

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**



THIRTY-SECOND SESSION
*Official Records**

FIRST COMMITTEE
40th meeting
held on
Monday, 21 November 1977
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 40th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 38: INCENDIARY AND OTHER SPECIFIC CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE THE SUBJECT OF PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE FOR HUMANITARIAN REASONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 40: 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 (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: CONCLUSION OF A TREATY ON THE COMPLETE AND GENERAL PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR-WEAPON TESTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 51: GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (continued):

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY;
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/32/PV.40
22 November 1977

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 38, 40, 49 and 51 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37, which pertains to agenda items 40, "Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban", and 49, "Conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests".

The draft resolution has no financial implications. It is sponsored by 22 delegations, and was introduced by the representative of New Zealand on 18 November.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by consensus.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) (interpretation from French): I have just indicated to the Secretariat that we should like there to be a recorded vote on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon members who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. VAVILOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union has made and continues to make all efforts to secure a complete ban on nuclear-weapon-tests. In 1975 the Soviet Union drafted and submitted for discussion at the United Nations a draft treaty on a complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. A year ago we declared our readiness for a compromise on the question of verification of the compliance with treaty obligations on the basis of voluntary on-the-spot verification which would have opened up the way to a solution of the control problem. Subsequently, we have taken a further important and constructive action, agreeing, by an understanding with the United States and the United Kingdom, not to conduct during a certain period any underground nuclear-weapon tests even before the adherence to a future treaty on the part of the other nuclear-weapon States.

Of extreme importance for the conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests was the statement made on 2 November this year by the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Brezhnev, concerning the readiness of the Soviet Union to reach agreement on a moratorium on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, alongside a ban for a certain period on all nuclear-weapon tests. We express our satisfaction that this important step taken by the Soviet Union has been duly understood by many delegations here at the General Assembly.

We hope that these new elements in the matter of a ban on nuclear-weapon tests will contribute to the creation of a favourable atmosphere for the negotiations among the interested powers in Geneva and will lead to the culmination of work on a text of an appropriate international agreement. I have in mind the holding of consultations with a view to the drafting of not two drafts, as they were in the past, but a single one on the question of nuclear-weapon tests. The Soviet delegation has taken the most active part in these consultations, displaying the utmost flexibility and readiness to devise compromise formulas. We note with satisfaction the spirit of constructive co-operation which has also been displayed by the other interested delegations.

(Mr. Yavilov, USSR)

As a result of these joint efforts, draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37 has been submitted and this takes into account the views expressed by the various parties. Adoption of this draft resolution, in our opinion, would reflect the new and favourable atmosphere in this matter.

In the light of the foregoing, the Soviet delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37. The delegation of France has asked for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, ~~Pakistan~~, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Chira

Abstaining: France

Draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37 was adopted by 89 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

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

Mr. SCALABRE (France) (interpretation from French): The position of the French Government on the question of a total cessation of nuclear-weapon tests is well known. We do not think that this measure is part of the effective disarmament which we have always advocated; for it would not lead to any reduction in the volume of existing nuclear weapons. It would not even interrupt the development of current arms programmes or arms programmes to come. Indeed, after the many nuclear tests that have been carried out during more than 30 years - and I note on this subject that the two greatest Powers have carried out 21 such tests since the beginning of this year alone - the improvement of nuclear weapons has taken place mainly in the area of delivery systems rather than in that of the nuclear explosive strictly speaking. This is why we abstained on the draft resolution just adopted by this Committee, as indeed we abstain in general on all matters not falling within the province of effective disarmament.

In conclusion, I would recall that the French Government has stated that it is now in a position to continue its programme of underground nuclear tests, and that the latest conclusions of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation have been most reassuring concerning radioactivity in the region of the South Pacific where the French tests have been carried out.

Mr. TSHERING (Bhutan): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37 just adopted by the Committee, but, at the same time, I wish to reserve my delegation's position on the words "the Treaty on Non-Proliferation" contained in the second paragraph of its preamble.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): I should like to be recorded as having voted for the resolution.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): The affirmative vote of the Indian delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37, which was made possible because of the postponement of the vote on Friday, is without prejudice to the well-known position of my delegation on the reference to the so-called "Non-Proliferation Treaty" in the second preambular paragraph.

Mr. STEPHANIDES (Cyprus): I merely wish to state that, had my delegation been present during the vote, we would have cast an affirmative vote.

