



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2107
10 December 1975

ENGLISH

Thirtieth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 5 December 1975, at 10.30 a.m.

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

- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3254 (XXIX): report of the Secretary-General /34/ (continued)
- World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee of the 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
- Mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade: report of the Secretary-General /42/ (continued)

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 11 DECEMBER 1975, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 16 DECEMBER 1975.

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

- 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)
- 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)
- 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 /126/

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 34, 40, 41, 42, 44, 47, 122 and 126 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed with voting on the draft resolutions, I should like to inform the Committee that the delegation of Oman has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/L.751 -- World Disarmament Conference.

The delegation of Pakistan would like to read into the records of the First Committee that in the separate vote taken yesterday, 4 December 1975, on the seventh preambular paragraph together with operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.741, the Pakistani vote, instead of being an abstention, should be understood to have been in the affirmative.

Two representatives have indicated their desire to make statements at this stage, and I shall now call on them.

Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) (interpretation from French): Yesterday at the time of voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.742, my delegation was not present in the room and accordingly was not able to vote. Today I simply wish to state that my delegation fully supports the draft resolution on the denuclearization of Africa. If my delegation had been present we would obviously have voted in favour of the resolution.

Mr. ROWE (Canada): Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you for allowing me to speak at this time because I should like to explain my delegation's position with regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.749, which concerns a proposal with regard to the strengthening of the United Nations Disarmament Affairs Division.

The Canadian delegation is always very willing to consider sympathetically evidence that any division of the Secretariat may need strengthening, including the possible addition of staff, because of an increase in responsibilities. However, my delegation prefers that, before arriving at a hasty decision in this regard, we should examine very carefully the over-all resources of the Secretariat. In our opinion, this is a sound practice because if we are not

(Mr. Rowe, Canada)

confident that all resource avenues within the Secretariat have been thoroughly explored, it could be unwise to urge the addition of new staff with the financial implications such an addition involves. I need not stress in this Committee that, as one views the total financial picture of the United Nations at this time, any economies which might be effected should be carefully examined.

Had the sponsors of resolution A/C.1/L.749 included a request that the Secretary-General find the necessary staff from existing resources within the over-all priorities of the United Nations as a whole, Canada could have supported the resolution. As this is not the case in the draft resolution before us, Canada will abstain when this resolution comes to a vote.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to inform the Committee that the two sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.726 on the reduction of military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council, have agreed, as a result of several suggestions made by other delegations, to amend operative paragraph 7 so that it will be read as follows:

"Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-first session an item entitled" -- so far it is identical with what is already in the text, the change comes now -- 'Reduction of military budgets: report requested of the Secretary-General in resolution ... (XXX)'."

So that in brief the change is to replace the words "implementation of resolution ... (XXX)" by the words "report requested of the Secretary-General in resolution ... (XXX)".

This change is a matter of drafting and not of substance, and hence the sponsors do not intend to request distribution of a new document. It is our hope that members of the Committee will agree with us that it is sufficient to make this an oral amendment.

I should like to make a similar announcement, in connexion with another draft resolution which I have the honour to introduce, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.744.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

In this connexion, we have not yet been able to complete consultations with all the other sponsors. Accordingly, I should like to ask whether it would be possible to call upon me later or whether you would prefer me to undertake those consultations here and now with the co-sponsors whom my delegation has not been able to get in touch with, in order to make the changes we had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN: Representatives will have taken note of the brief amendments that the representative of Mexico has just introduced orally relating to paragraph 7 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.726.

As far his second point is concerned, we shall, I believe, come to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.744 only late this morning if not early this afternoon, so I believe there is sufficient time for the sponsors of that draft resolution to get in touch. I shall certainly call upon the representative of Mexico when that has taken place so that he may explain to members of the Committee where changes may be necessary or amendments are desired to be made.

Last night the Committee heard from its Chairman, after the conclusion of the voting on the draft resolutions before it, that we would proceed this morning with the voting by taking up the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731, concerning the mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade.

I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of their vote.

Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal): I wished to make this statement in order to offer some comments on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731 and, to save the time of the Committee, also on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.732. Both draft resolutions contain constructive proposals and request the great Powers to pursue negotiations on disarmament. My delegation, in its desire to see progress in negotiations towards general and complete disarmament, will support the draft resolutions submitted to the Committee. However, as my delegation had the opportunity of stating.

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

during the general debate on disarmament, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has outlived its usefulness as a negotiating forum and it is essential to create a new forum, taking into account the realities that have prevailed since the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament, as it was then called, was created in 1961. We therefore express a reservation on paragraph 6 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731. My delegation fails to see how the Conference on the Committee on Disarmament could objectively reappraise its tasks and duties, as called for in that paragraph. We believe that a more objective and important reappraisal could be made only by the General Assembly, where all Member States are represented. We therefore support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.732, which calls for the creation of an ad hoc committee of the General Assembly to carry out a basic review of the role of the United Nations in the disarmament field. In carrying out such a review the ad hoc committee could also reappraise the role of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and its tasks and duties.

However, in supporting the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.732 we have to express our reservations on the fifth preambular paragraph, which recognizes the need to pursue negotiations on disarmament in existing negotiating forums. We favour the creation of a new negotiating forum which could learn from the shortcomings of the past and embark on meaningful negotiations.

Regarding the draft resolution in A/C.1/L.749, I wish to associate my delegation with the views expressed by the representative of Canada. We are still considering how to vote on that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce to the Committee that the delegation of Finland has become a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.749 and that of Bahrain a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.751.

