



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda items 26, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34:	
World Disarmament Conference: report of the Secretary-General (<i>continued</i>)	
General and complete disarmament (<i>concluded</i>):	
(a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;	
(b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency;	
(c) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2852 (XXVI), paragraph 5	
Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (<i>continued</i>):	
Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests (<i>continued</i>):	
(a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General	
Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2830 (XXVI) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General (<i>continued</i>)	
Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace: report of the Secretary-General (<i>continued</i>)	1

Chairman: Mr. Radha Krishna RAMPHUL
(Mauritius).

AGENDA ITEMS 26, 30, 31, 32, 33 AND 34

World Disarmament Conference: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/8654, A/8668, A/8681, A/8693 and Corr.1, A/8757, A/8817 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.618)

General and complete disarmament (*concluded*) (A/C.1/1025 and 1026, A/C.1/L.623):

- (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8818);
- (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (A/8774);
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2852 (XXVI), paragraph 5 (A/8803 and Corr.1, A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1, 625/Rev.1 and 626)

Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/8818)

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests (*continued*) (A/8740, A/8741, A/C.1/L.611, 615, 620 and 624):

- (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8818);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/8807)

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2830 (XXVI) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/8653, A/8808, A/C.1/1028, A/C.1/L.619/Rev.1)

Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/8809)

1. The CHAIRMAN: We shall now hear the speakers who wish to speak in connexion with the draft resolutions and amendments under agenda item 30.

2. Mr. ADALA (Kenya): We made a short statement at the 1893rd meeting in the course of which we announced an amendment to our amendments, and we said that we were doing so in a spirit of co-operation, in the hope that draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1 would get the majority required.

3. After my short statement the representative of Sweden made an amendment to our operative paragraph 3 by adding the words "the effects of". The paragraph would thus deplore the effects of the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in all armed conflicts. We said that we were open to suggestions. As we said earlier, we felt that the draft resolution was not carrying as much weight as we wanted it to carry. Nevertheless, we find it possible to accept the Swedish amendment in the spirit of co-operation with which we started.

4. Mr. ECKERBERG (Sweden): I thank the representative of Kenya for his statement and for the very constructive spirit of co-operation which he has shown, and I welcome the new amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1.

5. In response to his statement, I would now like to ask the other sponsors of this draft resolution whether they, like the delegation of Sweden, would be willing to modify the proposed new operative paragraph so that it would read as follows:

"Deplores the effects of the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in all armed conflicts;"

6. If there is no objection by the other sponsors to this proposal, I suggest that this amendment be introduced and that the draft resolution be put to the vote.

7. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) [*interpretation from Spanish*]: As one of the two delegations that originally sponsored this draft resolution, my delegation takes the liberty of requesting the representative of Kenya to be good

enough to extend the good will that he has shown so far by not pressing his amended amendment. I shall explain why I make my request. My delegation would not have found any obstacle to accepting his amendment as it appears in document A/C.1/L.625/Rev.1, which reads:

“*Deplores* the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in all armed conflicts”.

8. The amendment as so drafted had a meaning. But if we were to say that we deplored the effects of the use of napalm it would almost appear—at least my delegation so interprets it—that we deplored the fact that napalm has those effects, but that we did not deplore the use of napalm; that we would be deplored what I would term the medical aspect of napalm, but saying nothing regarding the moral aspect, which perhaps is the most serious aspect, of the use of napalm itself.

9. My delegation is fully aware of the fact that for some delegations it might be difficult to agree to the inclusion of the Kenyan amendment—as worded in document A/C.1/L.625/Rev.1—which, as I have said, my delegation could accept without any difficulty. My delegation, together with other delegations, also wants this draft resolution to be supported by as many affirmative votes as possible, and I would therefore ask the representative of Kenya to decide, after weighing the pros and cons, either to retain the amendment as it appears in the document just mentioned or, so that the draft may be supported by as large a number of members as possible—and perhaps this might be the better alternative—to allow the draft to be put to the vote as it appears in document A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1, of which my delegation is a sponsor.

10. If this is not possible, my delegation will be forced to amend the subamendment and ask that the paragraph read:

“*Deplores* the use and the effects of the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in all armed conflicts”.