Mr. MASOODI (Thailand): I was absent during the voting procedure, but had I been present I would have voted for the draft resolution.

Mr. PITARKA (Albania): As I was not present when the vote was taken, I was not able to cast my vote. My delegation would like to have its vote registered as being against this draft resolution.

Mr. YEO (Malaysia): My delegation wishes merely to indicate that we would have voted in favour of the draft resolution had we been present. We would appreciate having this reflected in the record.

Mr. CEFYFANTHOPOULOS (Greece): I should like to ask whether or not the amendments suggested by the representative of Nigeria had been incorporated in the text of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37 on which we have just voted.

The CHAIRMAN: There were no formal amendments to this draft resolution. My understanding is that Nigeria made a suggestion with regard to the draft resolution, which he was to discuss with the sponsors.

Mr. KITI (Kenya): My delegation would have cast an affirmative vote had it been present, and I wish this to be reflected in the records of this meeting.

Mr. RASULI (Afghanistan): Had my delegation been present during the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37 it would have voted in favour.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): Mr. Chairman, I think that the question put by the representative of Greece was quite pertinent, and I take it that your reply was due to the fact that you were not present in the Committee last Friday.

I also had assumed that since there was no indication from the sponsors the suggested amendments had not been incorporated in the draft resolution. But amendments had been suggested. But if the sponsors feel otherwise, I should of course like to know. Was the draft resolution on which we have voted upon the original draft resolution without any amendments whatsoever?

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that we find ourselves in a somewhat difficult situation. The draft resolution has been voted upon. If there was any point to be raised about the draft resolution, it should have been raised before it was put to the vote. As the matter now stands, the question was not raised, the draft resolution has been put to the vote and the vote has been completed. So I would appeal to the representative of Nigeria not to press the point.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I do not intend to press any point. It is just a matter of clarification. If your reply to the representative of Greece had been otherwise, I would not have asked to speak. The point was that some suggested that the amendments were made. At the time I proposed the amendments, I indicated that it was not my intention to create any difficulties for the sponsors. Yes, it is a fact that we have been in touch with some of the sponsors, and had they explained their difficulties we would have gladly dropped our amendments. But since no indication at all was received, it could be assumed by some representatives that what we had voted upon was the draft resolution incorporating the amendments which we had proposed.

I hoped that you would have made it clear that Nigeria had not pressed its amendments and that the draft resolution voted upon was the original draft resolution of the sponsors without any amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Nigeria for not pressing his point.

Mr. KAMAL (Bahrain) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to register here the affirmative vote of my country in support of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37.

Mr. BUTLER (Bahamas): My delegation wishes to state that had it been present it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37.

Mr. WOLZFELD (Luxembourg) (interpretation from French): Had my delegation been present, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37.

Mr. ISMAIL (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation was absent when the vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.37. Therefore, I should like the fact that we would have voted in the affirmative to be taken into consideration, and placed on record.

Mr. REMEDI (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): I merely wish to say that had my delegation been present, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution. May I apologize for having been late.

The CHAIRMAN: The statements made by representatives who were not present during the voting will be noted in the record.

As there are no other speakers, the Committee has concluded its consideration of agenda items 40 and 49.

The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2, pertaining to agenda item 51, entitled "General and Complete Disarmament". The draft resolution has no financial implications.

Before calling on those delegations that wish to explain their votes before the vote, I draw the attention of members to the amendments to the revised draft resolution, proposed by Pakistan in document A/C.1/32/L.38.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): Mr. Chairman, before you put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2, sponsored by the delegations of Australia, Bahamas, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Japan, Nepal, Norway, Poland, Senegal, Tunisia, Zaire and my own delegation, or the proposed amendments thereto submitted by Pakistan in document A/C.1/32/L.38, on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution I should like to make a statement containing proposed revisions to our present text which we hope will make it unnecessary for this Committee to vote on the amendments.

In saying that, may I refer to a number of previous statements in this Committee made both by the representative of Pakistan and my own delegation in which both sides have explained a rather lengthy process of negotiation and

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

consultation which has taken place between the sponsors of this draft resolution and the delegation of Pakistan, not only lately but through the weeks that have preceded this moment.

