



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2106  
9 December 1975

ENGLISH

Thirtieth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND  
SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 4 December 1975, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Baron von WECHMAR (Federal Republic  
of Germany)  
Rapporteur: Mr. ARTEAGA ACOSTA (Venezuela)

- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3254 (XXIX): report of the Secretary-General /34/ (continued)
- Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use: reports of the Secretary-General /35/ (continued)
- Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /37/ (continued)
- World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on World Disarmament Conference /40/ (continued)
- General and complete disarmament /41/ (continued):
  - (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament
  - (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, Room LX-2332, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 10 DECEMBER 1975, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 15 DECEMBER 1975.

The co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

75-71353/A

- Mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade: report of the Secretary-General /42/ (continued)
- Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa /43/ (continued)
- Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /44/ (continued)
- Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General /46/ (continued)
- Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other hostile purposes, which are incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /47/ (continued)
- Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia: report of the Secretary-General /48/ (continued)
- Conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests /122/ (continued)
- Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons /125/ (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 34, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 122 and 126 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: Some representatives have asked to be allowed to speak before we proceed to the voting on a number of draft resolutions this afternoon. I shall now call on them in turn, beginning with the representative of Argentina, who will introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.751.

Mr. BERASETIGUI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to put before the First Committee, on behalf of the 23 delegations of countries from the third world referred to in the relevant document, as well as of the delegations of Afghanistan, the United Republic of Cameroon, Niger and the Syrian Arab Republic, who were kind enough to associate themselves with it subsequently the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.751, relating to item 40 of the General Assembly's agenda, the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference. In so doing the sponsors have thus once again shown the importance they attach to the holding of such a conference, adequately prepared and with the participation of all States on an equal footing. For several years, the countries of the third world have fought for disarmament, making every effort to establish the conditions necessary to put an end to the arms race. In the opinion of the sponsors, this draft resolution deserves the broadest acceptance by the First Committee.

The document possesses two characteristics which warrant that recommendation: brevity and clarity. They make it unnecessary for me to undertake an exhaustive analysis of its contents, except to emphasize its essential aspects.

The preambular part recalls resolution 3260 (XXIX) and takes note of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee (A/10028).

The different paragraphs of the operative part are closely interrelated.

Paragraph 1 reaffirms resolution 3260 (XXIX) which means that all the provisions of that resolution would also apply to the work of the Committee in 1976.

(Mr. Berasetegui, Argentina)

Paragraph 2 renews the mandate already established by the General Assembly and requests a report which, as provided in paragraph 3, would include an analytical study of the conclusions in paragraphs 40 to 44 of the report in document A/10028, which is before this session of the General Assembly. The Committee is also asked to include any observations and recommendations it deems appropriate concerning its mandate. It is clear that, as concerns paragraph 3, the Committee will also have to work on the basis of the consensus provided for in paragraph 1, by virtue of the reaffirmation of resolution 3260 (XXIX) in its entirety.

Finally, paragraph 4 provides for consideration of the whole question of a world disarmament conference at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly.

It will be abundantly clear from what I have just said that the draft resolution says exactly what its text contains -- not one word more, and not even one word less. We sincerely hope that it will facilitate the work of the Ad Hoc Committee and that that Committee will be able to submit a full report which will be useful for the General Assembly. With that aim in view, the sponsors wish to appeal to all members of the Ad Hoc Committee, in particular the two nuclear weapon Powers which are in contact with it, to co-operate to the maximum in order to achieve the objectives of the draft resolution.

It will escape no one that the document we are presenting today is not entirely satisfactory to all members of this Committee. That feeling is shared by many of the sponsors, who would have preferred a draft containing more ambitious objectives. The text now before the Committee is in fact the result of intensive informal consultations aimed at bringing together differing views so as to arrive at wording acceptable to all delegations. The sponsors hope that all will realize that in proposing a draft of more modest scope they believe they have the right to demand that their attitude will meet with the reciprocity they can logically expect, and that the appeal I have just made will receive the response which their patience, flexibility and spirit of compromise deserve.



(Mr. Berasetegui, Argentina)

In conclusion, in view of the protracted informal consultations to which I have referred, the sponsors recommend that the draft resolution I have just introduced be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to speak on the subject of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1.

Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Yesterday, 3 December, at the meeting of the First Committee the representative of Liberia, Mr. Harmon, expressed the wish to propose an addition to the draft resolution concerning the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and of new systems of such weapons (A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1). A new provision would be added to the draft resolution, relating to the cessation of scientific work concerning new types of weapons of mass destruction. On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, I should like to thank the delegation of Liberia and Mr. Harmon for the interest shown in the proposal concerning the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction. The sponsors understand full well the reasons that prompted the Liberian delegation to put forward an amendment concerning the prohibition of future development of scientific work on the development and manufacture of new types of weapons.

(Mr. Roschin, USSR)

After having examined with great care the proposal of the Liberian delegation, the sponsors of the draft have nonetheless come to the conclusion that the inclusion at the the present stage of a provision concerning scientific work on new types of weapons would not be timely or appropriate, and this for the following reasons: the draft resolution in its present form is aimed at preparing and concluding a draft convention that would regulate the whole question of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and of new systems of such weapons. This, obviously, would include the prohibition of relevant scientific work.

On the whole, the problem of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and of new systems of such weapons, and the question of the cessation of scientific work to that end, would destroy the links existing among all of the component parts of this whole. Concerning the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new weapons of mass destruction and of new systems of such weapons, Many delegations have stressed how difficult it is to define the purpose of such prohibition, and have expressed the wish that expert studies be carried out on this problem. The sponsors of the draft resolution have voiced their agreement with that wish and, as is known, a relevant amendment was made to the draft resolution. The sponsors feel that the problem will have to be studied in greater detail with the participation of qualified experts in order to elaborate a scientific and legal definition of the types of weapons of mass destruction and of such systems. That is why the inclusion in the draft resolution of a provision concerning something which has not yet been defined would be premature.

In the light of the fact that the Liberian proposal has been made at a time when the First Committee's consideration of the disarmament problem is coming to an end, the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1 appeal to the delegation of Liberia not to press for a vote on its addendum. The sponsors of the draft would be very grateful to the delegation of Liberia if it would agree to meet their wishes in this regard, in view of the fact that they are prepared to co-operate in the achievement of the common goal: the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and of new systems of such weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to announce that at its plenary meeting the General Assembly has just now unanimously decided to admit Surinam as a new Member of the United Nations. I believe I am speaking on behalf of all Members when I extend the heartiest welcome of this Committee to our new Member and express the hope that the delegation of Surinam will soon be able to participate in the work of this Committee. As can be seen, its name has already been added to the voting panel.

The next speaker is the representative of the Netherlands, who wishes to comment on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.721/Rev.1.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): First, may I say that I too, of course, am very happy about the admission of Surinam to the United Nations. As Members know, Surinam until last week was an integral part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and we are very happy that it could be admitted so quickly to the United Nations.

