers ran leading editorials about the United Nations handling of the "yellow rain" issue, and all three editorials spoke of the concern at the way the issue was being and would be handled here.

175. First, the *Wall Street Journal* ran an editorial entitled, "Whitewashing yellow rain", on 23 November, which ended:

"The UN investigation was stalled for months and finally sabotaged by the refusal of the Soviet Union and its partners to allow the investigators appointed by the civilized world to go to the scene of the crime. Now, as the obstructionists no doubt planned, a soon-to-expire mandate for the investigation team threatens to lay UN involvement in the matter to rest with nothing more useful than the team's cursory findings. We indeed expected this but we know as well that the UN has more need than it may think to carry this investigation further. If it doesn't, it will have suffered one more black mark against whatever reputation it has left for contributing to world order. We're not sure it can stand many more."

176. Secondly, the *Washington Post* ran its editorial, aptly entitled, "Crucial test for the United Nations", on 27 November, which ended:

"The United Nations Group has so far not accomplished much of anything. . . . Secretary-General Waldheim must also see to it that the Group gets where it has to go, despite Soviet objections. The charges being investigated, after all, go beyond whether this or that chemical has been used. They engage nothing less than what the United Nations is all about—the international rule of law. The integrity of the international system demands that they be conclusively proved or refuted."

177. Thirdly, the relatively liberal *Newsday* ran an editorial on 30 November, entitled, "The United Nations' impotence in the 'yellow rain' case". This editorial pointed out that:

"The USSR and its allies blocked an essential ingredient of the investigation—access to sites where the attacks are said to have occurred. A Soviet under-secretary-general is the official who would have had to okay the United Nations team's movement into war zones and arrange for its security. He did neither. . . .

"An unsatisfactory investigation and an inconclusive report must not be allowed to end the matter. The General Assembly should continue the inquiry, not only to spare peasants in Indochina and Afghanistan, but also to rescue the United Nations itself from unalloyed impotence."

178. Those three leading newspapers recognize the serious challenge before the United Nations, and many others do also, for the use of toxins as warfare agents in South-East Asia has grave implications for present and future arms control arrangements. As biologically produced chemical substances, toxins fall within the prohibitions of both the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases and of

Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva in 1925¹⁸ and the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxic Weapons and on their Destruction [*resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex*]. These agreements, signed by both the Soviet Union and Viet Nam, and the customary international law which has developed out of the former, are being flagrantly violated.

179. To have the world realize these horrors, the United States co-operated fully over the past year with the Secretary-General and the Group of Experts in this investigation of chemical weapons use. We have provided three formal submissions, answered questions from the Group and provided further details about those submissions. Our medical and technical experts appeared before the Group of Experts to respond to questions and to provide background information and further clarification of our submissions of clear evidence. In this manner the United States has turned over its evidence to the Group of Experts. That Group, like the United States, now has physical evidence.

180. None the less, for years before the actual physical evidence was obtained, several countries, including our own, were awakening to the startling reality that the Hmong tribespeople of Laos had become targets of a calculated campaign of death and of terror. Reports were received from refugees and others about attacks in the remote hills and villages of Laos, reports that aircraft passing overhead would sometimes disperse a yellow cloud, a "yellow rain", as it came to be called, which settled to the ground and brought with it inexplicable sickness and death. These reports persisted and increased in frequency. They were amazingly consistent, whether given by farmers from Laos or Cambodia or hill tribesmen from remote parts of Afghanistan. Refugees fleeing Cambodia were recounting the same horrors, and experiencing the same attacks as those being reported by the Hmong. Over the past two years, there have been increasing reports of the use of lethal and incapacitating chemical weapons in Afghanistan. By 1980, the evidence was too massive, too compelling and too disturbing for the world to ignore. Last year, this body, in keeping with the central purposes of the Organization, accepted the responsibility to conduct an immediate, impartial investigation of the use of chemical weapons. This year, with further evidence accumulated, that responsibility has again been accepted by the Assembly.

181. Our objective is, quite simply, to stop these attacks. We shall keep this issue before the world community and on the international agenda because we believe this is the most effective way of stopping these attacks. We believe that if the facts of chemical weapons use are exposed to the world the nations now using them may be deterred from continuing such an abhorrent practice. We are striving to avoid any appearance of engaging in a propaganda campaign, since our efforts, if they are to have effectiveness, must be credible. Others must take this information as seriously as we do, and others are in fact beginning to do so.