In a statement which I had the pleasure of making to this Committee on Friday, I explained that because of the different views and suggestions from the delegation of Pakistan, and also from a number of other delegations, the draft resolution originally presented under this item has undergone considerable redrafting and revision. At that time, I invited members of the Committee to compare the present text with the earlier texts, and also to take into account at that point some of the formulations which had been proposed earlier by the delegation of Pakistan. After further consultation with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2, and in an effort to find the maximum accommodation with the views of the Pakistan delegation as reflected in the proposed amendments (A/C.1/32/L.38), I have been authorized to state that the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 are prepared to accept revisions which, we suggest, cover all the four amendments presented in document A/C.1/32/L.38.

The following revisions have been made, and I call the attention of representatives to page 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2. We suggest that a new paragraph be added to the preamble after the second paragraph on page 2 which reads:

"Noting that more than 100 States are now parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons,"

The new preambular paragraph to be inserted here would read as follows - and I suggest that representatives compare this language with the language of the second of the draft amendments proposed by Pakistan (A/C.1/32/L.38):

"Underlining the importance of the nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT responding positively, by participating in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy as provided in Article IV of the Treaty, to the proposals and preoccupation of the non-nuclear-weapon States in order to facilitate the adherence of all non-nuclear-weapon States to the Treaty;"

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

I understand that the Secretariat presently will have this text in writing, so perhaps I can go further with the other revisions.

Secondly, and this is in response to the first Pakistani amendment, in operative paragraph 4 first of all add the word "all" before "States", so that it reads "Reaffirms that all States ...".

And in the fourth line, replace the word "restraints", by the word "safeguards". Although the sponsors originally used the word "restraints" as restraints against nuclear proliferation, we understand that during the process that word has developed a negative connotation, and therefore we suggest that it should be replaced by the word "safeguards" which is an unambiguous term.

This, then, with reference to the first Pakistani amendment

In deference to the third Pakistani amendment, we suggest an addition at the end of operative paragraph 7 with a slightly changed wording of the proposed amendment by Pakistan, which would read as follows: "without jeopardizing their respective fuel cycle policies or international co-operation agreements and contracts for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, provided that agreed safeguard measures are applied."

And the fourth provision in deference to the fourth amendment by the delegation of Pakistan, in subparagraph (ii) of operative paragraph 8, replace the word "restraints" in the penultimate line by the word "safeguards".

Taking these revisions into consideration, and also the earlier rather extensive redrafting that has taken place in response to various earlier preoccupations presented by the delegation of Pakistan, I suggest that it would be the hope of the sponsors that the delegation of Pakistan would see its way clear to desist from its amendments, and that, as the representative himself was good enough to say on Friday, this would pave the way to accepting this draft resolution, if not with consensus, although that was the hope he expressed, at least with the very wide support which we believe has been behind the main thrust of our draft resolution all along.

Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): When I spoke here the other day and on previous occasions I made the point which the representative of Finland has recalled, that our objective throughout these discussions has been to find language which will reflect a sufficient consensus of intentions and policies so that there would be, in not adoption of this resolution without dissent, if not consensus, then at least the widest possible measure of agreement.

This is always our goal in the United Nations. But on matters of the nature with which we are dealing, it is all the more important that we should not only be agreed on words, but also that our intentions and purposes and policies should coincide.

Also, I have heard with very great attention the proposals just made by the sponsor of this draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.3. I do want at once to express to him and to the other sponsors and interested countries our very great appreciation for the effort that they have made to meet the point of view expressed by Pakistan - a point of view which I venture to think is sufficiently widely shared in this Committee to have some validity.

Nevertheless, I am bound to say that the draft resolution as it will stand, even after the latest revisions read out to us by the representative of Finland, is not, from Pakistan's point of view, altogether acceptable. We attach great importance to the ideas set forth in operative paragraph 6. I note that part of the amendment proposed by us in this paragraph is sought to be taken care of in the new preambular paragraph. We welcome this as a useful and necessary addition to the draft resolution. Nevertheless, my country does not feel that it can urge others to do what it has not itself done - that is to say, to adhere to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

In the second place, we find that the reference to acceptance of "other arrangements involving the application of safeguards to their complete nuclear fuel cycle" suffers from two defects. In the first place, the idea of other arrangements is somewhat loose in construction, capable of being interpreted one way or another, and we feel that in a draft of this nature dealing with a very specific matter, the language ought to be clear and unambiguous. Other arrangements involving the application of safeguards could include these safeguards, but also could include a variety of other measures.