Turning to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.721/Rev.1 on peaceful nuclear explosions, this morning the representative of Nigeria suggested a change in operative paragraph 8. We are very happy to know that the representative of Nigeria can now support the draft resolution, but he did make a suggestion, and the co-sponsors thought about it and indeed held consultations on his suggestion. Perhaps I might now suggest the following slight change in operative paragraph 8.

In the second line, after the word "review", we would insert: "th", in its consideration of the elaboration of a comprehensive test ban treaty,".

The whole sentence would thus read:

"Requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to keep under review, in its consideration of the elaboration of a comprehensive test ban treaty, the arms control implications of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, including the possibility that such explosions could be misused to circumvent any ban on the testing of nuclear weapons;".

(Mr. Meerburg, Netherlands)

The co-sponsors believe this new formulation would take into account the point raised by the representative of Nigeria, while at the same time also being more in line with last year's resolution 3261 D (XXIX); and I ask the representative of Nigeria, if he can, to agree to this new formulation.

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): The Swedish delegation will once again address itself to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.732, on the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

I wish to inform you that the only change made by the co-sponsors to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.732/Rev.1 concerns operative paragraph 5, which has been reworded more precisely with regard to the sessions of the proposed ad hoc committee. We trust that this will be helpful to a number of delegations.

An unfortunate error has been made in the document: the first country listed as a co-sponsor should be Austria. I understand that a corrigendum will be issued by the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker on the list before me is the representative of Denmark. I call on him to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/L.750.

Mr. GROOT (Denmark): My delegation, speaking on behalf of the five other sponsors -- India, Romania, Japan, Yugoslavia and Finland -- wishes to introduce a brief draft resolution on the subject of the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-bed and the Ocean Floor, and in the Subsoil Thereof. This draft resolution has been circulated as document A/C.1/L.750. Though it is simple and procedural, it is nevertheless urgent, for the reasons that I shall try briefly to explain.

Ninety-five States among our Members have already signed this Treaty, and so far 57 have ratified it. We, together with our co-sponsors, naturally hope that the circle of signatories will be widened and the number of ratifications and accessions increased in the near future. In the meantime, however, we face a procedural problem.

The Treaty entered into force in 1972. Under article VII of the Treaty, the parties are required to hold a review conference five years after the entry into force of the Treaty. This means that arrangements need to be put in hand for a review conference that should be held in Geneva, as specified in the Treaty, during the year 1977.

The parties to the Treaty held an informal meeting at the United Nations Headquarters on 2 December, three days ago, and decided, following the same procedure as for the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, not only that a review conference should be held, but that it should, as in the case of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, be serviced by the United Nations Secretariat, of course, at the expense of the participants in the conference. The most convenient time for the servicing of the review conference would be during the month of August 1977, and the best time for a meeting of the Preparatory Committee would be in January or February of that year.

In order to make all the arrangements agreed for these events, it is necessary for the Secretariat to have the authority of a simple resolution adopted by this Committee, so that the Fifth Committee may be able to take note of this

(Mr. Groot, Denmark)

call upon their resources. To make it possible for efficient and orderly arrangements to be made, these decisions need to be taken during the current Assembly session, rather than deferred until the end of 1976.

For these reasons, the sponsors commend to this Committee the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.750. It takes a simple form. The first preambular paragraph simply recalls this Committee's resolution 2660 (XXV), of 7 December 1970, which commended the sea-bed Treaty. The second preambular paragraph quotes the language of article VII of the Treaty, which provides for the review. The third preambular paragraph reminds us that the review conference should take place soon after 18 May 1977.

Turning now to the operative paragraphs, operative paragraph 1 notes that, after appropriate consultation -- which, as I mentioned, took place here on 2 December -- a preparatory meeting of parties should be arranged. This is the preparatory meeting to which I also referred and which we contemplate should be held at the beginning of the year 1977. The second operative paragraph embodies the request to the Secretary-General to render the necessary services to the Preparatory Committee and to the review conference, and I should perhaps re-emphasize the point that this would be at the expense of the participants in the conference. Finally, the third and last, operative paragraph simply expresses our hopes for the widest possible measure of adherence to the Treaty.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): In reply to the appeal made by my colleague from the Soviet Union, and speaking on his behalf and on behalf of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711, I wish to say that, as he has already correctly stated, all I was trying to do was to make the draft resolution more meaningful, and to give some assurance to the peoples of our one world that at this session of the United Nations General Assembly a clear indication had been made that we here were prepared to give some real, serious and dedicated attention to the question of disarmament. It was not intended as an obstruction. However, in a spirit of co-operation and understanding, I will not press to the vote the amendment which was submitted by Liberia.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Austria to address the Committee on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.749.

Mr. LENNKH (Austria): In introducing the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.749, on behalf of the sponsors -- that is, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Romania, Pakistan -- which is now to be added to this list -- Sri Lanka, Sweden, and Austria, my own delegation -- I would first of all like to apologize to the Committee for presenting this draft at such a late stage. But it is a very simple proposal, and I will now try to explain as briefly as possible the considerations which have motivated us in making it.

In our statement in the general debate on all disarmament questions, we did express the opinion that the trend towards a proliferation and fragmentation of disarmament-related subjects was not an altogether fortunate one, and that it certainly did not indicate to us any concomitant progress in the substance of disarmament. We felt that something had to be done about that situation, and suggested that one way to do it would be to proceed to a review of United Nations disarmament efforts. But this is only one side of the coin. On the other side, we have to realize that there has been a significant increase of disarmament activities under the aegis of the United Nations, and that this increase has already entailed a substantially greater workload for the Secretariat. These considerations are reflected in the two preambular paragraphs of the draft.

Let me add here that this trend towards an increase of disarmament activities has certainly not been reversed, or even stopped, by the present General Assembly session.

In the opinion of the sponsors, therefore, there was only one logical conclusion to be drawn: that is, we must enable the Secretary-General to take those steps that are absolutely necessary to allow for the continued, adequate servicing of the activities and requirements as they exist now.

The document on financial implications, which has to be seen in close conjunction with the only operative paragraph of the present draft and which will I understand, appear shortly, shows that an operation of a very limited nature is proposed.

(Mr. Lennkh, Austria)

What is not meant by our draft resolution are increases in staff or funding for any anticipated future activities. This question will have to be answered in the course of the proposed review, in which the organizational measures might be considered.

A further point which might usefully be underlined in this context is that, in requesting the Secretary-General to take any steps he considers necessary to reinforce the Disarmament Affairs Division, the sponsors would expect that all possibilities be explored of keeping a net cost increase in the United Nations budget at a minimum. We are indeed conscious of the financial difficulties of our Organization, and we do not wish to add to them. But then, we also have to be consistent in our decisions. If we wish disarmament efforts to continue by negotiations, studies or in any other way, we have to be ready to provide the material basis for them.

I should finally like to point, as we have already pointed previously, to the incongruity between international spending on armaments and the costs of the United Nations disarmament efforts. In this perspective, budgetary considerations could hardly constitute a major obstacle to the present very modest proposal.

After those explanations, we would hope that all delegations will be able to agree to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.749.