182. There is every reason why this should be the case. For over 50 years, as I stated, chemical weapons have been successfully banned from the battlefields of the industrialized world. What is happening today to the innocent people of Afghanistan and South-East Asia is not an East-West issue: it is an issue of universal importance, with particular consequences for those countries least

183. The PRESIDENT: I apologize for interrupting the representative of the United States, but his 10 minutes are up. I would request him to conclude his statement.

184. Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): In conclusion, I would say that it is the response of the United Nations and States around the world which will help determine whether these attacks continue and proliferate, or are halted forever.

185. The PRESIDENT: We shall consider next the report of the First Committee on agenda item 55 [A/36/756].

186. I call on the representative of Cyprus.

187. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The Rapporteur of the First Committee mentioned that in regard to agenda item 55 there was a new recommendation which should be added to the other recommendations related to this item. This new recommendation is contained in document A/C.1/36/17.

188. I should like to explain that the study on the relationship between disarmament and international security [A/36/597] contains a footnote regarding reservations by me, as a member of the Group of Experts, on the Relationship between Disarmament and International Security, to the effect that I consider the conclusions incomplete and inadequate.

189. I produced complementary conclusions and recommendations. The fact that they are complementary was mentioned also by the Chairman of the Group when he introduced the study. He was to have read out those new, complementary conclusions so that they would become part of the record of the First Committee. However, instead of reading them out, he produced them in writing, thinking that that amounted to the same thing. It seems that, because of technical difficulties in respect to interpretation into the other official languages, they were not included in the record of the First Committee. Therefore it was necessary to issue a corrigendum regarding that omission and to introduce my complementary conclusions and recommendations under this item as a separate document.

190. As a member of the Group of Experts, I felt that the conclusions were inadequate in certain respects. Because of the pressure of time, they were not properly completed. I consider that my complementary conclusions are indispensable to conveying the essence of the study and its very purpose—namely, the purpose of promoting international security as the only means for halting the arms race and proceeding to disarmament, particularly at a critical time when the very survival of mankind is threatened by the rapidly escalating arms race.

191. These complementary conclusions and recommendations are to be found in the document that I have already mentioned [A/C.1/36/17].

192. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the 12 draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 38 of its report.

193. We shall now vote on draft resolution A, entitled "Study on conventional disarmament". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/36/805. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bahrain, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 26 abstentions (resolution 36/97 A).¹⁵

194. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution B is entitled "Conclusion of an international convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons". The First Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to do the same?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 36/97 B).

195. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution C, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal,

Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 13 abstentions (resolution 36/97 C).¹⁵

196. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution D, entitled "Institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament", was adopted by the First Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution D was adopted (resolution 36/97 D).

197. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution E is entitled "Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Algeria, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belize, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lebanon, Mauritania, Morocco,

Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 84 votes to 18, with 42 abstentions (resolution 36/97 E).¹⁵

198. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution F, entitled "Confidence-building measures", was adopted without a vote in the First Committee. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do so also?

Draft resolution F was adopted (resolution 36/97 F).

199. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution G is entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Seychelles, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, France, India, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution G was adopted by 125 votes to 14, with 6 abstentions (resolution 36/97 G).¹⁹

200. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution H is entitled "Study on all the aspects of regional disarmament". It was adopted without a vote in the First Committee. May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution H was adopted (resolution 36/97 H).

201. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution I, entitled "Strategic arms limitation talks", was adopted without a

vote by the First Committee. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 36/97 I).

202. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution J is entitled "Review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Draft resolution J was adopted by 134 votes to none, with 12 abstentions (resolution 36/97 J).¹⁵

203. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution K is entitled "Disarmament and international security". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan,

Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, China, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution K was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 11 abstentions (resolution 36/97 K).¹⁵

204. The PRESIDENT: Lastly, we turn to draft resolution L, entitled "Study on the relationship between disarmament and international security". The First Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution L was adopted (resolution 36/97 L).

205. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the German Democratic Republic for an explanation of vote.

206. Mr. KAHN (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic joined the consensus on the adoption of draft resolution I, entitled "Strategic arms limitation talks", and wishes to give the following explanation.

207. Paragraph 4 of the resolution is fully in line with the statements made with the Committee of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty which met in Bucharest on 1 and 2 December this year. I quote from the communiqué:

"The States represented at the meeting unanimously support the prompt renewal of the Soviet-United States negotiations on strategic arms limitation. They consider it essential to ensure that the negotiations, drawing on all that has been achieved in this field and strictly observing the principle of equality and equal security for the two sides, will lead to the limitation and reduction of strategic arms, which would have great significance for the strengthening of international security."
[A/36/807, annex, para. 5.]