11. The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the representative of Morocco, would the representative of Kenya want to make any comments at this stage?

12. Mr. ADALA (Kenya): I had not intended to do so, but since the representative of Mexico has thrown a challenge I find myself really at a loss. I made my statement, as I said, in a spirit of co-operation, but now that the draft is the property of this Committee I have no more control over it. If it is the wish of the Committee, it can treat it any way it likes and I would have no objection.

13. Mr. KHATTABI (Morocco) [*interpretation from Spanish*]: I have asked to speak merely to say that my delegation fully supports the proposal that has just been made by the representative of Mexico, Mr. García Robles. Now that the representative of Kenya has accepted the Mexican proposal my delegation has nothing further to add.

14. Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): Nigeria was originally one of the delegations that sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/L.616 and continued to sponsor it when it was revised. However, I wish to make my delegation's position clear: the present amendment introduced by the representative of Kenya actually puts us in a very difficult position.

15. In brief, I should like to say that the Nigerian delegation fully supports the statement made by the representative of Mexico, supported by the representative of Morocco.

16. Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): I was going to explain our votes on these items. In view of this discussion I am not quite sure of what we are going to be voting on and would prefer to explain my vote a little later when the situation has been clarified. I should like to reserve my right to do so.

17. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) [*interpretation from Spanish*]: My delegation would like to go back to the previous situation, that is to say, the situation that arose after the amendments were submitted by four delegations and were introduced by Kenya [A/C.1/L.625]. Yesterday my delegation was not in a position to refer to those amendments—although, in principle, we entirely supported them—because we did not have a text showing precisely how those amendments would stand after the representative of Kenya had submitted changes to them yesterday afternoon. But the situation as we understand it now would force my delegation to go back to one of the preambular paragraphs that the four delegations originally wanted to modify. As matters stand at present, the fourth preambular paragraph would stand as originally submitted by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1.

18. My delegation would, therefore, propose a very simple amendment: to delete the end of the text after the words “human rights”. The reason why my delegation proposes the deletion of those words is the fact that we are somewhat confused by the expression “counterbrutality”. Those words are not very clear. I know that the sponsors of the draft resolution are perhaps alluding to similar wording used in resolution XXIII adopted at the Teheran Conference, but this draft resolution does not take up word for word all the expressions used in the Teheran resolution. The draft resolution is specifically based upon one document—the report of the group of consultant experts on napalm and other incendiary weapons, which does not contain the concept of “counterbrutality”.

19. As far as my knowledge of the Spanish language goes, the only logical way of interpreting the Spanish words used would be to attribute some degree of brutality to the victims of the brutal use of napalm and other incendiary weapons. Before accepting such a formulation, we must at least ask for some definition of this “counterbrutality”; that is, the brutality caused not by those using napalm, but by those against whom it is used. Do their bodies not burn in a properly civilized way? Is the behaviour of the victims of napalm annoying or vexing from the point of view of those using it? Perhaps they scream too loudly when they feel the napalm; perhaps they hurl insults at those who drop the incendiary bombs.

20. We believe the use of those words basically contradicts the entire report of the experts on napalm; it also introduces an element of confusion to our mind that might lead to an interpretation according to which the Committee would place on an equal footing those using napalm against peoples and those who, in Indo-China, the Portuguese colonies or elsewhere, are or may become victims of the

only brutality to which the report of the group of experts refers, namely, the brutality of using this type of genocidal weapon against specific populations.

21. So that, in a word, my delegation proposes the deletion of the last words of the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1.

22. Mr. LIN (China) [*translation from Chinese*]: The Chinese delegation would like to make the following two points.

23. In the first place, with regard to certain agreements on the limitation of strategic armaments reached by the Soviet Union and the United States in their high-level talks, the Chairman of the Chinese delegation has already stated our views in his speech at the 2083rd plenary meeting of the General Assembly. The Chinese delegation will not be able to participate in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/L.623 which is now before the First Committee.