I call on the representative of Nigeria on a point of order.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): I merely wish to say that, since we have not had any strong opposition to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731, and since we all share the frustrations which the representative of Nepal has just referred to, though he is still prepared to go along with the draft resolution, we hope that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731 might be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has heard the suggestion that it should adopt the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731 by consensus. As I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position with regard to the decision just taken by the Committee.

Mr. VAN DER ZEE (Netherlands): My delegation is pleased that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731, on a mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade, could be adopted without a vote. Had there been a vote on it, my delegation would have voted in favour. Nevertheless, I should like to make it clear that we have some misgivings about the link between disarmament and development which is mentioned in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

It is my Government's view that negotiated disarmament and arms control agreements not only contribute to more stable power relations and, consequently, to greater security, but also could set free vast intellectual, technological and economic resources which are badly needed for the solution of other pressing problems, in particular those of the developing countries.

My Government denies that there is a sort of automatic link between disarmament and development. In fact, such a link would, in our view, be detrimental to the interests of developing countries.

It is my Government's firm conviction that disarmament and development are two aims justified in their own right. The economic development of countries has its own momentum and needs, irrespective of developments in the field of disarmament.

My Government deems it necessary to give high priority to the supply of financial means for developing co-operation. In the meantime, we should, of course, continue all our efforts to bring about negotiated disarmament and arms control agreements in order to enhance international stability and security. The agreements may in turn set free new additional resources to help reduce the gap between rich and poor.

Mr. NISHIBORI (Japan): With regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731 just adopted by consensus, my delegation wishes to put the following on record. My Government, of course, welcomes the idea of using the human and material resources freed by disarmament for promoting economic and social development. But we cannot but have doubts about the justification and also the feasibility of linking the reduction of military expenditures directly with development assistance.

My delegation wishes to point out also that there remain such difficult problems as measuring objectively and accurately the military expenditures of States, the study of which is about to be initiated by the Secretary-General, as requested in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.726. This will delay until some future date our capacity to decide whether such a linkage will ever be possible.

Mr. GROOT (Denmark): I just wish to say to the Committee that the delegation of Denmark whole-heartedly supports the view expressed by the representative of the Netherlands.

Mr. KEVIN (Australia): Australia would have voted in favour of this draft resolution had it come to a vote. At the same time, we have reservations about operative paragraph 4, much along the lines of those voiced by the three previous speakers.

Australia supports the principle of reductions in expenditure for armaments and for military purposes. Australia is also firmly committed to the principle of expansion of resources available for development assistance. It would not, however, appear to be necessary that levels of expenditure on development should be influenced by levels of expenditure for military purposes.

Australia believes that it is too early to be sure that it will prove to be realistic and practicable to link these two principles together in advance of additional study of the subject.

Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom): If there had been a vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731, my delegation would have voted in favour. But I must record our view that, whilst the reduction of expenditures on armaments could in certain circumstances be expected to increase the capacity of the countries reducing their military expenditures to devote more resources to development, particularly in the developing countries, development is only one of the uses to which any of the resources released could usefully be put.

Mr. CHUANG (China) (interpretation from Chinese): With regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.731, if that draft resolution had been put to a vote, the Chinese delegation would not have participated in the vote.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): Had this draft resolution been put to the vote, the United States would have voted in favour, despite some reservations concerning its elements and language. In particular, we question the value of asserting an essential link between disarmament and development, as the draft resolution's operative paragraph 4 appears to do.

While both of these objectives are important, progress in achieving disarmament depends upon the solution of problems that in many respects are fundamentally different from those of development. In our view, disarmament and development should be pursued on their own merits, without being made mutually dependent.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation shares the reservations just expressed by various representatives, in particular those of the United Kingdom and the United States, on the link between disarmament and development. Moreover, I do not think it necessary for me to recall the criticism of the French delegation regarding the role of the Disarmament Committee in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2.

Mr. MISHRA (India): My delegation would request a separate vote on the fourth paragraph of the preamble, and further, that it be a recorded vote.

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

Mr. KEVIN (Australia): The Australian delegation has given close consideration to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707 and to its two subsequent revisions, particularly as we ourselves participated in the co-sponsorship of a resolution which was adopted yesterday dealing with the same area of nuclear arms control. Two days ago the representative of Finland explained in this Committee his delegation's reason for co-sponsoring the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.738 and A/C.1/L.707. He expressed the view of his Government that the two draft resolutions were not contradictory, but that they sought to approach the same goal of the comprehensive test ban by different methods. This point of view was apparently not shared by the Government of the Soviet Union, which yesterday abstained in the voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.738. It explained its abstention primarily on the basis that the Soviet Union did not consider a collective approach to a comprehensive test ban, as adopted in particular in operative paragraph 5 of that draft resolution, as a fruitful approach to this problem.

The Australian Government has, for its part, given similar serious consideration to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707 and its amendments. We were very pleased to see the amendments that have been made in recent days, following suggestions from delegations in this Committee. The broadening of the proposed negotiating group, which had originally been limited to the five nuclear-weapon States, to include 25 to 30 non-nuclear-weapon States, was a distinct improvement. Also, the additional preambular paragraph concerning peaceful nuclear explosions was, in the view of Australia, welcome. And third, the new amendment by which the proposed

(Mr. Kevin, Australia)

negotiating group would have available to it all documents relating to the consideration by this Committee of agenda items 37 and 122 were valuable. We think it is very appropriate that all these documents, including the Swedish draft treaty, which was submitted in this Committee, should be available to the proposed negotiating group.