208. My delegation also attaches the utmost significance to paragraph 5 of the resolution. Situated in the heart of Europe, the German Democratic Republic takes a vital interest in the successful outcome of the talks which began between the Soviet Union and the United States of America on 30 November, for which it is not the serious will of one side alone that is decisive. For that reason my delegation noted with concern what was stated only recently in this connection by one representative.

209. He who considers such talks merely as an alibi in order to trigger off a new round of the arms race—deploying nuclear arms in Europe, and who wants to use the North Atlantic Treaty Organization two-track decision to exert pressure on the other side, assumes a heavy responsibility for the danger thus caused for the peoples of the European continent.

210. The German Democratic Republic, as well as the other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, is deeply interested in eliminating such a danger. This should be the objective to be achieved by the Geneva talks, with due account taken of all factors which determine the strategic situation of the European continent.

211. The German Democratic Republic is in favour of banning from Europe all kinds of nuclear weapons, be they medium-range or tactical weapons.

212. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider agenda item 56. The report of the First Committee is contained in document A/36/757.

213. I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

214. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Iraq's initiative, which gave birth to the report of the group of experts, must be seen against the background of Iraq's own quest for nuclear capability.

215. I have already provided a detailed description of Iraq's attempt to go nuclear in my statements in the Security Council, the plenary meeting of the General Assembly and in the document attached to my letter of 19 October 1981 to the Secretary-General, circulated as document A/36/610-S/14732 and entitled "The Iraqi Nuclear Threat—Why Israel Had To Act".

216. The study under consideration was discriminatory in singling out Israel for investigation. There exists, of course, no United Nations study concerning the Iraqi nuclear programme, nor can we expect official United Nations interest in the nuclear programme of any country in the Middle East other than Israel. The terms of reference of the group of experts were clearly prejudicial in that they required the Secretary-General to prepare a study of the "Israeli Nuclear Armament". Thus, the very formulation of the terms of reference made any impartial research impossible.

217. It is hardly surprising that under those terms several reputable nuclear scientists who were approached refused to participate in the work of the group of experts.

218. It is certainly interesting to note that a report which dwells upon technological and scientific aspects of nuclear capability was written by five persons, four of whom are political scientists, while the only nuclear physicist happens to be an Arab. It is also worth noting that the expert who submitted the report on behalf of the group is a well-known proponent of the development of the "Islamic bomb", and has called several times for further proliferation of nuclear weapons. Ironically, this did not prevent the group from expressing concern over the dangers of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. In the light of the composition of the group of experts and of its terms of reference, the conclusions of the report were predictable.

219. In retrospect, there can be little doubt that Iraq's insistence over the last three years on pushing through resolutions condemning Israel was inspired not only by inter-Arab rivalry, but also by the need to divert the world's attention from its own frenetic nuclear activities. General Assembly resolution 33/71 A of 1978, which is recalled in the second preambular paragraph of this draft resolution, was a turning point that fundamentally changed the character of resolutions adopted by the First Committee of the General Assembly. The resolution of 1978 was a break with the honourable tradition which permitted the Committee to deal with disarmament and international security as world problems without the mention of local and regional disputes. The reluctance of many representatives to break with this tradition was stressed in the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute *Yearbook* of 1979. On page 507, the *Yearbook* noted the overwhelming feeling among representatives that the highly controversial Iraqi resolution "would diffuse the focus of the session and undermine the consensus on the Final Document".

220. The sheer hypocrisy of the draft resolution before us is manifested in the fourth preambular paragraph which expresses concern over the fact that Israel did not join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2327 (XXII), annex*]. Nearly half of the sponsors of the draft resolution as first presented are not parties to the Treaty. Why, may I ask, does the draft resolution refrain from expressing concern over the fact that these sponsors are not parties to that treaty, not to speak of several other Arab countries in the Middle East?

221. Israel has repeatedly stated that the most effective way to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to the Middle East is through the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region, modelled on the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) which was based on the initiative of Latin American States and on direct negotiations among them. Last year we submitted to the First Committee a draft resolution 20 on this matter, but as the report of the Secretary-General indicates [*A/36/431, para. 8*], our offer was rejected. Iraq took the lead among the Arab States which rejected out of hand our proposal. Its refusal was repeated this year in the deliberations of the First Committee. This Iraqi draft resolution which has since been adopted, contained in document *A/36/L.53*, has again raised grave doubts as to whether Iraq indeed favours the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

222. Hostile and biased initiatives—such as the Iraqi draft resolution before us—do not serve the cause of peace in the Middle East and are not intended to do so. Israel will therefore vote against this one-sided and hypocritical draft resolution.

223. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report contained in document *A/36/757*.

224. A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 together. I now put to the vote operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Belize, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Uruguay, Zaire.

Operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of the draft resolution were adopted by 89 votes to 21, with 30 abstentions.²¹

225. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

A recorded vote was taken.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 101 votes to 2, with 39 abstentions (resolution 36/98).²¹

226. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 128 [A/36/758].

227. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 7 of the report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 123 votes to none, with 21 abstentions (resolution 36/99).¹⁵

228. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 135 [A/36/759].

229. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution, entitled "Declaration on the prevention

of nuclear catastrophe", which appears in paragraph 10 of the report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland,²² Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Malaysia, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Zaire.

The draft resolution was adopted by 82 votes to 19, with 41 abstentions (resolution 36/100).²²

230. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their vote after the vote.

231. Mr. ABD. AZIZ (Malaysia): My delegation has consistently supported all measures to eliminate completely the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons through the cessation of the production and the destruction of the stockpiles of such weapons. However, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution which has just been adopted because the thrust of this resolution is limited to the first use of nuclear weapons. My delegation is convinced that such a declaration will have a limited value and will sidetrack us from the final objective of the complete elimination and prevention of the use of nuclear weapons.

232. Moreover, it is ironic to speak of the first use of nuclear weapons when in reality the first use will definitely lead to second strikes and so forth, the final result of which would be the complete destruction of our civilization.

233. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): An objective criterion for the evaluation of the work of any General

Assembly session is, we are convinced, how far it manages to reflect in its decisions the political tasks facing the world community at a given moment and how accurately it takes into account the moods and aspirations of the peoples of the world.

234. This session has taken place in conditions of a worsening international political situation and increased danger of an outbreak of nuclear war. We can say without hesitation that concern at this turn of events has been the leitmotif of the statements made by the representatives of the majority of countries at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

235. In the present tense situation, the elimination of the danger of the use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war have become particularly and acutely necessary. The Soviet proposal that the General Assembly should adopt a declaration solemnly proclaiming that States and statesmen that resort first to the use of nuclear weapons will be committing the gravest crime against humanity was aimed at the fulfilment of that task.

236. I take this opportunity to express the Soviet delegation's gratitude for the support that the majority of States has given to that proposal at this session. That support shows that the leaders of those countries understand the importance and timeliness of the Soviet initiative, which responds to the vital interests of peoples and the task of eliminating the threat of war, particularly nuclear war. In supporting the adoption of this Soviet proposal the General Assembly has demonstrated the high sense of responsibility of the Member States of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance of universal peace and the strengthening of international security.

237. The declaration is in step with the times and will undoubtedly become one of the most important documents of the United Nations in its efforts to achieve the noble aim of the Organization to save succeeding generations from the scourge of a war which has no analogy in the history of mankind. The main point of the declaration is to try to ensure that no one will ever be the first to use nuclear weapons. If no one uses them first, that means that they will never be used at all. The declaration should prove a timely warning to those who support the policy of building stocks of nuclear missiles and carrying out broad-based programmes of strategic rearmament and to all those who promote the senseless doctrine of nuclear first strike, the doctrine of the possibility and the acceptability of a "limited" nuclear war. For it is quite obvious that in our time any policy of the first use of nuclear weapons is suicidal, not only for any State or any political system, but for the whole of mankind. As has been repeatedly stated by Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, to try to beat each other in the arms race and to count on victory in a nuclear war is dangerous folly.

238. The Soviet delegation wishes to state once again that, as was noted in the communiqué issued by the meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, which was held in Bucharest on 1 and 2 December last, the Soviet Union and the other States of the socialist community "do not have, have not had and never will have any strategic doctrine other than that of self-defence, do not have, have not had and never will have any intention of building up the potential for a first nuclear strike. They are not striving and never will strive for military dominance. They have advocated and will continue to advocate taking disarmament measures in order to insure a military balance at a lower level and

reducing and eliminating the military confrontation in Europe." [A/36/807, para. 2.]

239. It is to be hoped that other States which bear responsibility for the fate of the world share this position after all and will state clearly that they renounce any doctrine or intention to be the first to use the nuclear weapon.