24. In the second place, before draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1, on napalm and other incendiary weapons is put to the vote, we would like to express the following views. The Chinese delegation has yet to study the contents of the Secretary-General's report on napalm and other incendiary weapons, so we are not going to make specific comments on it. It must be pointed out, however, that the preambular part of the draft resolution fails to make a distinction between just and unjust wars but states indiscriminately that all armed conflicts and the use of any weapons bring suffering. Moreover, it makes no distinction between the aggressor and the victim of aggression but only talks indiscriminately about general and complete disarmament. The Chinese delegation has reservations on that wording. With these statements and reservations, the Chinese delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution on napalm and other incendiary weapons.

25. Mr. FACK (Netherlands): I had asked to speak to explain my vote on the draft resolution before us on the strategic arms limitation talks [A/C.1/L.623]. We seem to be discussing particularly the draft resolution on napalm and other incendiary weapons at this time, I should like to reserve my right to come back to that draft at a later stage.

26. Mr. HAINWORTH (United Kingdom): I had asked to speak, like my United States colleague, to explain my country's position on the draft resolution on napalm, but since the meeting began we have heard differing views on possible amendments coming from the sponsors. It seems to me that we do not at present know exactly what we are going to vote upon. I should have thought it might be beneficial, if the Committee so agreed, for us to have a 15-minute recess to enable the sponsors to decide among themselves what it is they are going to ask us to vote upon.

27. The CHAIRMAN: I can assure the representative of the United Kingdom that the Chairman has already made up his mind on what he is going to put to the vote. Before I give a ruling on the request of the representative of the United Kingdom I will call on the representative of Algeria, who is the last speaker on my list.

28. Mr. BENSMAIL (Algeria) [*interpretation from French*]: I shall be brief. I merely want to support the

statement just made by the representative of Cuba about the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1 and the deletion of the words, "and engender counterbrutality". I do not see how the victims of these napalm bombings could exert counterbrutality, and Algeria knows what napalm is.

29. The CHAIRMAN: A request has been made that the meeting be suspended for consultations among the sponsors. If there is no objection, the meeting will be suspended.

The meeting was suspended at 11.25 a.m. and resumed at 12.10 p.m.

30. The CHAIRMAN: I have no more names on the list of speakers for agenda item 30 and I therefore take it that the Committee is ready to vote on the draft resolutions and amendments thereto submitted on this item.

31. Members of the Committee are aware that there are two draft resolutions before it, namely, A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1, submitted by 27 delegations, and A/C.1/L.623, submitted by 12 delegations. There are also revised amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1, which have been circulated this morning in document A/C.1/L.625/Rev.1. There has been an oral amendment by Kenya to the amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.625/Rev.1, supported by Sweden, but since it has not received the support of the other sponsors, I take it that the amendment in document A/C.1/L.625/Rev.1 remains as originally submitted, reading

"Deplores the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in all armed conflicts;".

That is the revised amendment I shall be putting to the vote.

32. As draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1 has financial implications, there is before the Committee a statement by the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 155 of the rules of procedure, contained in document A/C.1/L.626.

33. Members will recall that there has been an oral amendment by the delegation of Cuba regarding the revised draft resolution; that delegation has requested the deletion of the last words of the fourth preambular paragraph.

34. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting. The first name on the list is that of the representative of the United States on whom I now call.

35. Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): In view of the slight confusion about the draft resolution on napalm, I shall explain my delegation's vote after it has been voted on, in order to know exactly what I am explaining.

36. I should now like to address myself to draft resolution A/C.1/L.623. The United States understands and welcomes the interest shown by the world community in the forthcoming second round of negotiations on strategic arms limitations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We believe that these negotia-

tions will be of great significance for disarmament and hence for world security. For our part we intend to do everything possible to assure their successful outcome. However, we do not believe that the draft resolution under consideration will further the cause of these negotiations, which we expect to be of extreme complexity.

37. We shall therefore abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

38. Mr. FACK (Netherlands): Since the Chairman has now clearly outlined the procedure before this Committee, I should like to address myself to both propositions before the Committee, that is, the draft resolution concerning the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks and the various draft resolutions on the use of napalm and on the napalm report.