Unfortunately, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2 still contains a serious shortcoming. Nowhere in that draft resolution is there any reference to the need for a continuing role for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in negotiations on a comprehensive test ban, nor is there any acknowledgement of the very hard work and very valuable achievement that have been carried out over the years in the CCD on this subject. We think it is a little strange that a draft resolution on a comprehensive test ban which is co-sponsored by one of the Co-Chairmen of the CCD should continue to say nothing on this aspect, even after two amendments have provided an opportunity for a response to the rather clear indications of views around this Committee.

As far as the Australian delegation is concerned, we agree with the statement by the delegation of Finland two days ago that all approaches to the essential goal of a comprehensive test ban should be attempted, and we do not oppose consideration of a comprehensive test ban outside the forum of the CCD. However, we are disturbed that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2 gives no indication whatsoever of the need for a continuing role for the CCD on this subject. Therefore, Australia will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2.

Mr. ROWE (Canada): As my delegation stated in the general debate on 4 November, this Assembly over and over again has called for action to limit the arms race, especially in nuclear arms. For many years this Assembly has stressed the need, as a step towards nuclear disarmament, for the complete cessation of all nuclear-weapon testing. As the debate in this Committee has amply demonstrated, the Assembly will again, at this session, renew its call for a comprehensive test ban. As we know, this call is sounded in two draft resolutions under two different agenda items. The one draft resolution before us, that in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2, in seeking the conclusion of a treaty

(Mr. Rowe, Canada)

on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, suggests an interesting approach different from that which we have considered in this Committee in recent years. However, in proposing this different approach, the draft resolution does not recognize, implicitly or explicitly, that, as we have already noted in another resolution, already adopted, document A/C.1/L.738, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament still has a valuable role to play. As a member of the CCD, Canada cannot but regret this omission, and we believe that other delegations, also involved in the CCD, share this regret.

Moreover, in the view of my Government, to be effective, a comprehensive test-ban treaty must provide adequate means for the nuclear-weapon States to assure each other and the world community that they are fully complying with its provisions. It must ensure that any testing or application of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes does not contribute to the testing or refinement of existing nuclear-weapon arsenals or to the acquisition of nuclear explosive capability by additional States. Agreement by some testing Powers to stop their tests should not, in the view of my delegation, have to await the participation of all nuclear-weapon States. We believe that the two super-Powers and as many other nuclear-weapon States as possible should enter into an interim agreement, open to all States and containing appropriate provisions to ensure its effectiveness. Parties to such an agreement would halt their nuclear-weapon tests at least for a specified time. At the end of that time the agreement could be reviewed to determine whether it could be continued or should be replaced by an agreement involving all nuclear-weapon States. We trust that the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2 will appreciate that, while Canada is willing to consider any approach that can advance serious negotiations which will lead to a fully effective comprehensive nuclear-weapon test ban, we should be careful lest we place undue emphasis on one approach to the exclusion of other approaches and other ideas, all of which, in our opinion, must be looked at very carefully.

In conclusion, I wish to inform the Committee that Canada will abstain in the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): Earlier in our debate my delegation commented in some detail on certain aspects of the draft treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests which was introduced by the Soviet Union. At that time we pointed out that the United States recognizes that a complete halt of all nuclear-weapons testing by all countries must certainly be our ultimate objective on the test-ban issue. However, this draft resolution proposes that this objective be pursued by calling on all the nuclear-weapon States and a substantial number of non-nuclear-weapon States to commence negotiations by 31 March 1976 on a complete and general test-ban agreement.

It is clear that it is not realistic to expect all nuclear-weapon States to agree to join comprehensive test-ban negotiations in the near future. Under these circumstances, we frankly believe that the only sound course of action is to continue consideration of the test-ban issue in existing negotiating forums, particularly the CCD.

Accordingly, my delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to inform the Committee that Iran has become a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.719.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation will abstain on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2 on the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests. In all humility, I must confess that if we take this position it is because the meaning and the exact scope of the draft resolution remain unclear to us, despite the explanations we listened to with a great deal of attention.

It is certainly not for the French delegation to praise the work of the CCD; more authoritative voices than ours should be heard on the matter. I should like to say, however, that on this issue the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, working documents of great technical value have been submitted to the CCD, with a view to clarifying the conditions for such a prohibition. Despite those studies, despite the discussion in

(Mr. Scalabre, France)

depth to which they have been giving rise for four consecutive years, we can see that so far the three nuclear Powers participating in the CCD have not been able to arrive at an agreement.

In these circumstances, what usefulness can the draft resolution before us have? Can we reasonably believe that the presence of China and France in these discussions, in a new framework, will enable us to do away with the obstacles that so far have been insurmountable for those Powers which first began the exploration of the atomic domain and which have arrived at a high degree of technical knowledge after having carried out numerous and varied tests?

Frankly, we do not believe so, and the draft resolution before us seems to us, politically speaking, to be unrealistic. France has repeatedly stated that it was ready to study with the parties concerned all aspects of the nuclear problem. Thus, from the very beginning we agreed to a conference of the five nuclear Powers. Since the conference was not held, for reasons beyond our control, we supported the idea of a world disarmament conference to deal with these problems. We truly regret that so far this idea has not been realized. We are still ready to undertake the study of effective disarmament measures whenever any real opportunity of doing so emerges.