240. The mass movement against the threat of nuclear war has always had powerful backing in the socialist countries and has enjoyed broad-based support from the non-aligned countries. Recently we have seen how this movement has encompassed Western Europe. It is beginning to develop in the United States as well, where there is a growing understanding of the total falsity of the doctrine that the threat of first use of the nuclear weapon can serve as a means for maintaining peace. One would have to be very naive to believe sincerely that the threat of nuclear war can be eliminated by brandishing the nuclear weapon. It can be said rather that the doctrine of first use of the nuclear weapon is designed to serve as a means of political pressure and blackmail.

241. To strengthen peace and international security it is imperative, now more than ever, immediately to halt the arms race and to proceed towards substantive disarmament measures, particularly nuclear disarmament measures. For many years the Soviet Union has insistently and consistently sought negotiations on nuclear disarmament and on other aspects of disarmament. We are prepared to make every effort to ensure that such negotiations are successfully concluded.

242. Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh): Bangladesh has consistently supported all measures aimed at the total elimination of nuclear-weapon stockpiling and production. With regard to the resolution just adopted, Bangladesh finds paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 acceptable. But the formulations of paragraphs 1 and 2 are not comprehensive enough and do not meet the commitment of Bangladesh to total disarmament and to the complete banning of the use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances.

243. The Bangladesh delegation has therefore abstained in the vote on the resolution contained in document A/36/759.

244. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 57 [A/36/760].

245. I shall now call on the representative of Ecuador who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

246. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The item on development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States is of great importance to Ecuador and is also the very essence of the purposes and principles of the United Nations. During the debate in the First Committee my delegation pointed out the prime significance we attach to the practice of good-neighbourliness and peaceful coexistence between adjoining States, as well as among the States of a region and among all States members of the international community.

247. My delegation joined the consensus in adopting this draft resolution in the First Committee, given the need for observing the standard of good-neighbourliness, and it will do so in this plenary meeting of the General

Assembly. However, we should like to point out that we would have preferred a broader and more categorical resolution on such an important and urgent topic.

248. For example, it is regrettable, and perhaps significant of the present critical world situation, that all reference has been deleted from the text to the concept of the peaceful settlement of disputes, which is the best approach and the one most worthy of the United Nations, if countries are "to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours", as the Charter of the United Nations states. Furthermore, the Organization must advocate peaceful methods of arriving at understanding, and in no way should this forum of world aspiration to peace and creative co-operation be one for producing condemnations, confrontations and tension, whose prolongation may ultimately endanger world peace.

249. We would have preferred to retain the original ideas in this draft resolution concerning the need to maintain good-neighbourliness between countries regardless of their political and social system, their creed or international orientation. Mention should have been made of the deep concern of the international community over the continuation or emergence of conflicts between States, particularly those with common borders, which endanger international peace and security and delay the progress towards a better life for neighbouring peoples. The need to eliminate psychological barriers in all areas that separate countries at present should have been stressed, in order to promote forms of co-operation between neighbouring States. It should have been stated that the development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness must contribute to the solution of problems between States, especially bordering States, based on the urgent establishment of a climate of confidence between them, in order thus to promote lasting peace by means of the peaceful settlement of disputes. The draft resolution fails to make any mention of the need to avoid international disputes or peacefully to resolve those that exist, so as to eliminate obstacles to cordial relations between neighbours. It fails to appeal to all States to refrain from any action which might affect the development of good-neighbourliness between States, or to point out that the general practice of rules of good-neighbourliness, ignoring historical, political and religious barriers, as well as the codification of such rules, would help to strengthen friendly relations and co-operation among States.

250. For us good-neighbourliness means not sending troops of occupation to an adjoining country, even under the pretext of a call from a régime manufactured by the pressure of those same troops, or with the unacceptable objective of trying to impose unfair agreements. It means being ready to sit down at the conference table in order to arrive at the peaceful settlement of disputes and, with that in view, to exchange ideas instead of missiles or bombs or actions leading to disturbances or the destabilization of governments or other displays of violence, which can never constitute a valid system of expressing political preferences. It means returning territories occupied by force and refraining from establishing settlements in them or in disputed areas, since neither armed victory nor military occupation can be the source of any right. It means that neighbouring countries should speak a language of economic and social projects for constructive action in the service of peoples, rather than a negative language of redundant condemnations and confrontations on the international scene. It means the use of a respectful, measured and cordial style in the drafting of international documents rather than of an aggressive accumulation of in-

sults, which cannot be the expression of a system of civilized coexistence.

251. Only good-neighbourliness will lead to the mutual understanding and peaceful coexistence of all peoples in the Middle East, Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America. When peoples enjoy the benefits of peace based on justice, on the reparation of injuries, on the recognition of age-old rights, it will be possible to say that countries have finally taken the path leading to good neighbourliness.