(Mr. Akhund, Pakistan)

Secondly, with regard to "the application of safeguards to their complete nuclear fuel cycle", this is a matter of great importance; nevertheless, it is a matter of detail. It is subsumed in the acceptance of safeguards. Situations and conditions differ from country to country and from place to place. While we think that the application of safeguards should be non-discriminatory - and not merely that safeguards themselves should be non-discriminatory but that the application should be non-discriminatory - we think that the singling out of one particular measure, especially at a time when the subject is under review not only in IAEA but also in other forums, one of which is the Conference on Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation which held its first meeting in Washington last month, and this stress on the full scope of complete fuel-cycle safeguards seem to pre-empt positions that might evolve as we proceed with our studies. For this reason, paragraph 6 is not acceptable to us. Therefore, we are not able to go along with the draft resolution as a whole.

However, recognizing the efforts of goodwill that have gone into evolving this text as it now stands, with the amendments and revisions proposed by the representative of Finland, and recognizing that this is a matter on which real differences exist, my delegation will not press its amendments to the vote and is prepared to withdraw them. I hope that this will lead to the adoption of this draft with a wide measure of agreement.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): I believe that, speaking on behalf of the sponsors, I should be remiss in courtesy and appreciation if I were not at this point to express our thanks to the delegation of Pakistan for the co-operative attitude it has taken on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives wishing to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine delegation regrets that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 is to be put to the vote. We believe that the contents of this document cover a wide variety of matters which, because of their importance, should

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

have been the subject of a consensus in this Committee, since there can be no doubt that the implementation of the measures recommended in its paragraphs must necessarily require the consent of all States concerned.

Obviously, that type of support will not be given to the draft resolution before us. It is therefore surprising that, whereas on the one hand emphasis is placed on the need to adopt by consensus everything dealing with substantive questions - as the Committee itself decided, for example, regarding the holding of the next special session of the General Assembly - on the other hand, despite the undoubted importance of the subject before us, in this case we do not take that sort of concern into account. This is a precedent that will have to be borne in mind in the future.

My delegation has serious doubts regarding some of the preambular and operative paragraphs of the draft resolution. Among other things, we might point out that through a resolution of this Assembly we are trying to alter radically principles and norms on which international co-operation in nuclear technology for peaceful purposes is based. If we accepted the views expressed in this draft, we should be adding discriminatory conditions to bilateral and multilateral co-operation in this field and, what is even more serious, trying de facto to alter the very delicate balance of responsibilities contained in the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. That instrument is sufficiently clear in establishing the guidelines to which aid to the developing countries is to be adjusted for us to object to this quite inappropriate alteration of that balance.

In operative paragraph 3 of this draft resolution we underline "the importance of determined efforts especially by the nuclear-weapon States to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States". The Argentine delegation wonders what those "determined efforts" are, and we also wonder how, except by nuclear disarmament, we could guarantee the security of the developing countries. The draft resolution does not reply to any of these questions.

Then too, consistent with this line of reasoning, operative paragraph 6 urges developing States that are not parties to the non-proliferation Treaty to give the international community "satisfactory assurances" against the

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

dangers of proliferation, but in none of the paragraphs does it require the nuclear-weapon States to give similar assurances against the far greater dangers of uncontrolled vertical proliferation which we are now witnessing.

We also wonder why the eleventh preambular paragraph refers partially to the results of the Conference on International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation recently held in Washington. I refer to this as a partial reference because it overlooks one of the most important aspects of the communiqué issued at the end of that meeting, which said:

"The participants are aware of the vital importance of stemming proliferation and, furthermore, of adopting effective and urgent measures to curb and turn back the nuclear-weapon race among the nuclear-weapon States."

That is to say, whereas that Conference asked for effective and urgent measures, operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution only speaks of "determined efforts", and the preambular paragraph I have mentioned does not even refer to this vital aspect of the question.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

In short, draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 is the clear expression of a doctrine that is intended to consolidate the existing oligopoly in nuclear technology for peaceful purposes by placing obstacles in the way of scientific development of energy by the developing countries.

The new limitations on the transfer of such technology which are advocated in the document before us would therefore delay and, in some cases, totally paralyse present and future efforts of many of the countries represented in this Organization.

We do not believe that that is the way effectively to eliminate the risks of either vertical or horizontal proliferation. On the other hand, we feel that unreserved acceptance of the criteria laid down in the draft resolution might seriously jeopardize the possibilities of arriving at equitable and agreed solutions.