But having thus made manifest our goodwill, we cannot agree to a draft resolution which isolates, in the area of nuclear disarmament, a specific point which does not affect the substance of the problem. The prohibition of tests is the same type of enterprise as the Non-Proliferation Treaty; that is, it is not of a nature to put an end in any way to the production of nuclear weapons. If an agreement were reached on this point, the tremendous privilege of nuclear Powers would still be maintained without their undertaking obligations regarding real disarmament: that is, the limitation and the reduction of nuclear weapons.

We believe that partial measures are only a palliative and can only be a false security measure. We repeat this now. This is not how we want to see the problem of nuclear disarmament approached. Rather, what we want to see is negotiations concerning the real elimination of these weapons.

Only then would an end to nuclear tests be an episode in that process, without which it has no real significance.

Mr. NISHIFORI (Japan): With regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2 which we are about to vote upon, I think I need not repeat the position of my Government which I made clear on 28 November, concerning the Soviet draft treaty attached to the resolution.

As for operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, my delegation believes that the nature of the Soviet draft treaty is such that it should be discussed and negotiated at the CCD on its merits, in the context of a comprehensive test ban, as is urged in operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.738 on which my delegation voted in favour yesterday. In other words, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2 should have been drafted in such a way so as not to contradict the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.738.

For these reasons, my delegation is not able to support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2, and will abstain in the vote on it.

Mr. di BERNARDO (Italy): My country considers the achievement of a complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests as a condition of primary importance in order to promote nuclear disarmament and, consequently, to consolidate the process of international détente and of mutual trust among nations. Italy has always endeavoured in this Committee, as well as in the CCD, to define concretely the conditions essential to a valid agreement in this field, and has actively participated in all the common efforts aimed at reaching such an agreement as soon as possible.

Unfortunately, while almost all the aspects of this complex and urgent matter have been the subject of intensive scrutiny and thorough elaboration from the scientific, technical and juridical points of view, some serious obstacles have so far blocked the achievement of any positive and concrete results.

We are keenly aware of the risks that such a situation implies, as well as of the dangers that it brings to bear on international peace and security. We are even more conscious of the need to intensify our common endeavours and to achieve progress in this fundamental field lest a state of affairs is created which would put the present system of non-proliferation under an unbearable strain, with the risk of its disruption at any moment.

(Mr. di Bernardo, Italy)

Consequently, we have considered with great interest the proposal of the Soviet Union embodied in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2. We fully agree with all the considerations developed in the preambular part, and sympathize with the preoccupations that have rightly motivated the sponsors. Unfortunately, we have two main objections to their proposal. First, we do not find in the draft resolution any reference to the question of control and verification, and we do not see how a serious and satisfactory solution to the problem could be reached without duly taking into account this central and vital aspect. Secondly, we are far from convinced that the creation of a group of non-nuclear States, together with the nuclear Powers -- some of which, by the way, are not willing to participate in it -- will by magic remove all the obstacles that have so far prevented any solution.

Furthermore, we still consider the CCD to be the most appropriate and competent multilateral body to conduct the negotiations on nuclear disarmament and the discontinuance of the nuclear race. It is not by changing the negotiating bodies that real difficulties, which have in fact nothing to do with these bodies, will be solved. These difficulties consist essentially in the political will and courage to meet all the necessary prerequisites of a credible and solid CCD.

For these reasons, the Italian delegation, while appreciative of the intentions of the sponsors of the draft resolution in question, will not be in a position to vote for it, and consequently will abstain.

Mr. DAYRELL de LIMA (Brazil) (interpretation from French): My delegation will abstain in the separate vote on the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2, and in the final vote on that resolution.

The abstention of my delegation on the fourth preambular paragraph should be interpreted in light of our position on the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which we believe to be discriminatory. That is the reason why Brazil has not signed that Treaty, though we are fully committed to nuclear non-proliferation, as evidenced by our signature and ratification of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

(Mr. Dayrell de Lima, Brazil)

Our abstention on the draft resolution as a whole reflects not only the reservation I have just expressed, but also our difficulty regarding the negotiating process envisaged in its operative part, which leaves the CCD on the sidelines.

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2 is not sufficiently clear in its objectives, the procedures for participation of the countries concerned in the proposed negotiating process, and its sphere of application. These are the reasons prompting us to abstain in the forthcoming vote.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to the vote. A separate and recorded vote on the fourth paragraph of the preamble has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire,

Against: Albania, China

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Chile, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Honduras, India, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritania, Portugal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Zambia

The fourth paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2 was adopted by 88 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2) as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Albania, China

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, Congo, Denmark, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Guinea, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2), as a whole, was adopted by 73 votes to 2, with 37 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): My delegation attaches the highest importance to the cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests. We therefore, of course, study all proposals in this context most attentively, and that includes the draft treaty and the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union. We regret that we have not been able to support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2, as in our view it does not move the important matter of the comprehensive test ban closer to generally acceptable solutions. The suggested new method of negotiation is certainly one element contributing to that character. The revised draft resolution's inclusion of provisions for the participation of a number of non-nuclear-weapon States, besides all nuclear-weapon States, does not seem to increase acceptability in this regard. My delegation continues to be of the opinion, which seems to be widely shared, that the question of a complete ban on nuclear-weapon testing should remain an item of highest priority for the CCD. We expect that our proposal to have an expert meeting on the test ban issue in early March next year within the CCD will prove useful for further progress.