252. Only public opinion and the will of the people to reject all forms of violence and armed or verbal aggression can guarantee permanent solutions, understandings, and lasting accords between countries, which will allow the inhabitants of each to benefit from the fruits of peace.

253. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. Since the First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote, may I consider that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 36/101).

254. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to agenda item 58. The report of the First Committee is contained in document A/36/761.

255. I call on representatives who wish to explain their delegation's position before the Assembly proceeds to take action on the draft resolution.

256. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The Albanian delegation did not participate in the vote at the 51st meeting of the First Committee, on 3 December, on draft resolution A/C.1/L.61. It will adopt the same attitude now that that draft resolution is recommended to the General Assembly for adoption in paragraph 12 of the report of the First Committee [A/36/761]. Since we did not explain our position in the First Committee, we should like to do so now.

257. At previous sessions we have repeatedly emphasized—and we did so again in our statement in the debate on agenda item 58, on 2 December, at the 48th meeting of the First Committee—that we share the concern over the threat to peace and security in the world. We have given our analysis of the basic cause of that danger, while stressing in particular that the main enemies of peace and international security are the imperialist super-Powers and the various reactionary régimes and forces.

258. Regarding the draft resolution now before the Assembly, we share the justified anxieties, pertinent findings and well-founded conclusions it contains. We also share the concern at the worsening of the international situation. In brief, we share many of the ideas and provisions contained in the draft resolution.

259. Nevertheless, against its wish our delegation cannot vote in favour of the draft resolution, because it contains other ideas and provisions that give rise to some reservations or are not acceptable to us. In order to avoid going into a detailed analysis at this stage I should simply like to emphasize the following.

260. Our opinion on the so-called "process of détente" in the past is different from that reflected in the draft resolution. We do not approve of appeals to permanent

members of the Security Council like that in operative paragraph 5, because among those members are also imperialist super-Powers, and we know very well that it is the super-Powers that are mainly responsible for the tense situation throughout the world.

261. Operative paragraph 7 contains the idea of the Security Council meeting at a higher level. We do not think that this can change the course of events because we feel that the Security Council's lack of effectiveness arises not from the rank of the personalities who meet together there, but from other factors, among them the obstructions caused by the aggressive and hegemonistic policy of the super-Powers. Those same Powers have adopted the idea of meetings of the Security Council at the highest level. We feel that this type of deceptive manoeuvre on the part of the super-Powers is not to be trusted.

262. We also have reservations regarding the idea of proclaiming parts of the world so-called zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones. The draft resolution contains provisions to that effect, and we therefore maintain our reservations.

263. Regarding operative paragraph 14, we should like to emphasize that peace and security in the Mediterranean region would be greater if the majority of the littoral States undertook to counter the manoeuvres and designs of the imperialist super-Powers, particularly with respect to the presence of the American and Soviet navies. Peace and security would be better served there by refusing to grant bases and port facilities for those fleets, by refusing to accept the warships of the United States and the Soviet Union and by prohibiting them from entering or mooring in ports in Mediterranean countries on the pretext of taking on supplies or of paying so-called friendly visits.

264. As in the past, we do not accept the evaluations given in the draft resolution regarding the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed at Helsinki on 1 August 1975. Nor do we accept the process set in motion by the European security conference. We do not expect any better than the Madrid meeting, and we cannot go along with what is said in operative paragraph 13.

265. For all those reasons my delegation cannot support the adoption of the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", and we prefer not to participate in the vote on it.

266. Mr. JEAN POIX (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): The Republic of Haiti has always been in the vanguard of all movements seeking to consolidate the sovereignty of States, and has never failed in its task of advocating and encouraging non-intervention in internal affairs. In this respect, my delegation would like to pay a resounding tribute to the delegation of Guyana for the introduction of the draft resolution entitled "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States", which reflects the profound concern of mankind at the many practices and initiatives which are contrary to the code of conduct guaranteeing the full development and unhampered activity of the States of the world.

267. However, Section II (i) of paragraph 2 of the Declaration, contained in the annex, which discourages the conclusion of interlocking arrangements, casts a shadow over this picture because we know very well that the

inequality of geo-political conditions, a factor with well-known consequences in the scientific and military fields, can lead some States to have recourse to defensive alliances in order to protect themselves against the appetites and expansionist designs of other States.

268. My delegation, while expressing serious reservations regarding the interpretation of this paragraph, will nevertheless vote in favour of the draft resolution to demonstrate its support for and commitment to the sacred principle of non-intervention.

269. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 12 of its report in document A/36/761.