As I said at the beginning of my statement, in view of the obvious lack of a consensus, we would have preferred this draft not to be put to the vote until the thirty-third session of the General Assembly in order to await the decisions that the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament might adopt on that matter. Since this is not being done and for the reasons that I have already stated regarding document A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2, the Argentine delegation will not participate in the vote.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): Strengthening the régime against the proliferation of nuclear weapons is, in our view, the most pressing challenge confronting the international community. We have often stated that in the long run the nuclear arms race between the two major nuclear-weapon States endangers seriously an effective global non-proliferation policy. One cannot envisage a world in which a limited number of nuclear-weapon States exists for ever while the rest of the world would agree to continue to forego the nuclear option.

The question of vertical proliferation will be addressed in this Committee in several resolutions, such as the resolution on the test-ban Treaty and the resolution which will come up later on the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks and others.

In resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 before us, we look mainly to the problem of the horizontal proliferation of nuclear explosive capabilities. My delegation has several doubts about the wisdom of introducing a draft resolution on that subject of this session of the General Assembly. In the last one or two years new ideas have been developed to stop the danger of the further horizontal proliferation of nuclear explosive capabilities. Discussions have started in several forums to develop a new consensus on what measures the international community must take in this field. In particular, I may mention the international nuclear fuel cycle evaluation which has just started.

My Government is convinced that a new consensus is absolutely necessary for an effective world-wide non-proliferation policy. It is clear, however, that this consensus does not exist at this particular moment. Although we are not sure that such a consensus can be achieved in the coming years, we must do our utmost to achieve that goal in a world-wide dialogue. We have to start that dialogue with an open mind and not with fixed positions, therewith prejudging the outcome.

However, draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 before us asks countries for an opinion on matters which are at present under intensive discussion. The draft resolution has the effect of **fixing positions** on questions which need more time to ripen. Therefore, it is our

(Mr. Meerburg, Netherlands)

considered view that this was not the right moment to introduce such a resolution. And the same holds for the draft resolution on nuclear co-operation introduced by Nigeria under item 14 in the plenary meeting.

That does not mean that my country had, in general, many problems with the text of resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 before it was changed a few moments ago. On the contrary, the ideas of the sponsors of the resolution on future non-proliferation policies are in essence very similar to ours. We will, therefore, vote in favour of the draft resolution.

But what is the essence of our problems here? I would like to dwell a little on this. In our opinion, the situation can be described as follows. Until recently the international community was convinced that, with adequate International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, an effective barrier could be constructed against the misuse of nuclear materials for the manufacture of nuclear explosive devices. Indeed, until now IAEA safeguards have proven to be effective in that respect. But even the best possible IAEA safeguards can never prevent weapons-usable materials from becoming available to a great number of countries. At present, as we all know, most nuclear facilities in the world do not use nuclear materials which can be immediately misused for nuclear explosive devices. Most reactor types at present use only natural uranium or slightly enriched uranium. Moreover, commercial reprocessing is still in its infancy and is restricted to a few countries. But with large-scale development of the nuclear industry in all its stages around the world, that situation is bound to change, and with it the security situation in all countries.

We are on the brink of a new era in the field of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. In particular, the world is moving towards the large-scale use of plutonium. The Netherlands Government, together with others, is of the strong opinion that, before we embark on such a road, we must seriously reflect on what we are doing. We have to study quite seriously whether the energy situation in the world makes continuation of the development of fast-breeder reactors really unavoidable. There are legitimate doubts in that respect. We have to look to possible fuel-cycle

(Mr. Meerburg, Netherlands)

alternatives. We have to see whether reprocessing is necessary at the moment, and so on. It is that very complicated but extremely important study which has just started in the form of the international nuclear fuel cycle evaluation. We do not know what the answers will be but, in any case, we would like to wait for the outcome before fixing our policies in the nuclear field.

That study would lose its meaning and relevance if, pending the study, States were to take far-reaching and irreversible decisions in the fields just mentioned. We hope that all countries, industrialized and developing alike, are prepared to learn from the international nuclear-fuel cycle evaluation.

Just because that study still has to be carried out, we are not completely sure, as stated in preambular paragraph 12 of the draft resolution before us, that the two objectives, that is, the accelerated spread and the development of nuclear technology and the danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, are not contradictory. Perhaps they are only not contradictory with a nuclear fuel cycle which is inherently as safe as possible. In such a fuel cycle the amounts of nuclear materials which can directly be used for nuclear explosive devices would be minimized. And, to the extent that such materials are present in the fuel cycle, they would be the object of special international arrangements, such as regional and multilateral fuel cycle centres, or they could be placed under an international plutonium storage régime.