Mr. BAYANDOR (Iran): My delegation has voted affirmatively on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2 with certain misgivings about its suggested approach. We are not altogether certain that a call for an early beginning to negotiations among all the nuclear Powers and the group of non-nuclear-weapon States under the circumstances that are known to everyone, can serve a very useful purpose at this stage. My delegation the selective approach implied in the Final Declaration of the Review of the NPT -- which was also explored in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.738 adopted yesterday -- to be a more realistic one. In spite of this, we also adhere to the view already expressed by some that any approach to a comprehensive test ban should be examined and tried out if necessary, and it is on that basis that we cast a positive vote for the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2.

Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan): My delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2. Speaking in the general debate, the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan, His Excellency Mr. Agha Shahi, supported in principle the proposal that a treaty on a comprehensive test ban be elaborated. That position remains unaltered. However, he made the following observations on the draft treaty itself: first, unless the term "nuclear-weapon States" in article III of the draft treaty was specifically clarified to denote the five nuclear-weapon States referred to in the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the term could conceivably allow the inclusion in its purview of any number of nuclear-weapon States in the years to come.

Secondly, he expressed Pakistan's concern over the exclusion of peaceful nuclear explosions from the envisaged ban on underground nuclear testing.

Thirdly, he said that national means of verification would hardly be able to ensure compliance with the ban if tests could be conducted in the guise of peaceful nuclear explosions.

Fourthly, he pointed out that a comprehensive test ban should not be made conditional on its acceptance by all nuclear-weapon States.

In view of these considerations, my delegation was constrained to abstain on this proposal.

Mr. MAHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): The Yugoslav delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2 because my country has always urged the permanent prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments. However, we would have liked to have operative paragraph 2 provide for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) to continue to consider the question of the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests which has always been regarded as an item of the highest priority on its agenda.

As we stated in this Committee on 2 December, if the participation of all nuclear-weapon States in the negotiations cannot be secured for one reason or another, provision should be made for the possibility of the preparation of such an important agreement within the framework of the CCD which is the only multilateral negotiating organ in the field of disarmament under the auspices of the United Nations. The CCD would thus be in a position to deal with this and other similar proposals on an equal footing, including of course the proposal made by the USSR which is annexed to the above-mentioned resolution.

We therefore understand this resolution to mean that if the negotiations as envisaged in this draft resolution are undertaken the CCD should continue its consideration of the issue of a comprehensive test ban as a matter of high priority.

Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom): In my statement to the First Committee on 13 November I made it clear that my Government would welcome a ban on all nuclear-weapon tests, and indeed it has worked for this objective for many years. We shall continue to do so and we share the declared objectives of the draft treaty which has been tabled before this Committee as the annex to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.2.

Nevertheless, as I also make clear in my earlier statement, we do not believe that our Soviet colleagues have found the answers to the problems. The draft treaty seems to us to be defective in two important respects. First, it does not include verification provisions which would meet the real needs for confidence that all parties are respecting all the provisions of the treaty.

(Mr. Allen, United Kingdom)

Secondly, despite the inclusion of the fourth preambular paragraph, for which we voted, the draft treaty does not deal adequately with the question of peaceful nuclear explosions. And finally, whilst my Government is always willing to proceed towards a universal nuclear test ban, we are not convinced that the arrangements which are proposed in the draft resolution for securing the support of all the nuclear-weapons States represent the best way to proceed.

For these reasons, my delegation has abstained on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Mauritius who, as a sponsor of the draft resolution just adopted, will make a general statement and not a statement in explanation of vote.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I am in a very difficult situation. This is not going to be an explanation of vote after the vote. It is not going to be a general statement as a sponsor of the draft resolution. But I reached the Committee room 30 seconds too late to cast a vote, and this is what I wanted to explain.

I would like the Secretariat to make a note that had I been present I would have voted in favour of this draft resolution, including the separate vote taken on the fourth paragraph of the preamble.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes our consideration of this item.

The Committee will now take up the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1. It has been suggested that this draft resolution be adopted by the First Committee by consensus. Are there any objections to that suggestion?

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): I regret that my instructions at this time do not permit me to join in a consensus on this draft resolution. If it is to come up at this time, I would have to object to that procedure.

Mr. CHUANG (China) (interpretation from Chinese): With regard to the procedure, we favour a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: Since it appears that some delegations would prefer to deal with this draft resolution by a vote rather than by consensus, we shall proceed accordingly. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. Di BERNARDO (Italy): On behalf of the States members of the European Community, I wish to explain the reasons which will lead us to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1.

The States members of the European Community have considered with interest and with a positive attitude the proposal concerning the prohibition of development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction. We share in principle the objectives which underlie this proposal.

The prevention of the development of still more destructive weapons must strike a sympathetic chord in the minds of all of us. However, it is not clear to us that a draft agreement without any specific prohibition would be a useful means of achieving this objective. In these conditions it is difficult to evaluate all the implications of such an initiative. We would have rather seen, as a matter of priority, a clear and comprehensive definition of the concept of weapons of mass destruction before starting a negotiating process which is hardly conceivable without having an idea as to precisely what we are going to negotiate.

We therefore consider it necessary for the representatives of interested Governments, as a first step, to consider together the best practical approach to study further particular scientific development capable of military application. The States members of the European Community, therefore, while sympathizing in principle with this new initiative, believe that the best way forward will be to examine ways in which restraints might be devised which would avert the threat of more terrible and indiscriminate new weapons and in this connexion to consider the methodology of forecasting possible developments.

We look forward to a profitable discussion along these lines. Our abstention on this draft resolution in no way indicates a lack of interest or concern but simply the desire to get this new subject launched on the right lines.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to add a few remarks to what the representative of Italy has just said on behalf of the European Economic Community. It is to be understood of course, that we associate ourselves fully with the statement just made by the representative of Italy on behalf of the Community.