39. To start with the draft resolution concerning the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, I should like briefly to explain the reason for my delegation's vote. In its statement in the general debate on disarmament, my delegation stated, *inter alia*,

"In view of the recent history of the strategic arms race there is reason to fear that the significance of these agreements"—that is to say, the SALT agreements of 26 May—"might quickly be eroded by the introduction of even more sophisticated weapon systems than those in existence today.

"It is essential, therefore, that the Soviet Union and the United States pursue the objective of nuclear-arms control and limitation with vigour and vision during the next round of the SALT negotiations, in order to arrive at qualitative limitations and/or quantitative reductions of offensive strategic arms." [1884th meeting, paras. 5 and 6.]

40. Clearly, the Netherlands would be more than prepared to give its support to any draft resolution on the question of further limitation of strategic nuclear-weapon systems worded in a constructive and non-partisan manner. That is why we are disappointed with the proposal contained in draft resolution A/C.1/L.623. Its reference in the first preambular paragraph to a resolution that was adopted in the face of articulate opposition by a number of countries, including my own, seems to reflect a deliberate attempt to neglect the position of those countries on a matter that concerns all of us.

41. Secondly, the appeal in operative paragraph 1 to the Soviet Union and the United States to reduce substantially their defensive strategic nuclear-weapon systems does not, in our view, serve any practical purpose. My delegation is of the opinion that the Moscow agreements on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems has substantially diminished the danger of the strategic balance being undermined by expanding ballistic missile defence systems. We do not share the view implied in draft resolution A/C.1/L.623 that this would represent a measure of doubtful significance.

42. It is for those reasons that the Netherlands delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution now before us. I might add that we sincerely regret that it looks today as if an opportunity has been lost of reaching virtual

unanimity on a subject that is of such historical and world-wide significance.

43. As to the other documents at present before this Committee, I also expressed in my statement in the general debate the lively interest which my delegation takes in the napalm report submitted by the Secretary-General. My country had no expert in the group of consultants that assisted the Secretary-General in the compilation of that report, and my Government therefore needs to study this report most carefully. I said as much in the general debate and this is still the attitude of my delegation.

44. Now, although my delegation has some slight reservations and hesitation on points in draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1, we would be willing to vote for it as it stands. This draft resolution is, of course, basically of a procedural nature, and this is exactly how it should be. We have before us here a report by the Secretary-General which has to be studied by Governments, and we say as much in the operative paragraphs of the draft. We also say that Governments, after having studied this report carefully, can submit their comments to the Secretary-General and, after the comments have been received this matter can be taken up again by the General Assembly at its next session.

45. That is all perfectly proper. What is being proposed to us now, however, in the amendment in document A/C.1/L.625 is a judgement of substance by representatives of Governments who have not yet had a chance to study a report which has just been submitted by the Secretary-General. This, we submit, is incorrect procedure and is illogical and inconsistent. Therefore, we cannot vote for this amendment.

46. Mr. HAINWORTH (United Kingdom): Before we reach the stage of voting, I should like to say a few words about the United Kingdom's attitude towards draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1 and the single amendment now proposed, as you have explained to us, by the representative of Kenya.

47. This draft resolution originally introduced by the representatives of Sweden and Mexico, both of whom made forceful statements on the subject of the Secretary-General's report itself and on the need to reflect on and study what the next steps should be. The United Kingdom delegation certainly considers that it is right that Governments should have an opportunity to comment on the report after due study and reflection. We hope that the adoption of such a course of action will enable Governments to make up their minds on the further handling of the subject.

48. The form in which draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1 has been cast is such that the operative part duly gives effect to the aims described by the sponsors, although my delegation understands the word "welcomes" in operative paragraph 1 as meaning "welcomes the circulation to the General Assembly", rather than an endorsement of the contents of the report before it has even been studied.

49. In the view of my delegation, however, the preamble to this draft resolution does not altogether accord with the

over-all purpose described by the original sponsors. But I should like to record my delegation's sincere appreciation of the two changes made since the submission on 26 October of this draft resolution.