May I add one last word. Since this draft deals with the work of the Secretariat, I should like to say, on behalf of my delegation -- but I am certain that all the co-sponsors and, indeed, the entire Committee would join me in this -- how much we appreciate the tireless efforts of the staff of the Disarmament Affairs Division in assisting us in our work.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we continue, I should like to announce that Sweden has become a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.750 and Jordan a sponsor of that in document A/C.1/L.741.

Mr. YANGO (Philippines): I should just like to add my delegation as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.749.

My delegation is a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.732/Rev.1, and I believe that these two draft resolutions complement each other, in so far as mention was made in the draft resolution in A/C.1/L.732/Rev.1 of the increased responsibilities that have been placed on the Disarmament Affairs Division.



Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): As one of the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.749, I should like to point out that my delegation is of the view that, when the Disarmament Affairs Division is strengthened, as we request in this draft resolution, it will provide an excellent opportunity to try to obtain what the United Nations Charter calls -- if my memory serves me right -- equitable geographical distribution among the staff of that Division.

I understand that at this time there are 11 officials in the Division, of whom 5 are nationals of the group known as Western European and Other States, 3 nationals from socialist countries and only 3 nationals from third world countries -- although, as we all know, there are more than 100 Member States belonging to that category.

I repeat: I think that the strengthening of that Division will provide the Secretary-General with an excellent opportunity to restore balance, and I am sure that he will take advantage of that opportunity.

Mr. MISHRA (India): I should like to refer to what was said earlier by the representative of the Netherlands in relation to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.721/Rev.1 about operative paragraph 8.

Through you, Mr. Chairman, I should like to request him to repeat the addition he wishes to make to that paragraph.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): I am sorry; I apparently spoke too quickly, and I shall read it out more slowly now. It is in operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.721/Rev.1. In the second line, after the word "review,", add "in its consideration of the elaboration of a comprehensive test-ban treaty,".

Mr. MISHRA (India): I should merely like to point out that there continues to be a difference between paragraph 2 (b) and paragraph 8 as now amended by the representative of the Netherlands.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other representative wishes to speak at this time, we shall now begin the voting on the draft resolution. Firstly, I shall put to the Committee, under agenda item 35, Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.728. In this connexion, I should like to call the attention of the Committee to the financial implications of this draft resolution, which you will find set forth in document A/C.1/L.736.

It is my understanding that some delegations wish this draft resolution to be adopted by consensus. I invite any representatives that wish to do so to voice an opinion on this suggestion.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation supports the consensus on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.728 because we are fully in agreement with the motives which prompt it, and also with its content.

With regard to its wording, my delegation would have preferred, in the text of the fourth operative paragraph -- in which the Assembly decides to include this item at its thirty-first session -- more specific language concerning the types of weapons whose use we wish to prohibit or to restrict on a priority basis.

My statement of 14 November referred to the need to establish a single concept concerning needlessly cruel weapons, and other delegations have also referred in similar terms to the item we are now discussing. I seem to recall that the Prime Minister of Sweden himself, in his statement at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly, referred to "excessively cruel" weapons which should be restricted on a priority basis. The terms used by the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.728 are much more vague, since they refer to "specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons".

(Mr. Elias, Spain)

Bearing in mind that the purpose of this resolution is to suggest a field for study to the Diplomatic Conference on International Humanitarian Law, it would appear at first sight that the work of the Conference is not likely to be facilitated by the vagueness of the language. It is very hard to determine how far humanitarian reasons prevail in the restriction of weapons, since in one sense all known weapons should be prohibited, if we judged them by purely humanitarian criteria. There is no war weapon which can be regarded as acceptable from the humanitarian viewpoint. They can only be accepted as a lesser evil, despite the humanitarian reasons which would militate against their use.

That is why my delegation feels that the intention of the sponsors of this draft resolution is to encourage the drawing of ethical distinctions in connexion with the use of these types of weapons, so that the Diplomatic Conference itself, without entering into any definition and guided only by humanitarian criteria, should be the one to determine which types of weapons should be prohibited in this context.

My delegation may have reservations on the effectiveness of this procedure, but does not wish to block the adoption of the text. For that reason, I shall confine myself to hoping that next time the First Committee considers this item it may be able to do so on the basis of a specific proposal concerning the prohibition of some types of weapons so that it will not again be compelled to conduct its debate at the level of piecemeal wishes, as it has thus far.

The CHAIRMAN: May I assume, in the absence of a request from any delegation to take a formal vote on this draft resolution, that the Committee is prepared to adopt the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.728 by consensus?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. STASHEVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation had no objection to the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution on the question of napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use contained in document A/C.1/L.728.

However, the Soviet Union still believes that the question of the prohibition or limitation of the use of individual types of conventional weapons -- including napalm and other incendiary weapons -- should be resolved not at the diplomatic Conference on humanitarian law but within the general confines of the whole complex of disarmament problems at an appropriate international forum or forums, particularly in the Disarmament Committee.

Mr. KEVIN (Australia): The Australian delegation is very pleased that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.728 has just been adopted without a vote. We would have supported the draft resolution had it come to the vote.

We would like to make clear our position on a point arising out of the present wording of operative paragraph 4:

"Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-first session an item entitled 'Incendiary and other specific conventional weapons ..."

etc. This is a broadening of the scope of the agenda item from that in previous years, when it was restricted to napalm and other incendiary weapons. The broadening of the item's scope this year reflects the reality that the diplomatic Conference on humanitarian law in armed conflict has, since 1974, been discussing the question of prohibitions or restrictions on the use of weapons that may cause unnecessary suffering or may have indiscriminate affects. These discussions are taking place both in the context of the weaponry committee of the diplomatic Conference on humanitarian law at Geneva and also in the related context of the conferences of government experts on weaponry under the auspices of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).

(Mr. Kevin, Australia)

The Australian Government, therefore, supports the change in title of the agenda item as indicated in operative paragraph 4. At the same time, I should like to put on record the Australian Government's understanding that the diplomatic and weaponry experts Conferences which are taking place under the auspices of the International Committee of the Red Cross are the appropriate bodies for the determination of the complex technical questions involved in this subject. We consider that operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.728 which has just been adopted gives an entirely accurate and appropriate statement of the mandate of these conferences which are taking place under ICRC auspices.

In Australia's understanding, the consideration by next year's General Assembly of the agenda item "incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons" ought not to prejudge the outcome of the continuing discussions in ICRC forums on this subject.

Finally, I should like to reaffirm Australia's active interest and participation in the international efforts that are under way to reach international agreement on the prohibition or restriction for humanitarian reasons of the use of specific conventional weapons.

Mr. MISTRAL (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation did not want to oppose the consensus which there has just been recorded on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.728. However, the approval we have given is not unmixed, and we have some serious reservations. We have already had occasion -- last year in particular -- to explain in this Committee the essential elements of our position. I shall, therefore, only repeat these briefly.