(Mr. Scalabre, France)

My delegation will unfortunately have to abstain on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1, because in our view we should consider very carefully the idea of prohibiting new types of weapons before they reach a stage of development, where their elimination would create almost insurmountable obstacles.

That was the point made by the President of the Republic of France when, in a recent interview on 12 November 1975, he said:

"The world can derive no benefit from developing new weapons ruinous to its economies and certainly lethal to its existence."

The interest we take in this new approach towards an important element of disarmament leads us to hope that prompt replies will be given to a series of questions which are at the core of the draft resolution. We had hoped, I must say, that the sponsors of this draft resolution, who are best qualified to tell us exactly what they have in mind, would have given us some more details.

We are not asking them to describe new weapons or types of weapons which have not yet been invented and therefore cannot be defined before some distant date in the future. Nevertheless, the fundamental concepts on which the preparation of the agreement is to be based should have been specified in greater detail.

What do we mean by weapons of mass destruction? What is a new type of weapon? What is a new system of weapons? Are we to understand that a new weapon is one requiring scientific and technological applications as yet not achieved in the field of armaments? If so, that would be a limited concept. Should one, on the contrary, consider that further substantial improvement of an existing weapons system may make it a new weapon subject to any ban on manufacture which might be decided upon? Finally, will the provisions of the new agreement apply to nuclear weapons and to chemical and bacteriological weapons which, by general consensus, are considered to be types of weapons of mass destruction?

(Mr. Scalabre, France)

In respect of these points and some others, we would have wished to receive some information. But, as I said earlier, we shall unfortunately have to abstain in respect of certain provisions of the draft resolution which seem to us to be unacceptable: First of all, operative paragraph 2, which takes note of a draft agreement which was annexed to the draft resolution. That document is based on certain conceptions, particularly in respect of control and verification, to which we cannot subscribe.

Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution refers the study to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. We need not remind the General Assembly of our position, for it knows full well our reservations in respect of that body. It is therefore essentially for procedural and not for substantive reasons that we shall have to abstain.

Nevertheless, it is the intention of the Government of France to follow with interest and care the work which will be carried out in this field. We will assess the results obtained on the basis of merit. We sincerely hope that these results may be positive and lead to the actual prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons. Everybody would stand to gain, no one would lose -- that would indeed be an encouraging factor for concluding an agreement on this subject.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): The United States shares with the co-sponsors the concern expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1 over the dangers posed by the possible development of new weapons of mass destruction. We accordingly informed the sponsors of the draft resolution of our willingness to consider any practical steps towards the prevention of such dangers.

We indicated that the United States could support a resolution calling for examination of this issue by the CCD. We believe, however, that before making a commitment to seek restraints on new weapons of mass destruction, it is essential to obtain a clear understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, we could not associate ourselves at this time with the assertion contained in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution that it is necessary to conclude an international treaty on new weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. Nor could we agree with a request, as contained in operative paragraph 3, that the CCD proceed as soon as possible to work out the text of such an agreement.

These features of the draft resolution compel us to abstain in the vote.

Mr. KEVIN (Australia): Australia's views on the new Soviet initiative concerning weapons of mass destruction were expressed in some detail in our statement on 7 October in the general debate on disarmament, and we trust that they will be taken into account in future consideration of this subject by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

Australia will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1. We shall do so on the basis that we believe this is a subject worthy of consideration in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. We have two points to make arising out of the text of the draft resolution. They are not criticisms but statements of interpretation.

First, concerning paragraph 2, we should like to make it clear that as far as Australia is concerned we do not wish at this stage to indicate any approval of the draft agreement that has been submitted by the Soviet Union. The agreement is obviously a basis for negotiation at this stage.

Secondly, we should like to make it clear that our understanding of operative paragraph 3 would not be that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should give a very high priority to this work at this stage in view of its many other important and urgent tasks, particularly in the field of nuclear arms control. Indeed, even outside the field of nuclear arms control we would like to see the draft agreement on environmental modification techniques in warfare brought to a successful conclusion before too much effort is allocated to this new area of work.

Having made those comments, I would repeat that Australia will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1.

Mr. CHUANG (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation has repeatedly, several times, pointed out that the draft resolution proposed by the Soviet Union contained in document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1, is an attempt to divert the attention of people from the immediate issues by speaking about remote issues. It does not at all involve the question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. Proceeding from this position of ours, the Chinese delegation will not participate in the vote on this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In Favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Albania

Abstaining: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mauritania, Netherlands, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The draft resolution (A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1) was adopted by 99 votes to one, with 15 abstentions.

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

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): The Swedish delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1, since we agree that there is a need to make every effort to halt the development of new weapons of mass destruction before they are included in the arsenals of States. We wish to make it clear, however, that in our view the primary task entrusted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament must be to determine in what fields the development of new weapons and weapons systems is likely and the need for international agreement against that background. It would in our opinion be of limited value to present a draft convention to the General Assembly before agreement had been reached on its real scope and content.

Mr. ROWE (Canada): The Canadian delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1 because we hope it will be possible for the international community to take effective steps to prohibit the development of new weapons of mass destruction. My delegation stresses, however, that our affirmative vote must not be interpreted as any prejudgement on our part of the specific steps, treaties or agreements that might be most appropriate to achieve that objective, or of how compliance with such treaties or agreements could be adequately verified. Canada would not be able to take decisions on those questions before the weapons and the weapons systems they would cover had been clearly identified. Because the present proposal is so general, it is our opinion that considerable thought will be required before useful recommendations on this subject are likely to materialize.