270. I shall first put to the vote draft resolution I, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

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

Draft resolution I was adopted by 127 votes to none, with 20 abstentions (resolution 36/102).¹⁵

271. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution II, entitled "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bénin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Swaziland, Turkey.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 120 votes to 22, with 6 abstentions (resolution 36/103).¹⁵

272. The PRESIDENT: Lastly, I put to the vote draft resolution III, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel, United States of America.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 143 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 36/104).¹⁵

273. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their votes after the vote.

274. Mr. VOSS RUBIO (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to speak briefly in order to explain its vote on draft resolution II, which has just been adopted. We voted in favour of it, being convinced that the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States is one of the basic pillars of relations between members of the international community.

275. My country is convinced that any violation of the principle of the inadmissibility of interference in the internal affairs of States is tantamount to a threat to the freedom of peoples, to their sovereignty, to the political independence and territorial integrity of States and to their political, economic, and social and cultural development.

276. We believe that the resolution we have adopted is a valuable contribution to the code of conduct that governs relations between States, and that is why we supported it. However, the text of this Declaration contains some statements with which we do not agree, because they are alien to the nature of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, and also contrary to the purposes and principles in the Charter. We refer in particular to section III (b) of paragraph 2 of the Declaration. We cannot accept or subscribe to a paragraph which would attempt to institutionalize recourse to armed force for the attainment of any objective, however noble it might appear to be.

277. With this reservation, we voted in favour of draft resolution II.

278. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution II, entitled "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States", as we also did in the First Committee. We consider its adoption to be a major step forward and a comprehensive political indication of the genuine preoccupations of the non-aligned movement.

279. In view of the importance of the Declaration, we do not consider it the final word on the question. If the Declaration can be further improved at forthcoming sessions to gain even wider support, we would welcome that possibility, as we feel that the more international backing there is for the Declaration the more chance it has of being respected.

280. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

281. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): I wish to refer to the statements made this afternoon by the representative of the United States and the representative of Israel.

282. The statement made by the representative of the United States on the Iraqi draft resolution was merely another effort on the part of the United States delegation to divert any criticism directed at its unruly protégé, Israel, which is daily becoming more aggressive and intransigent.

283. As for the Israeli allegations repeated here this afternoon, they are simply ludicrous. To come here to speak of a demonstration of goodwill and good faith and to brand the Iraqi proposals as malicious amendments designed to destroy consensus is simply baseless and ludicrous. It is Israel, by its own actions, that has destroyed whatever consensus there may have been in the Assembly concerning the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

284. Israel has mounted a strong attack on the Group of Experts that prepared the Secretary-General's report concerning Israeli nuclear armament. It attacks the experts but it does not refute what is contained in their report. It claims, on the other hand, that the question of Israeli nuclear armament must be seen in the context of Iraq's own nuclear capability.

285. The report of the Secretary-General [A/36/431] quotes Zionist leaders like Katzir and it quotes respectable sources like the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. It even quotes a report of the Central Intelligence Agency. In chapter V of the annex, for example, the following appears in footnote 50:

"On 26 January 1978 the United States Central Intelligence Agency released a memorandum dated 4 September 1974 entitled 'Prospects for Further Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons' in which it stated: 'We believe that Israel already has produced nuclear weapons'. . . . Most recently, a former senior CIA official repeated in an ABC television programme of 27 April 1981 that he and his colleagues believed in 1968 that the 'likely case' was that the Israelis were fabricating nuclear weapons."

286. No similar assessment has ever been made of Iraq's so-called nuclear capability. The same report of the Central Intelligence Agency quoted in the report of the Group of Experts was also referred to and quoted by Mr. Ernest Lefever in his report entitled "Nuclear arms and the third world", published by the Brookings Institution of Washington, D.C., in 1979. In that report Mr. Lefever also states:

"Israel is the only State in the third world that appears to have a militarily significant nuclear force of 10 or more bombs and the means to deliver them to plausible targets. No other threshold State is likely to acquire one by 1985."

There is not a single reference in that report published by the Brookings Institution to any Iraqi capability in the nuclear field.

287. In another article, published by the *Army and Navy Journal* in 1977 under the title "How much is too much?", Mr. Anthony Codsman, who has served as a civilian assistant to the Deputy Secretary of Defence, Robert Ellsworth, and as Secretary of the Defence and Intelligence Board, states the following:

"The former Director of the CIA has indicated that Israel now has at least a dozen nuclear weapons. There is growing Congressional discussion of the possibility that these weapons were built using missile material stolen by Israel from the United States."