My country remains in favour of international legislation which would govern the use in war time of certain weapons considered as causing unnecessary suffering and having indiscriminate effects. In particular we consider regulation of the use of napalm appropriate, and we participated in the Red Cross Conference in Lucerne, by sending a

(Mr. Mistral, France)

number of qualified experts to attend it. Similarly, we shall take part in the Lugano Conference, and we hope that the results of these technical studies will be useful for Governments and enable them to take decisions in the light of all relevant factors.

Having said that, we believe that the international diplomatic Conference on the development of humanitarian law is not the appropriate place for taking effective decisions on this subject. The problem of unnecessarily cruel weapons obviously has two aspects -- a humanitarian aspect and also a political aspect -- because any regulation of or ban on certain types of weapons affects the security interests of States, and is likely to make their defence more difficult or even, in some cases, to endanger it. We consider that this aspect of the question, which is just as important as its humanitarian aspect, cannot be given its proper emphasis at a Conference of which the main interest -- in fact the very purpose of that Conference -- is in the strictly humanitarian aspects of the law of warfare. We fear, and we must point this out, that any regulation which may be laid down by the diplomatic Conference and by its ad hoc Committee will lack the authority necessary to ensure its application. We have always considered and said that these problems should be considered in an organization with political competence, and we wonder whether in the final analysis this Committee does not agree in substance with our position.

(Mr. Mistral, France)

If we believe that the Diplomatic Conference is competent in this matter, it will be enough to allow it to continue its work and we should not give it any guidelines or set any goals for it; but our Committee obviously feels that this is an area in which it has to take some action, hence the draft resolution we have just adopted. We see in this an implicit contradiction, which we believe will emerge more starkly, in fact strikingly, when we come to deal with specific cases relating to types of weapons which very closely affect the security of States, such as small-calibre projectiles. We wonder whether a decision of our Committee might not have a negative effect, by encouraging the International Diplomatic Conference to depart from its essential objective and concentrate on problems it is not supposed to be dealing with. We fear that the intervention of that conference might finally lead to making even more difficult a solution of the problem which it is up to our Organization itself to solve, within its Political Committee.

Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom): At the last session of the General Assembly, in 1974, the United Kingdom felt obliged, for reasons set out at the time, to abstain in the voting on resolution 3255 A (XXIX). We are therefore happy to have been able on this occasion to go along with the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.728) which is in a sense this year's counterpart to the resolution of last year's Assembly to which I have just referred. We are grateful to the sponsors of this year's draft resolution for the efforts they have evidently made to avoid language which would have prevented my delegation, and perhaps certain others, from going forward with them on the basis of a consensus, which is indeed the only satisfactory basis for dealing with matters such as this which touch closely the security of States.

There are, nevertheless, certain passages in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.728 on which the United Kingdom has reservations, and I should like to describe them.

First, in two parts of the draft resolution -- the first preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 -- there are references to "excessively injurious" conventional weapons. One of the classical criteria for judging the nature of weapons from a humanitarian point of view is whether or not they cause "unnecessary suffering". That term was indeed the expression used regularly

(Mr. Taylor, United Kingdom)

throughout the meetings of the experts at the Lucerne conference and during those of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Diplomatic Conference. The United Kingdom sees no point, and a possible basis for confusion, in the proliferation of synonymous terms during the course of international discussions about weapons. We would therefore have preferred the resolution to have made use of the classic term "unnecessary suffering".

Secondly, we are mildly concerned by the importation into the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution of the idea of a possible prohibition of production and stockpiling of those weapons. In our view, the international community would achieve more if it concentrated on one process, even on one weapon, at a time. The weaponry conference is focusing on the question of possible bans or restrictions on use -- and I emphasize the word "use" -- and we would have preferred it, therefore, if the draft resolution had followed that lead and concentrated on that aspect of the problem.

The United Kingdom looks forward to the possibility of our making progress on these problems at the Lugano Conference to be held under the auspices of the International Committee of the Red Cross. As already stated in this Committee, we hope to be able to put forward at that conference practical suggestions designed to limit the indiscriminate effects of certain weapons. The Conference of Experts at Lugano will have the task of trying to reach decisions upon any proposals advanced, whether by the United Kingdom team or by that of any other country. The matter has been left entirely open by this draft resolution, and that has helped to make it possible for us to go along with the consensus on it. We wish the International Committee of the Red Cross and the experts of the national teams every success with their conference.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian):

My delegation associates itself with the statement just made on this subject by the representative of the Soviet Union. Approval of the draft resolution does not, in the view of our delegation, change the position of principle of our country, which is that the question of prohibiting napalm and other incendiary weapons should be considered in close connexion with other disarmament questions. All other solutions to these problems can be arrived at only by the relevant bodies dealing with disarmament. The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is one such body.



The CHAIRMAN: Since no other representative wishes to speak following the adoption of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.728, we shall now proceed to the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.738 on agenda item 37, relating to the urgent need for the cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and the conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban, as orally amended.

I shall now call upon those speakers who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the vote on the draft resolution on the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing, the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement.

The Soviet Union is in favour of the prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing, including underground testing, everywhere and by everyone. That position of the Soviet Union has been expressed particularly in the proposal submitted to the present session of the General Assembly on conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing. That proposal has received considerable support at this session. It provides for direct talks among States possessing nuclear weapons in order to produce a relevant international draft agreement. The idea is that the complete and general prohibition of tests can be brought about only with the participation of all the nuclear Powers.

(Mr. Roschin, USSR)

However, in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.738 we find a provision which is not based on a principle acceptable to the USSR. We believe that the moratorium on nuclear testing proposed in the draft resolution will not facilitate progress towards the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing. If this measure is put into effect by only a few nuclear Powers, it will lead only to the creation of one-sided advantages for certain States, to the detriment of others.

The Soviet Union cannot agree either with the attempt to place responsibility for the absence of progress in this area on, among others, the USSR, which has constantly bent every effort to solve the problem of the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, and which has put forward a new initiative designed to attain that objective.

In the light of what I have said, the Soviet delegation will not support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.738, and will abstain from voting on it.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): As was the case last year, the Netherlands delegation wishes to dissociate itself from the wording of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.738 -- that is, to condemn all nuclear-weapon tests. In our view, progress towards a comprehensive test ban will not be enhanced by condemning the various States on which co-operation for such progress really depends.

Moreover, my delegation regrets that, instead of operative paragraphs 3 and 4, the drafters of the proposed resolution did not use wording similar to that in the Final Document of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, namely:

"... that the nuclear-weapon States Party to the [Non-Proliferation] Treaty should, as soon as possible, enter into an agreement, open to all States and containing appropriate provisions to ensure its effectiveness, to halt all nuclear-weapons tests of adhering States for a specified time, whereupon the terms of such an agreement would be reviewed in the light of the opportunity, at that time, to achieve a universal and permanent cessation of all nuclear-weapons tests."

(NPT/CONF/35/I/Annex I, p. 8)

(Mr. Meerburg, Netherlands)

This carefully worded formulation describes, in our view, the best practical approach to the comprehensive test ban question.