The international fuel cycle evaluation gives us an opportunity to have an in-depth discussion on the technical, economic and political possibilities of such a proliferation-resistant nuclear energy structure. I would beg all interested countries here to have an open mind also towards the evaluation.

We had some problems with the Pakistani amendments. I am glad that in a certain way that problem could be solved. But I must say that the new draft just introduced by the representative of Finland - and I understand his position on this question very well - is to our mind rather a weakening of the draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 which we support completely. Furthermore, I hope that the new preambular paragraph cannot be misconstrued to mean that countries are not asked to join the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

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

Mr. ULUCEVIK (Turkey): It is the understanding of the Turkish delegation that the revisions which were just introduced by the representative of Finland were going to be made available in written form to the Committee before we took a vote on this particular draft resolution. May I request clarification on this point?

The CHAIRMAN: The draft is now being distributed. I will allow approximately 15 minutes for members of the Committee to read and study the draft and then we shall proceed.

The meeting was suspended at 4.25 p.m. and resumed at 4.40 p.m.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I have merely asked to speak in order to clarify one point which I feel should be made clear before the vote.

The original of this draft resolution is in English. However, we have already received copies in all the working languages. They are not the blue copies but the black ink copies, which might lead one to believe that they are the definitive version.

My delegation has not as yet had the time to make a very careful comparison of the Spanish and the English texts. In order to do so, we were awaiting what might be considered the final text following a decision on the amendments. However, from a very cursory comparison of the two texts, we find that operative paragraph 3 in Spanish says exactly the opposite of what the original English paragraph 3 says.

The English text says:

"Underlines the importance of determined efforts especially by the nuclear-weapon States to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States;"

In the Spanish, it would appear that it is not the future that is considered, but the past, and that therefore the resolution would stress the importance of "determined efforts" that are being made primarily by the nuclear-weapon States. For that paragraph to read correctly in Spanish and truly reflect the English, it would have to say "subraya la importancia de que principalmente los Estados poseedores de armas nucleares realicen decididos esfuerzos para garantizar ...". The correction is in the Spanish text only, it does not apply to the English text. Therefore, the vote that my delegation is to cast will be based upon the English text and not the Spanish text which is, as I said, incorrect.

I believe that it is the duty of the Secretariat to make a very careful analysis of the other texts, comparing them with the original English and to bring the other languages into line with the original English. As far as the Spanish text is concerned they might begin with the error I just mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Mexico for drawing our attention to the error.

Mr. CORREA DA COSTA (Brazil): I simply wish to say that the amendments incorporated by the sponsors of the draft under consideration do not satisfy my delegation. For reasons very similar to those expressed a few minutes ago by the representative of Argentina, the Brazilian delegation will not participate in the vote.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): I should like to make some brief comments on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2.

My delegation has followed with close attention the successive versions of this draft resolution and we find as a result of this study that the draft continues to have certain paragraphs in it with which my delegation cannot be in agreement.

To give a few examples: operative paragraph 3 speaks of underlining "the importance of determined efforts especially by the nuclear-weapon States to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States,".

This paragraph is, to say the least, rather loosely worded. My delegation fails to understand the significance of the word "especially". We do not understand how or what the non-nuclear-weapon States can do to ensure their own security. The term "especially", I think, is superfluous.

Furthermore, the "determined efforts" referred to in operative paragraph 3 are not very clear to my delegation. We feel that the only way to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States is by total nuclear disarmament, and this is a step which only the nuclear-weapon States can take.

Furthermore, in operative paragraph 4 an attempt is made to reaffirm the right of all States "to acquire and develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes ...". However, there is a direct link between this "right" and the Non-Proliferation Treaty. My delegation cannot accept such a discriminatory approach to the right of States to acquire and develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

AP/kd

A/C.1/32/PV.40
43-45

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

With regard to operative paragraph 8 which seeks to enunciate certain principles, my delegation feels that the first principle should be that nuclear energy will not be used to make or to manufacture nuclear bombs. We feel that this should have been the first principle rather than the principle of not converting civil nuclear facilities to the production of nuclear weapons.

There are a number of other provisions in this draft resolution which my delegation is unable to accept.