Moreover, we are of the firm view that any examination of the possibility of concluding treaties or agreements designed to prohibit weapons of mass destruction or systems of such weapons, whether in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament or elsewhere, must take adequate account of all points of view and all suggestions put forward on the question.

Finally, my delegation wishes to emphasize that consideration of steps to prohibit new weapons of mass destruction must in no way detract from the priority to be given to efforts to limit and to reduce already existing weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. NISHIBORI (Japan): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.711/Rev.1, concerning the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction, to which a draft agreement is annexed. We did so in recognition of the need to ban the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction, even at this stage, before they come into use.

Moreover, our experience in the past shows that once new types of weapons have been developed, it is extremely difficult to come to an agreement on their prohibition. However, my delegation has some reservations which it wishes to put on record.

According to the draft resolution, the draft agreement will be referred to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. As article 1 of the draft agreement indicates, what is to be prohibited under the agreement is to be specified through negotiations on the matter. Our position is that the specific weapons to be prohibited should first be made clear.

I share the opinion expressed by many representatives, that these preventive measures dealing with possible future weapons should not divert our attention from the need to deal with the vast quantity of armaments held by many countries.

Furthermore, I should like to stress that the control, reduction and destruction of nuclear weapons -- which are the most destructive weapons known to us -- should be given the highest priority in the CCD, and the importance of nuclear disarmament should in no way be neglected.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to explain its vote after the vote, that concludes the Committee's consideration of agenda item 126.

We shall now take up the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.726 and Corr.1, which now includes the amendment to operative paragraph 7 proposed orally by the representative of Mexico this morning. The draft resolution is accompanied by a document (A/C.1/L.745) which sets forth its financial implications.

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

Mr. YUNIS (Pakistan): My delegation regards the wide disparity that exists between the military expenditures of the two super-Powers, on the one hand, and those of other countries, on the other, as a basic factor that should be brought to bear on the consideration of this item. We therefore consider operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.726 of particular importance, as we believe that success in its implementation must surely lead to success in the implementation of operative paragraph 1 also.

Although we are always ready to support such an initiative, my delegation is not sure of its immediate prospects. Apart from the technical difficulties that stand in the way, there is the barrier raised by tensions and mutual differences that exist among the great Powers. Détente has yet to emerge on a universal scale. We look forward to it.

In the present circumstances, perhaps the more hopeful aspect of this proposal is the report that has been called for. It will, we are sure, clarify matters further, and will in this manner give impetus and continuity to the efforts of those delegations that have consistently worked to promote an aim the worthiness of which no one can deny. We shall vote for this draft resolution in that spirit.

Mr. STASHEVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the forthcoming vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.726 and Corr.1, on military budgets, the Soviet delegation would like to state the following.

At the twenty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly the Soviet Union put forward a proposal on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and the utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries. That proposal was widely supported in the United Nations.

(Mr. Stashevsky, USSR)

Its specific provisions laid the basis for General Assembly resolution 3093 A (XXVIII). However, the practical implementation of that proposal has been delayed, a situation for which certain permanent members of the Security Council must bear responsibility, since so far they have not shown any readiness to implement that measure in practical terms.

In our opinion the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.726 will not promote the solution of the problem of the reduction of military budgets. It would only replace the reduction of military budgets by theoretical research into questions connected with those budgets.

We are convinced that technical research cannot replace the actual reduction of military budgets of permanent members of the Security Council and other militarily significant States. The efforts of United Nations Member States, in our view, should be directed not towards theoretical research in the area of military expenditures of States, but rather at the speediest practical implementation of the aforementioned resolution of the twenty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly on the reduction of military budgets.

Moreover, the draft resolution before us appeals to only two States to reduce their budgets unilaterally. This course will not lead to a solution of the important question of the reduction of military expenditures of States.

(Mr. Stashevsky, USSR)

Reduction of military budgets should be carried out by all permanent members of the Security Council as well as by the most militarily significant States bearing a special responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. The Soviet Union is ready to adopt the relevant practical measures for the reduction of military budgets along with all the other permanent members of the Security Council.

For the above reasons, the delegation of the Soviet Union will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.726 and Corr.1.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.726 and Corr.1, as orally amended this morning in its operative paragraph 7 by the representative of Mexico.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/L.726 and Corr.1), as amended, was adopted by 91 votes to 2, with 20 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes on the draft resolution that has just been adopted.

Mr. ROWE (Canada): My delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.726 for the following reasons. Canada is unable to accept a resolution calling for reduction of military budgets before the establishment of either a system of assessment or a formula by which reductions in military spending can be measured and compared among different kinds of budgets, and which will provide means to assure States that announced reductions have actually taken place. As pointed out in the report of consultant experts on reduction of military budgets, technical measurement and comparisons are extremely complex. The value of agreed reductions as an effective disarmament measure cannot be assessed before a much more detailed expert analysis of the problems associated with military budget comparisons and reductions has been completed and fully considered by Governments.

Mr. BAYANDOR (Iran): In explaining my delegation's affirmative vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.726 and Corr.1, I would like to emphasize that our decision to vote affirmatively was based on the recognition that the sponsors were motivated by a sincere and positive spirit in drafting the resolution. In doing so, my delegation takes note of the fact that the resolution has rightly focused its attention on the States which account for the bulk of the world's military expenditures and which have already acquired sufficient strength to deter or confront any conceivable threat.