Notwithstanding our reservations, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution to express our deep concern about the ongoing nuclear arms race in general, and nuclear-weapons tests in particular. We are looking forward to fruitful discussions next year in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, including discussions to resolve a number of technical questions. I may mention in this respect the problem of how to avoid the misuse of peaceful nuclear explosions for weapons-tests under test ban conditions. In a draft resolution on peaceful nuclear explosions, this problem is clearly recognized.

Mr. KATHIRAMALAINATHAN (Sri Lanka): The delegation of Sri Lanka agrees with the stated objective of this draft resolution, which is the earliest possible cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests, and the conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban.

We also appreciate the sense of balance achieved by the co-sponsors in emphasizing the responsibility for concrete action on the part of nuclear-weapon States, especially those which are party to international agreements in which they have declared their intention to achieve the earliest possible cessation of the nuclear arms race. In the view of our delegation, however, that sense of balance has been compromised by operative paragraph 1, which condemns all nuclear-weapon tests. There are some States which are so far advanced in the sophistication, variety and destructive potential of their nuclear arsenals -- achieved over decades of untrammelled testing and refinement -- that they would retain their superiority in destructive capability for years to come.

There are others which might rightly consider that their own security is in the balance until they can develop their own nuclear defence potential to match that of these giants.

(Mr. Kathiramalainathan, Sri Lanka)

Against such a background, it would be unrealistic and discriminatory to deny to this second category of States the freedom which the others enjoyed for so long. The comparison would become even more invidious if we take into account other proposals before this Committee -- the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.744, for example -- which ignore the existence of the situation in which two States which are giants in the field of nuclear weaponry may go on negotiating into the 1980s, not for the purpose of dismantling their arsenals but for further limitation and possible reduction of strategic arms after 1985.

It is for this reason that we have consistently maintained that any programme for nuclear disarmament must be based on four necessary steps. These are: the categorical renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons; the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty; the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and the freezing of stockpiles of these weapons; and, finally, an agreed programme for the dismantling of existing nuclear arsenals.

There will be no discrimination within such a programme, and without it we would be contributing only to a proliferation of resolutions to match the proliferation of ever-newer weapons. It would be a programme based on the equality of all Members of this Organization, in responsibilities as in rights -- one in which some will not be less equal than others.

Having said that, I would add that we shall vote in favour of this draft resolution. To vote against it would be to vote against the survival of the human race; and to abstain from voting might mean indifference to this problem of survival. In effect, we are for the earliest possible achievement of a comprehensive test ban, and against discrimination in the search for it.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed to the vote, I wish to inform the Committee that certain delegations have requested separate votes on some of the paragraphs of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.738, which is before us. It is my understanding that the co-sponsors of this draft resolution have agreed to such separate votes. These separate votes concern the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 1 and 5.

(The Chairman)

In addition, a recorded vote has been requested both on the separate votes and on the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

We shall now proceed with the separate votes on the paragraphs. However, before I continue, I call on the representative of India.

Mr. MISHRA (India): Just two points. My delegation is one of those that have requested separate votes on the fourth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 5. We shall have no objection to those two paragraphs being put to the vote together, if that will save the time of the Committee.

Secondly, it is my understanding that the recorded vote will be reflected in the verbatim record and in the report of the Committee to the plenary of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: In reply to the last question put to the Chair by the representative of India, the answer is yes.

May I invite comments from members of the Committee concerning whether it is acceptable to those who have requested a separate vote, to combine the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5 in one vote.

Mr. KEVIN (Australia): The understanding of the co-sponsors is that it would be more convenient for certain delegations if the vote on the fourth preambular paragraph were to be taken separately. I apologize for the extra time involved but, as points of substance are involved, I understand that this would be a more appropriate procedure.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall therefore proceed with the voting in the following order. I shall first call on the Committee to vote on the fourth preambular paragraph, and subsequently on operative paragraphs 1 and 5, separately, and then on the draft resolution as a whole. All four votes shall be recorded. We shall now vote on the fourth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, France, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Hungary, India, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Spain, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republic, United States of America, Yugoslavia

The fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/L.738 was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to the vote on operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.738.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierre Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sri Lanka, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 80 votes to 5, with 33 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.738.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierre Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Hungary, India, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Zaire

Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 96 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.



The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded the separate votes on paragraphs in the draft resolution before it. I now put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.738, as a whole. As I have already said, a recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Albania, China

Abstaining: Algeria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 92 votes to 2, with 24 abstentions.

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

Mr. ROWE (Canada): The Canadian delegation has reservations about the appropriateness of some of the language of the draft resolution before us. Nevertheless, we have chosen to vote for it because of our firm and long-standing support of a comprehensive agreement to ban all nuclear-weapon tests. In doing so, however, we wish to point out that, in our view, any halt or suspension of nuclear-weapon tests should be undertaken on the basis of a binding agreement containing appropriate measures to ensure that its provisions will be fully met by all parties. May I add that Canada, as a member of long-standing in the CCD, by voting for this resolution reaffirms its belief that the CCD still has a very important role to play in the discussions and efforts to achieve a comprehensive test-ban agreement, and that the entire question of nuclear disarmament remains the subject of the highest priority for the CCD.

Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan): In voting for this resolution, my delegation assumes that a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, in order that it be regarded as really comprehensive, will address itself to the questions that are raised by peaceful nuclear explosions for the observance of the ban.

Mr. DAYRELL DE LIMA (Brazil) (interpretation from French): My delegation has asked to speak in order to explain its abstention in the vote on the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution under consideration.

My Government cannot in fact associate itself with the passage referring to the deliberations of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, a Treaty which it has not signed and about which it has very serious objections of a legal, political and economic nature, which have been explained in detail by my delegation in the past and more recently in this Committee.

It also goes without saying that my Government fully subscribes to the urgent continuation of the CCD negotiations on the item which we are now considering. That was what prompted my delegation to vote in favour of operative paragraphs 1 and 5 and of the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): No matter how worthy the objective of a comprehensive test ban, or how desirable it may be to achieve it at the earliest possible date, members of the General Assembly would be deluding themselves to believe that significant progress can be made without recognizing and coming to grips with the problems that must be solved if that objective is to be realized.

While the United States remains firmly committed to the objective of an adequately verified comprehensive test ban, my delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.738 because, in our view, that draft resolution ignores or minimizes those problems.

My Government believes that it is illusory to expect States to enter into an agreement affecting their basic security interests in the absence of sufficient confidence that the terms of the agreement will be fully respected. In the case of an agreement to prohibit all nuclear-weapons tests, this means that a verification system must be devised capable of performing two essential functions. Firstly, it must provide adequate assurance that clandestine weapon tests are not going undetected and unidentified. This requires the ability to determine whether ambiguous seismic signals -- even relatively small signals -- are caused by an earthquake or a nuclear explosion. Various approaches to this verification problem have been advanced, but so far there is no agreement. Secondly, a verification system must assure participants that weapons-related information is not being obtained from nuclear explosions carried out ostensibly for peaceful purposes. At a minimum, such a system would have to provide confidence that peaceful nuclear explosions do not involve the testing of a new-weapons concept, the use of a stockpiled weapon to verify its performance or the carrying out of nuclear-weapons effect studies.