50. One purpose of the preamble seems to be to give Governments some general guidance by pointing to documents which should be taken into consideration when examining the report. In my delegation's view, considerable guidance is already available in the report itself, and it might have been possible to adopt a rather shorter preamble. In the interests of consensus, however, my delegation does not wish to press this point.

51. Some parts of the preamble, however, in particular the last three paragraphs, seek to anticipate the conclusions which Governments will draw from their study of the report. There seems to be something of a logical consistency between the operative part, which commends the report for study, and the preamble, which presents some possible conclusions of that study. And my delegation regrets that the sponsors have not found it possible to agree to the suggestions we made for trying to remove the remaining problems from the preambular paragraphs.

52. My delegation agrees with the approach outlined twice by the Swedish delegation. What is needed is a broad and solid basis for deciding on the next step. It seems to us, therefore, that if we are to take examination of this subject forward in a constructive manner, it is important to reach as near a degree of unanimity as we can on the next steps. To that end my delegation can vote for draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1 as it stands, on the understanding that the essence of the resolution is procedural and that the sentiments expressed in the preamble do not commit Governments in any way before they have studied the report.

53. We are now, however, also faced with a suggestion from the representative of Kenya which could completely alter the character of the resolution from being procedural to one seeking to comment on matters of substance dealt with in the report itself. I should like to repeat that my delegation wants to see this matter discussed. But let me make my delegation's position on this matter quite clear. We shall, in any event, co-operate with the Secretary-General in the task given to him. We shall study the report and then, in the light of that study, we shall comment. But surely, having asked the Secretary-General for an experts' study and report, we should study it carefully and then comment, rather than comment first and then study it.

54. My delegation accordingly regrets that this amendment has been proposed. We cannot vote for it and shall have to abstain. In the event that the amendment should be adopted we would, to our great disappointment, again have to abstain—despite our first preference—on the resolution as a whole.

55. The CHAIRMAN: As no other representatives wish to explain their votes before the vote, the Committee will now proceed to the vote. I put to the vote first the amendment

contained in document A/C.1/L.625/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

“After operative paragraph 2, insert the following new operative paragraph 3 and renumber the subsequent paragraphs accordingly:

“3. *Deplores* the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in all armed conflicts;”.

56. A roll-call vote has been requested by the delegation of Sweden.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Khmer Republic, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The amendment was adopted by 83 votes to none, with 32 abstentions.

57. The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote the Cuban oral amendment to delete the words “and engender counterbrutality” from the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1 A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates,

United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Algeria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Oman, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania.

Against: Sweden, Thailand.

Abstaining: Singapore, South Africa, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Khmer Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal.

The amendment was adopted by 62 votes to 2, with 51 abstentions.

58. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1 as amended. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, France, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 100 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

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

60. Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): I should like to state why the United States abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1. Since we abstained in the vote on resolution 2852 (XXVI), requesting the Secretary-General to prepare a report, and since we did not associate ourselves with any aspect of the preparation of the report, we did not find it appropriate to cast any substantive vote on a draft resolution based on that report.

61. Mr. NISHIBORI (Japan): My delegation abstained in the vote on both the amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.625/Rev.1 and on draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1 as amended.

62. My delegation would have been able to vote in favour of the draft resolution as it originally appeared. In fact, we would have liked to see the draft resolution adopted unanimously. For obvious reasons, my delegation is seriously concerned about the views expressed in the report submitted by the Secretary-General on napalm and other incendiary weapons. My delegation fully concurred, therefore, in the general purport of the draft resolution in its original form, since it commended the report to the attention of all Governments and peoples and solicited comments from Member Governments by having the Secretary-General circulate the report.

63. However, the addition of the new operative paragraph deploring the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons in all armed conflicts changed the procedural character of the draft resolution. My delegation feels that it would be a little too prejudicial now to deplore the use of those weapons without ascertaining the views and getting the comments of Member Governments.

64. That is the reason why my delegation was compelled, much to its regret, to abstain from voting on the amendment as well as on the draft resolution as a whole.

65. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand): In my statement at the 1887th meeting, I said that my delegation believed that we should make every effort to ban types of weapons that are of a particularly indiscriminate or cruel nature. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1 provides for the report of the Secretary-General on napalm and other incendiary weapons to be referred to Member States for their comments. Following that step, the matter would be considered again at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, when we would have the benefit of the comments of Member States in deciding whether action should be taken to ban or restrict the use of these types of weapons.

66. My delegation fully supports that procedure, and we would have liked to support draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1 in its unamended form, even though we had some reservations about parts of its preamble. Those reservations apply in particular to the last three preambular paragraphs

which, in our view, highlight only some of the conclusions of the report and have no place in an essentially procedural resolution referring the report as a whole to the attention of Governments.

67. For the reason, however, that the draft resolution as amended—and as now adopted by the Committee—tends to prejudge the issue, we were obliged, with regret, to abstain in the vote on the amendment in document A/C.1/L.625/Rev.1 and on the draft resolution as amended.

68. Mr. MOLTENI (Argentina) [*interpretation from Spanish*]: I should like to explain the position of my delegation on the draft resolution that has just been adopted. The Argentine delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.616/Rev.1 because of the humanitarian purposes on which it is based and, on the understanding that this draft only recommends that a certain procedure should be adopted for study by the Governments of Member States of matters dealt with in the report of the Secretary-General on napalm and other incendiary weapons.

69. In the same way, the Argentine delegation considers that the draft resolution which has just been adopted should not be interpreted as prejudging the position of Governments. Once Governments have examined the report with the care it deserves, they will be able to take a position.

70. My delegation considers that the conclusions of the report on the possibility of finding measures to prohibit the utilization, production and stockpiling of napalm and other incendiary weapons calls for very careful study in view of the special characteristics of those weapons.

71. For the same reasons, my delegation abstained in the vote on the amendment in document A/C.1/L.625/Rev.1.

72. The CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding to the next vote—that is, on draft resolution A/C.1/L.623—I call on the representative of Senegal to explain his vote.

73. Mr. FALL (Senegal) [*interpretation from French*]: I do indeed prefer to explain my vote before the vote on this draft resolution since, I must admit, that this draft resolution has given me a kind of nightmare. It is an innocuous text and my delegation should be able to vote in favour of it without any problem, but I consider that it is somewhat at variance with the specific item under consideration, that is, item 30, which speaks of general and complete disarmament. One cannot entrust the task of the general and complete disarmament of all Powers and of all nations to the two super-Powers alone. I think that our

Committee is not being true to its philosophy on the subject of disarmament by adopting a draft resolution requesting the two super-Powers to continue their dialogue and merely to report to the General Assembly.

74. My delegation will not go so far as to vote against the draft resolution, but neither will it be able to vote in favour. Our vote will therefore have to be interpreted as condemning the *tête-à-tête* of the two super-Powers about problems which affect the very survival of mankind.

75. The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/L.623.

The draft resolution was adopted by 82 votes to none, with 30 abstentions.

76. The CHAIRMAN: That concludes our consideration of item 30.

77. As regards item 31, no draft resolution has as yet been submitted. Therefore, we will have to postpone consideration of this item for the time being and review the situation at a later stage.

78. The Committee will thus proceed to the consideration of item 32. Under this item the Committee has before it three draft resolutions. First there is draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, sponsored by 14 Powers; amendments to that draft resolution have been submitted by 8 Powers and are contained in document A/C.1/L.624. The other two draft resolutions are A/C.1/L.615, sponsored by 18 delegations, and A/C.1/L.620, sponsored by 15 delegations.

79. Before adjourning this morning's meeting I should like to pay tribute to our friend Mr. Kurt Herndl of the Secretariat, who, as the Committee knows, has been substituting for the Secretary of the First Committee. Mr. Herndl showed great devotion to the work of this Committee and was of tremendous help to the Chairman and, I am certain, to members of the Committee. I enjoyed working with Mr. Herndl and I came to appreciate his great talents and experience.

80. It also gives me immense pleasure to welcome Mr. Chacko, the veteran Secretary of the First Committee. As the Committee knows, Mr. Chacko has been on a very important mission to Namibia since the beginning of our work. I very much look forward to working with him and the Committee can look forward with assurance to his courtesy, experience and guidance.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.