For all these reasons the Indian delegation will not participate in the vote.

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt): In a brief explanation of vote before the voting, I should like to say that my delegation will most reluctantly vote for the draft resolution because it has very grave reservations with regard to operative paragraph 6, in particular the second part of that paragraph that refers to "other arrangements". We believe that, as the representative of Pakistan has already said, it is ambiguous and unclear, which should not be the case in a matter of that degree of importance.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2, as amended orally by the sponsors. I request the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting procedure.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee): Before the Committee proceeds to the vote, I should like to draw attention to a small typographic error in document A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2, dated 17 November 1977. Operative paragraph 4 reads as follows:

"Reaffirms that States have the right, as provided for, i.e. in...".
It should be corrected to read as follows:

"Reaffirms that States have the right, as provided for, inter alia, in article IV ...".

This correction should be noted by the representatives before the vote takes place.

The delegation of Finland has asked for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahirya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, 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

Against: China

Abstaining: Algeria, Bhutan, Burma, Colombia, Ecuador, France, Kuwait, Mauritania, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Uganda, Zambia

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 89 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.

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

Mr. YANG (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese Government has always held the view that the so-called Non-Proliferation Treaty is a scheme and a fraud jointly concocted by the two super-Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, for the purpose of maintaining their position of nuclear monopoly, nuclear blackmail and nuclear hegemony. We have always been firmly opposed to the using of this Treaty by the super-Powers to deprive and to limit the numerous countries with no or few nuclear weapons their right to develop and to use nuclear energy.

Based on the above principled position, the Chinese delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2.

Mr. NORBERG (Sweden): The Swedish delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2. The strong conviction of my Government of the urgent need for effective measures to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons to additional States is well known and has found expression in Swedish statements and initiatives in several international forums. The positive vote of my delegation with regard to the draft resolution as a whole should be seen against this general background.

Nevertheless, the text has, in our view, certain shortcomings. Nuclear energy as a source of energy creates special problems and implies special risks. It seems to us that the draft resolution does not sufficiently take account of the various aspects involved of which non-proliferation is one.

In this connexion I wish to emphasize the importance that my Government attaches to increase the availability of energy, not least for the needs of the developing countries. Here the industrialized countries in particular have a responsibility to develop as a matter of the highest priority alternative sources of energy.

Finally, I should like to draw attention to operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, where the General Assembly is asked solemnly to affirm certain principles for co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear technology. For any principles adopted by the General Assembly to acquire international

(Mr. Norberg, Sweden)

recognition and to have a lasting impact it is essential that they be drafted with the utmost care and precision and not lend themselves to opposing interpretations. In our view, operative paragraph 8 does not meet the very high standards which are required in matters of such serious concern to the international community as the vital issue of nuclear-weapons proliferation and the uses of nuclear energy for exclusively peaceful purposes.

Mr. JAZIC (Yugoslavia): In explaining the vote of the Yugoslav delegation I should like first to recall our position put forward at the First Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which we still maintain, and to express our reservations with regard to operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution for the following reasons.

First, we consider the language of this paragraph addressed to the States that have not adhered to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as not being conducive to finding a satisfactory solution to the problem of their possible adherence to that Treaty. Secondly, the notion of applying safeguards to the complete nuclear fuel cycle is a relatively new concept for us that has to be properly defined and negotiated, and, in our opinion, it would therefore be premature to decide on it at this stage.

Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia): My delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because of the numerous references to the Non-Proliferation Treaty in it. We do not accept these references in light of Zambia's position with regard to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Mrs. SZOKOLCZI (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): The question of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy is a matter of obvious importance to all countries, as proved by the intense negotiations and the many changes that were made in the draft resolution that was originally submitted as document A/C.1/32/L.3. In the course of the consultations that preceded the vote on it, the need was brought out for more appropriate wording and a more precise spelling out of the paragraphs so that there would be no room for misunderstandings or misinterpretations that might be detrimental to the interests of a group of countries.

As we understand it, the amendments that the sponsors included in the document, after the very well-founded concern expressed by a number of delegations, seem to have been adequate to alleviate the fears and avoid any of the misunderstandings which might have crept into the interpretation of some of the paragraphs and might have had profound repercussions.