No solution to this complex problem has yet been found. Indeed, the international community has hardly begun to examine the critical question of whether, under a comprehensive test ban, an adequately verifiable accommodation for peaceful nuclear explosions is possible.

Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.738, while referring to the conclusion of an effective comprehensive test ban, seems to recognize that such an agreement must contain provisions on verification to assure its effectiveness. My delegation cannot, however, agree with the measure recommended in operative paragraph 4 as an interim step towards an effective comprehensive test ban.

(Mr. Martin, United States)

While an earlier version of this paragraph called for an agreement containing appropriate provisions to ensure the effectiveness, the present paragraph simply calls for an agreed suspension. Thus, the sponsors apparently discarded the idea that the testing prohibition should be adequately verified.

My Government cannot accept the notion that any nuclear-testing restraint should lack effective verification provisions, both with respect to nuclear-weapons tests and to peaceful nuclear explosions if they are to be permitted.

My Government strongly objects to operative paragraph 2. It is clear from that paragraph that the sponsors have chosen simply to ignore the Threshold Test-Ban Treaty. The United States believes that this Treaty will have a significant moderating effect on the competition in nuclear arms between the two parties to the agreement. We also believe that the detailed and innovative verification procedures contained in the agreement should provide a sound technical basis for achieving further restraint in nuclear testing. Operative paragraph 2 also ignores the CCE's work on the implications of peaceful nuclear explosions under test-ban conditions.

As can be seen in the section on the arms control implications of peaceful nuclear explosions in the Committee's annual report, considerable light was shed this past year on a subject that had previously received little international attention. Legitimate and sincere differences of opinion can exist concerning the adequacy of progress towards a comprehensive test ban. But to deny, as this paragraph does, that progress has been made, is not only a distortion of the historical record but could also work against the comprehensive test ban objective if opportunities are missed to build upon the progress that has already been achieved.

Finally, my delegation takes exception to the tone of operative paragraph 1. It seems inconsistent to us that many of the States that voted for the blanket condemnation contained in that paragraph, and some of the sponsors of the draft resolution, have publicly recognized that genuine problems must be solved before a comprehensive test ban can be achieved.

Mr. MAHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): Since a separate vote had been requested on the fourth preambular paragraph, my delegation abstained from the vote only because of the wording of subparagraph (a), in conformity with the interpretative statement made by the head of the Yugoslav delegation at the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons on 30 May 1975 concerning the issue of consensus in the adoption of the final declaration of the Review Conference. I am quoting from the relevant part of that statement:

"The Conference has failed to reach a consensus both in the informal working groups and in the Committees on any substantive issue.

This reflects profound divergencies on fundamental issues." (A/C.1/1068, p.32) However, needless to say, we support all other paragraphs of the draft resolution, and my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. ANDREAE (Federal Republic of Germany): My Government, too, is in favour of the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests. We advocate the accession of all States to the Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963, as well as an early conclusion of a comprehensive and adequately controlled international agreement on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

We regard a comprehensive test ban treaty as a significant contribution to a curbing of the nuclear arms race and as an effective means of safeguarding the non-proliferation policy.

Nevertheless, we abstained in the vote on the draft resolution since, in our view, its wording is not as balanced as would seem to us necessary and desirable. We appreciate, however, that the central role of the CCD, in considering this important subject, has been reaffirmed in that resolution.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): I regret very much that I was called out for an urgent appointment and was not present when the vote was taken.

I should like the record to reflect that Liberia voted in favour of preambular paragraph 4 and operative paragraphs 1 and 5 and voted in favour of the adoption of the entire resolution. I would appreciate it if the record would reflect that, because we are intensely interested in any effort to bring about the cessation of nuclear testing.

Mr. MISHRA (India): It was regrettable that the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.738 included reference to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and its Review Conference. These references were in preambular paragraph 4 and, indirectly, in operative paragraph 5.

In line with its well-known position, my delegation therefore abstained on those two paragraphs in the separate votes. However, my delegation voted in favour of the resolution as a whole for three reasons. First, we condemn all nuclear-weapon tests in whatever environment they may be conducted. Secondly, we believe that a comprehensive ban on all testing of nuclear weapons is among the first important steps which should be taken on the road to the elimination of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. Thirdly, we agree with the sponsors that the CCD should be urged to give the highest priority to the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban agreement at its next session.

The CHAIRMAN: The next draft resolution that the Committee has before it, under agenda item 46, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", is contained in document A/C.1/L.741. Here again, a recorded vote has been requested on the resolution as a whole. So far, we have no request for a separate vote.

That concludes the Committee's consideration of agenda item 37.

Mr. MISHRA (India): My delegation would like to request a separate recorded vote on the seventh preambular paragraph, on operative paragraph 2 and the following words in operative paragraph 3. The words are in the third line of operative paragraph 3 (a) and read: "and nuclear explosive devices". I shall be satisfied with one vote on all these three points.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): I have a query which is just for my own information. I should like to know how operative paragraph 3 (b) reads at present.

The CHAIRMAN: May I turn first to the question from the representative of Nigeria and I will come later to the remarks that were made by the representative of India.

It is the understanding of the Chair, unless instructed otherwise by the co-sponsors of the draft resolution before us, that in subparagraph (b) of operative paragraph 3 the word "transit" in the second line has been deleted. I have now been handed corrigendum No. 1 to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.741 before us, and the corrigendum says: "page 2, operative paragraph 3 (b)" -- which is the one that the representative of Nigeria has referred to -- "in line 2 delete the word 'transit'" and also "in operative paragraph 4 of that same draft resolution in line 1" -- the first line -- "after the word 'Recommends' add the word 'to'". So it should then read: "Recommends to the nuclear-weapon States". Members may have before them, or will be receiving within the next few minutes, a separate document under the heading "Corrigendum" which will contain the corrections that I have just read to you from the Chair. This is not a complete new document but is the old draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.741 plus a corrigendum, which you may have already. The Chair hopes that the question asked by the representative of Nigeria has thereby been answered.

(The Chairman)

The Committee has heard the wish of the Indian delegation to have a separate vote on the last, the seventh, preambular paragraph as well as on operative paragraph 2 and on the four words "and nuclear explosive devices" in operative paragraph 3 (a). The representative of India has also declared his readiness to have these three separate votes combined into one. Is there any objection on the part of Committee members to proceed in this way? I call on the representative of the Netherlands.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): On some points I can imagine that a combination is possible because they go over the same subject. On the other hand so far as I can see these are not all concerned with the same subject and it is strange to me to think of combining the votes on them.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the Chair to understand that this is a proposal or is it simply a comment? Is this a proposal to have separate votes on each of the three separate parts of the draft resolution?

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): I can imagine that the seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 which are concerned with the same point could be combined, but on the other point I should like to see a separate vote.