Having said this, I must reiterate the position of principle which my Government has underscored repeatedly, namely, that the defence postures of States are closely linked to the perception of their security which they form on the basis of circumstances particular to their surroundings. In a world still fraught with so much strife, uncertainty and danger, the resort to pressure and force is still a means of maximizing policy objectives, and while no secure United Nations machinery is yet available to offer genuine protection to medium-sized and small Powers, such States are left with no alternative but to continue to pursue the means of their own defence.

Based on such conviction, our positive vote for this draft resolution must not be interpreted as an indication of pliancy in our resolve in the vital matter of our defence requirements.

Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom): The experts' report in document A/9770, which was presented at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, threw much useful light on the complexities of the comparison of military budgets. The views and suggestions which have since been given by Governments show that there is considerable interest in the possibility of developing a standardized system for measuring military expenditures. Many of the comments also make it clear that there is no quick route to the development of a new, effective disarmament technique. Still, any progress towards the objective of a standardized system would be worthwhile. My Government therefore is in favour of a study designed to prepare a report which would contain an

(Mr. Allen, United Kingdom)

analysis in depth and an examination in concrete terms of various aspects of this problem, though I must add that we would have liked the study to be carried out by governmental experts, either in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament or working under its auspices, rather than by a group working under the Secretary-General. We hope that future studies of this topic will be referred to the CCD. It has not, therefore, been possible for us to vote in favour of this draft resolution, but we shall support the work of the group and we shall provide such assistance as may be required for the efficient preparation of its report.

Mr. SCHLAICH (Federal Republic of Germany): The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany has abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because it could not vote for it in its present form. Nevertheless, I want to stress, as we have already done in Geneva in the CCD, that we are in favour of the main objective of this draft resolution and that, furthermore, my Government is ready to co-operate in the work this draft resolution calls for. However, as far as this is concerned, I want to stress that we too would have liked that the work be carried out by governmental experts either in the CCD or under its auspices.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): We truly regret that certain unacceptable elements in the draft resolution made it necessary for us to abstain. Among such elements, we could not agree to operative paragraph 2 which singles out two States and urges them to reduce their military expenditures in advance of achievement of effective agreements. We do not understand how any State can be expected to reduce its defence expenditures without some assurance that doing so would not jeopardize its security.

Under present conditions, as later operative paragraphs in the draft resolution clearly recognize, it is not even feasible for one State to compare its own defence expenditures with those of other States. To provide a basis for such comparisons is indeed an aim of this draft resolution. Operative paragraph 2 is clearly inconsistent with that aim. However, I now want to emphasize that our abstention does not in any way reflect disagreement with the central purpose of the draft resolution as set out in the last five operative paragraphs.

Quite the contrary, we consider the request for an in-depth analysis and examination in concrete terms of the issues involved in the definition and comparative measurement of military expenditures to be a constructive and a valuable action by the General Assembly. It represents, in our view, an essential step forward toward creating conditions in which agreed limitations on military expenditures can become a serious possibility.

(Mr. Martin, United States)

As I noted in my statement before this Committee on 30 October, the United States proposed last summer at the CCD that such a study be undertaken by a small group of highly qualified governmental experts. Indeed, the specific topics suggested in the United States working paper as a basis for further study are very similar to those set out in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

Although we suggested that the CCD would be the appropriate body to organize this study, we can agree to the draft resolution's request that the Secretary-General assume responsibility for its organization. The United States is prepared to co-operate fully in the preparation of the report called for in the draft resolution. We sincerely hope that the other States which are principally concerned will be able to do the same.

Mr. NISHIEORI (Japan): My delegation has just voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.726. In dealing with this question, however, needless to say the essential preconditions is to clarify such basic issues as the definition and the scope of the military sector, military expenditures, and international value comparison of military production.

As this draft resolution is intended to obtain the answers to these basic and preliminary issues from the Secretary-General, in the form of a report by qualified experts, my delegation supported it. But on this occasion, we would like to place emphasis on the part of the draft resolution beginning with operative paragraph 3.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): Nigeria voted in favour of the adoption of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.726 even though we would have been happier if the wording of the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, particularly with respect to the use of the phrase "comparable military expenditures" had been more felicitous. This is, first, because the phrase tends to dissimulate world-wide concern over the dangers and economic consequences of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction under a general

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

classification of military expenditures. Secondly, the phrase appears vague and subjective and may delay action. It presupposes that certain objective criteria will have to be agreed upon to determine what is to be compared in financial or temporary terms before embarking on the substance of the exercise.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): If I take the liberty of asking for the floor even though it is so late, it is for two reasons: first, because I shall be very brief, and second, because I think that what I am about to say may be useful for those delegations which are interested in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.744, which refers to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT).

My delegation has already had an opportunity to consult the co-sponsors and, accordingly, I am able to announce, on behalf of everybody, that in response to the wishes expressed to us by some representatives, we agree to amend the first part of operative paragraph 1 which now reads "Deplores". We would amend that so that in the two languages in which the original was submitted to the Secretariat -- that is to say, Spanish and English -- it will say, respectively, - "Lamenta" in Spanish and "Regrets" in English. Thus, operative paragraph 1 will start with the word "Regrets". This is so simple a matter that the co-sponsors do not intend to submit a new document and we believe that this oral amendment is fully sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN: I am confident that members of the Committee will have taken note of this oral amendment so that we do not need to distribute a new document before the vote on that draft resolution this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.