288. Finally, the distinguished diplomat and former Under-Secretary in the Department of State, Mr. George Ball, in an article published in the *Washington Post* under the heading, "Israel—no more blank cheques", says the following:

"When I was in the State Department in 1963 American intelligence discovered the hidden nuclear installation of Dimona, in southern Israel. After protracted negotiations, our experts gained access to it. They found a French-designed reactor capable of producing enough plutonium to make one nuclear bomb a year. That was about 20 years ago. In spite of repeated requests, our Government has never again been permitted an inspection or given any information about the Israeli nuclear arsenal."

Mr. Ball goes on to say the following:

"For a nation with an atomic arsenal to destroy the nuclear facilities of another nation in order to maintain its nuclear monopoly makes a mockery of all international rules."

He further states the following:

"We should promptly initiate a concerted effort with the other nuclear-supplying nations to keep bombs out of the chaotic Middle East. The first step in any such programme is for Israel to get rid of its nuclear arsenal and stop making bombs. It is far too great a threat to world peace."

289. The Iraqi-initiated draft resolution submitted at this session had exactly that in mind, and we hope that the day will come when officials of the United States, even when they are still in office, will come to see this truth, this threat to international peace and security, and not be content with pointing it out after they leave office.

290. Mr. BEKER (Israel): The representative of Iraq apparently thinks that whoever has the last word has won the debate. That may apply to altercations in the market squares and bazaars, but we do not believe it applies to bodies such as this.

291. In speaking in exercise of the right of reply, the representative of Iraq did not mention anything that has not already been said by Iraq on dozens of occasions in the First Committee and in plenary meetings this year and in years gone by. The Iraqi arguments have all been answered by the representatives of Israel, and we do not feel that we are obliged to replay the record tape. No arguments, no excuses, no repetitions of Iraq's worn-out clichés, are going to absolve Iraq from responsibility for breaking the consensus of the General Assembly on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

292. Iraq's rejection of Israel's proposal last year, coupled with Iraq's draft resolution, adopted as resolution 36/87 B, raise grave doubts about Iraq's true intentions with regard to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

293. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): I apologize for taking the floor again. Really there is no one here who repeats clichés as much as the representative of the Zionist entity.

294. Iraq was the one that voted for and supported all the draft resolutions that were adopted by this Assembly on the item concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Israel, among all the States that abstained on all these draft resolutions except for the one that was adopted by consensus last year, was the only one constrained to follow that consensus, although its intentions are very clear in the area. Its so-called goodwill was demonstrated by the fact that it carried out its unprecedented criminal attack against the Iraqi safeguarded nuclear installations.

295. All these allegations and lies about Iraqi intentions and Iraqi facilities have been more than adequately refuted by the Director-General of IAEA, the international organization primarily responsible for questions of nuclear proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. What the representative of Israel says here is of no value whatsoever. He may repeat it until doomsday, but nobody will take his word; everyone knows it is based on allegations and pure lies.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.

NOTES

¹ A/AC.206/14.

² The delegations of Angola and the United Republic of Cameroon subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

³ The delegations of Angola, Malawi and the United Republic of

Cameroon subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

⁴ The delegations of Angola, Malawi, Mauritius, the United Republic of Cameroon and Vanuatu subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

⁵ The delegations of Angola, Malawi, Mauritius and the United Republic of Cameroon subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

⁶ See GC(XXV)/643.

⁷ GC(XXV)/Res/381.

⁸ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326.

⁹ The delegations of Angola, Malawi, Peru and the United Republic of Cameroon subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

¹⁰ The delegations of Angola, Samoa, the United Republic of Cameroon and Vanuatu subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

¹¹ The delegations of Angola, the United Republic of Cameroon and Vanuatu subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

¹² The delegation of Angola subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

¹³ The delegations of Angola and Vanuatu subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

¹⁴ The delegation of Vanuatu subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution and the delegation of Bangladesh that it had intended to abstain.

¹⁵ The delegation of Malawi subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

¹⁶ The delegations of Malawi and Peru subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

¹⁷ The delegation of Malawi subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution and the delegation of Vanuatu that it had intended to abstain.

¹⁸ League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV, No. 2138, 1929, p. 65.

¹⁹ The delegation of Malawi subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution and the delegation of Seychelles that it had intended to abstain.

²⁰ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda items 31-49 and 121, document A/C.1/35/L.8.

²¹ The delegation of Liberia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution and the delegation of Malawi that it had intended to abstain.

²² The delegations of Malawi and Swaziland subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.