Mr. MISHRA (India): It is not strange to me that the representative of the Netherlands has made the request that he has. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN: Since I do not see anybody else who wishes to speak on that point, before calling on those delegations which wish to speak in explanation of vote before the vote, I should like to suggest to the Committee,



(The Chairman)

that we proceed as follows: there will be a separate vote on the combined seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2; subsequently a separate vote on the four words in subparagraph (a) of operative paragraph 3; and then there will be a recorded vote on the draft resolution as a whole. From the previous statement of the representative of India I recall that he had requested also a recorded vote on the separate votes. We will proceed, therefore, with three recorded votes after the explanations of vote before the vote.

I now call on those speakers who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. HAMZAH (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): I shall try briefly to explain and interpret the vote of my country on the draft resolution before the Committee, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, although we have already expressed our views at length on this question in the general debate in the Committee.

Democratic Yemen supported the idea of declaring the Middle East a denuclearized zone, and last year too, we supported the draft resolution on the question. Today we intend to support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741. In supporting that draft resolution, my country is being consistent with its position, which is favourable to all the positive aspects of the declaration of various parts of the world as denuclearized zones. However, our support in no way implies that we endorse the fifth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 2 and 3 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

I should like also to state that if a separate vote is taken on the fifth preambular paragraph my delegation will not take part in the voting. Similarly, if a separate vote is taken on paragraphs 2 and 3 my delegation will not take part.

We think our reservations on this subject in no way contradict our desire and our wish to see nuclear-weapon-free zones created in the world, and a halt to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Such a prohibition would be in the interests of international security. I should like to make it clear that the reservations I have mentioned on the paragraphs of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741 are based on reasons connected with the situation in the Middle East at the moment. Similarly, my delegation has reservations on any identical or similar paragraphs in all other draft resolutions which follow the same course.

To be more precise, I should like to indicate certain paragraphs of draft resolutions relating to the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world. My delegation has already made its views known in the voting, on 28 November, on the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific (2100th meeting, p. 51), and we shall attempt to explain our views on all these questions when the occasion arises.

(Mr. Hamzah, Democratic Yemen)

I repeat that if and when there is a separate vote on any of the paragraphs I have mentioned, or on any other paragraph of the same kind in any other draft resolutions, the delegation of my country will not take part in the vote on those paragraphs. The reason for that attitude is connected with the specific circumstances prevailing in the Middle East, of which the Committee is aware.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): For Nigeria, and I believe also for sister States of Africa, the Middle East is to Africa what Mecca is to Medina; it is hard to speak of the one without having in mind the other. Because of that intimacy and affinity of interests, my delegation welcomes the initiative of Egypt and Iran on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. We shall therefore vote in favour of the adoption of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741, in the firm belief that consideration and realization of the objectives of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that region will contribute effectively to the solution of the cancerous Middle East question.

We wish to stress, however, that the deletion of the word "transit" from paragraph 3 (b) does not in any way impinge upon or derogate from the customary interpretation of the word "transit" in international law, nor does not in any way qualify our understanding of the Declaration of our Heads of State and Government on the denuclearization of Africa as a continent totally and absolutely free of and safe from nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles.

Mr. MAKELELE-KABUNDA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): The purpose of my statement is to recall what my delegation said in this Committee on 10 November 1975. On that occasion the delegation of Zaire condemned the development, manufacture and stockpiling of both conventional and nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

With reference to nuclear weapons, my delegation referred to the statement made ten years ago by the Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity aimed at prohibiting the purchase and transportation of such weapons in Africa. Thus, by deleting the word "transit" as requested by the delegations of Iran and Egypt, the delegation of Zaire believes that the sponsors of the draft resolution are tacitly authorizing the presence in Africa, even provisionally,

(Mr. Makelele-Kabunda, Zaire)

of that type of weapon. That runs counter to the Declaration of the African Heads of State and we accordingly request that a separate vote be taken on subparagraph 3 (b) of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741.

The CHAIRMAN: That increases the number of separate votes requested to three.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): If I understood the representative of Zaire correctly, he is in effect asking us to amend the present draft resolution by reinserting the word "transit". If this is not so, and if he is merely asking for a separate vote on that paragraph as it is constituted at present, without the word "transit", I have no problem. If, however, he is asking for a separate vote which will insert the word "transit", then I would have to ask the Chair to defer the consideration of this draft resolution, because my instructions do not cover this situation.

The CHAIRMAN: May I invite the representative of Zaire to clarify for the Members of the Committee -- in particular, for the representative of the United States, who has asked for such a clarification -- whether his request to have a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 (b) means a separate vote on the paragraph as it is now, without the word "transit" in it, or whether the intention of the representative of Zaire is to combine with a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 (b) the reinstatement of the word "transit".

Mr. MAKELELE-KABUNDA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): The intention of the delegation of Zaire is to see the word "transit" retained. If it is deleted, we shall have to abstain from voting on this draft.

Mr. ALFARARGI (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to make a clarification in the form of an appeal to my brother from Zaire with regard to the term in operative paragraph 3 (b) to which he referred.

Egypt maintains its support for the Declaration of the Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity. Egypt has no intention of not discharging its obligations. But each region has its own particular situation; consequently, this phrase, which might raise doubts, in no way means that our position has changed, or our<sup>d</sup> commitment as a member State of Africa. For the second time, I appeal to my brother from Zaire to withdraw his request in the light of my clarification.

Mr. MAKELELE-KABUNDA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): I have listened with attention to what the representative of Egypt has just said, and I agree to withdraw my request if that can help us to make progress.

The CHAIRMAN: If I understood the remarks made by the representative of Zaire before the last statement of the representative of Egypt, he was prepared to have a vote taken on operative paragraph 3 (b) even without the word "transit" in it, but then would be forced to abstain from voting on that subparagraph; is that correct?

Mr. MAKELELE-KABUNDA (Zaire): Yes, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: That means we are now able to proceed to separate votes as requested. The first of these separate votes will be on the seventh preambular paragraph combined with operative paragraph 2.

The second separate vote would be on the four words in the third line of operative paragraph 3 (a), and the four words are: "and nuclear explosive devices".

The third separate vote would then be on operative paragraph 3 (b).

And following that, the Committee would be invited to vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

For the record, we are dealing at the moment, under item 46, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", with the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741 and Corr.1.

We shall now proceed with the voting. The Committee is invited to vote on the seventh preambular paragraph combined with operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741 and Corr.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Bhutan, Brazil, France, India, Indonesia, Israel, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania

The seventh preambular paragraph combined with operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to invite the Committee now to proceed to a separate recorded vote on the following four words in the third line of operative paragraph 3 (a) of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741 and Corr.1: "and nuclear explosive devices". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Bhutan, Brazil, France, India, Israel, Kenya, Malawi, Spain, Sri Lanka, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire

The words "and nuclear explosive devices" were adopted by 96 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.



The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 (b) of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741.

Operative paragraph 3 (b) was adopted by 100 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now invite the Committee to vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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 Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel, United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire.

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741 was adopted by 111 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations that have asked to speak in explanation of their votes after the vote.