On the understanding that the necessary provisions of the text are not to be interpreted as damaging or prejudicial to the interests of non-nuclear-weapon States, and because we agree with its general tenor, the delegation of Venezuela was able to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. DORJI (Bhutan): My delegation has abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 as amended and adopted by the Committee, as it had abstained on some of the resolutions recalled in its preambular paragraphs. Also, my delegation wishes to reserve its position on the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and other issues connected with it. However, that does not affect my delegation's position against the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation abstained in the vote on this draft resolution, not because we have in any way less interest in a reduction in the proliferation of nuclear weapons, but because of the very serious doubts that were raised here by outstanding members of the Committee about the activities carried out in the nuclear field and in particular because of many who abstained in the debate and in the vote. Mention has been made of a lack of clarity, and in this case the lack of the necessary consensus required in such

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

an important subject which is, after all, one of the basic subjects which the United Nations is considering. There is not even agreement in a somewhat confused resolution between the contents of the paragraphs themselves. For example, paragraph 3 does not even spell out what these "determined efforts" are to be. However, since Ecuador has subscribed to and ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), it would have been in favour of operative paragraph 6. However, as a result of its lack of clarity it reaches very confusing conclusions in the second part, when compared with the assertions in the first part.

Therefore, to achieve that consensus and adopt a positive resolution on this important matter it would have been desirable to postpone the question at least until it had been discussed at the special session of the General Assembly to be devoted to disarmament. For that reason, and not because of the essence of the subject before us, my delegation has abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. ULUÇEVİK (Turkey): The Turkish delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2 as amended by the delegation of Finland at the meeting this afternoon. Our positive vote is without prejudice to my Government's position in connexion with the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Mr. CHAMPENOIS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): My country voted for the draft resolution which has just been adopted, but would like to avail itself of this opportunity to place on record its view concerning the physical protection of nuclear materials, a question which is currently being negotiated within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Control must be a matter for the exclusive national sovereignty of every State, and only international transport of raw materials may be subject to international control. Those remarks apply in particular to the penultimate paragraph of the preamble and to operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution which has just been adopted.

Mr. ALVARADO CORREA (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation was unable to be present during the vote on this draft resolution. However, we are in favour of the draft resolution and therefore I would appreciate it if a note were made in the record of the vote we would have cast had we been here.

Mr. PINTO-BAZURCO (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation feels that the draft resolution upon which the Committee has voted includes aspects that give rise to serious reservations. Some of them might even increase the imbalance in our efforts to avoid horizontal or even vertical proliferation, setting forth imprecise, restrictive measures for the development of nuclear weapons by countries that do not possess them, and it only contains a vague request in different terms for a cessation of the nuclear-weapons race. Efforts have been made to improve the text, but we have abstained from voting because even with the amendments the draft resolution which was voted upon is still out of balance, and that imbalance should have been corrected before it was put to the vote.

Mrs. BORODOWSKY JACHIEWICH (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation appreciates the strenuous efforts made by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.3/Rev.2. We are sure that the purpose in the minds of the sponsors was to try to avoid one of the most burning issues in the question of general and complete disarmament, namely, nuclear proliferation. But in the draft resolution certain matters are reflected which it would have been better to examine later, as the representative of Argentina pointed out. That is why, much against its will, my delegation did not participate in the vote.

Mr. WOLZFELD (Luxembourg) (interpretation from French): My delegation unfortunately was not present when the vote was taken. Therefore, I should like to point out that had we been present we would have voted for the draft resolution, and I would ask the Chairman to ensure that my statement is noted in the records of the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: The statements made by the representatives who were not present during the voting will be noted in the record.

I have no further speakers in explanation of vote after the vote on the draft resolution. As no other delegation wishes to explain its vote, I declare consideration of the draft resolution concluded.

I would inform the Committee that Australia has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.28.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee, who wishes to make a statement.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee): the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.29/Rev.1 on "Incendiary and Other Specific Conventional Weapons which may be the Subject of Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use for Humanitarian Reasons", agenda item 38, remains to be adopted. This draft resolution which was circulated on Friday 18 November has financial implications which are being considered by the Secretariat in the light of clarifications which have just been received by the sponsors of the draft resolution.

It is hoped that the financial implications will be ready on Thursday 24 November, and, of course, the Committee will be able to take up the resolution at any subsequent date.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will consider the remaining draft resolutions, namely, A/C.1/32/L.29/Rev.1 and A/C.1/32/L.28 on Friday morning. Tomorrow, the Committee will continue its consideration of the agenda items relating to outer space.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.