Mr. BERASATEGUI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine delegation would like to explain its vote on the resolution that has just been adopted, sponsored by the delegations of Egypt and Iran. The last paragraph of the preamble, operative paragraph 2 and part of operative paragraph 3 (a) were voted upon separately. Though we took part in those separate votes, my delegation had to abstain, as it has on other occasions, in order to be consistent with the policy of the Government of Argentina in connexion with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The principles which are embodied in that document and govern its implementation give rise to many reservations on our part which it would not be appropriate to reiterate now. However, it is relevant to point out that the paragraphs in question are clearly based on that Treaty. We had to abstain in the voting on paragraph 3 (b) because we feel that the inclusion of the prohibition of transit is essential in the case of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We did, however, vote favourably on the draft as a whole, since we understand that, in the final analysis, only the States of a region are empowered to consider and determine by whatever means they deem politically acceptable, the type of statute that will determine the total absence of nuclear weapons from the area in question, and that will apply to such States.

Mr. ROWE (Canada): My delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741 because Canada is strongly sympathetic, in principle, to the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones where they are feasible and would promote stability. However, we do have some reservations about operative paragraph 3 of the resolution. Consistent with the position Canada has always adopted on the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones, we recognize that the establishment of such zones can have maximum effectiveness if all parties in the area concerned are prepared to make affirmations of their intention to refrain from the actions listed in operative paragraphs 3 (a) and 3 (b). But, equally consistent with our long-standing position that nuclear-weapon-free zones should be created on the basis of consensus within the region concerned, Canada, as a State outside the area, is reluctant to recommend to parties of the region the specific measures they should take.

(Mr. Rowe, Canada)

We should of course be happy to see such affirmations if these would facilitate the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. That objective would be still further advanced, in our view, if, following the example of several parties of the region, still others would adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It has long been Canada's view that, for the creation of nuclear-free zones to be fully effective, each of the parties concerned should have grounds for assurance that its provisions will be observed by all other parties. We believe that ratification of the Non-Proliferation Treaty would provide a formalized and verifiable basis for such mutual assurance. We therefore note with considerable satisfaction that the resolution calls upon the parties concerned in the area to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Mr. DAYRELL DE LIMA (Brazil) (interpretation from French): I wish briefly to explain my delegation's position regarding the two first separate votes.

The abstention of my delegation in those votes should be interpreted in the light of the consistent position of my Government in connexion with the Non-Proliferation Treaty, whose clauses and terminology give rise to very deep reservations on the part of my Government -- reservations which have to a large extent been pointed out and commented upon in this forum.

Having said that, it goes without saying that my delegation firmly supports the principle of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the establishment of zones free of these weapons of mass destruction, as attested to by our reaffirmation and signing of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. For that reason, we voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): The United States supports the objective of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East under conditions which we have enumerated in the past for assuring the effectiveness of such a zone. We are prepared to lend our co-operation to efforts to achieve this objective.

(Mr. Martin, United States)

For that reason, although we question the approach of asking States to undertake commitments in advance of the negotiations of a zone arrangement, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741.

Mr. SUTOWARDOYO (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation abstained in the separate vote on the seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2. I wish to make it clear that our abstention is in connexion with operative paragraph 2 only.

In 1968, we voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII), referred to in the seventh preambular paragraph. We made it clear at that time that our vote should not be taken as an indication that the signing and eventual ratification of the Non-Proliferation Treaty by the Indonesian Government would follow as a matter of course. Our position on the Non-Proliferation Treaty was made clear when we signed the Treaty in 1970 and has been further clarified in our delegation's statement at an earlier stage of this Committee's discussions.

We abstained on operative paragraph 2 because we feel that, not being party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, we cannot sincerely urge other countries to adhere to it.

Mr. CHRYSANTHOPOULOS (Greece): I wish to associate myself with the statement made by the representative of Canada with regard to the necessity for a consensus of all the States within nuclear-weapon-free zones to be established. I also wish to state that, as my delegation understands it, free trade and the freedom of the seas would not in any way be impaired by the eventual and hoped for establishment of such zones.

Mr. YEH (China) (interpretation from Chinese): With regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741 just adopted by the Committee, the Chinese delegation voted in favour of the draft as a whole.

However, it is necessary to point out that, because we are firmly opposed to the so-called Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, therefore when the paragraphs were put to the vote separately in the relevant parts of the draft resolution, we did not participate in the vote.

Mr. MAKELELE-KABUNDA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): It was in no way the intention of my delegation to abstain in the vote of the draft resolution as a whole. We should like to ask the officers of the Committee to consider our abstention as a regrettable mistake and register our support for the proposal of the friendly countries of Egypt, Iran and Jordan.

Mr. ERELL (Israel): As delegations will have noted, my delegation abstained in the vote on this resolution as a whole as well as in those on various separate paragraphs in the preambular and operative parts.

I should merely like to draw the attention of members of the Committee to the statement which I had the privilege to make in our Committee yesterday. That statement is in the record and gives the full explanation for the votes I cast today.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the Committee's consideration of agenda item 46.

The Committee will now proceed to agenda item 43, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". The draft resolution on this item is contained in document A/C.1/L.742.

As no delegation wishes to explain its vote before the vote, and as no separate vote on individual paragraphs has been requested, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision on that draft resolution (A/C.1/L.742). A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: None.

The draft resolution was adopted by 114 votes to none, with no abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of their vote after the vote.

Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan): In voting in favour of the resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.742, my delegation gave expression to our consistent support to the current initiative for creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world.

We consider that the adoption of this resolution, and of resolutions on other zones, substantiates, inter alia, the following principles: firstly, that the General Assembly should lend its undeniable authority to the regional efforts to create nuclear-weapon-free zones. Secondly, that conditions being different in various regions, the evolution of various zones might well follow different courses of action. And thirdly, that the regional States should persist in their efforts to realize the objective of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones endorsed by the United Nations.

Mr. CHRYSANTHOPOULOS (Greece): I wish to state again that, as my delegation understands it, free trade and the freedom of the seas would not in any way be impaired by the eventual and hoped for establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.742. Our position reflects our long-held view that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in appropriate regions of the world could usefully complement the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a means of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. The United States would, of course, have to examine specific nuclear-weapon-free zone arrangements in the light of the criteria we have enunciated in the past.

Our support for this resolution also takes into account the statement made yesterday by the representative of Nigeria, Mr. Clark. It is our understanding from what he said that the resolution, and particularly its fourth operative paragraph, is not intended to impose commitments on States in advance of the negotiation of an arrangement establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa.

Mr. MISHRA (India): In view of the statement made by the representative of Nigeria, Mr. Clark, in the Committee yesterday, my delegation did not feel it necessary to voice any reservation on the second preambular paragraph of the resolution which we have just adopted in document A/C.1/L.742. We should like it to be clear that this paragraph cannot be construed, in any manner, to refer to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

I should also like to congratulate the delegations of Africa that sponsored the draft resolution on the unanimous adoption of that draft resolution -- as shown by the vote a few moments ago.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the Committee's consideration of agenda item 43. I would like to express my gratitude for the co-operation of members during the difficult voting procedure this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.