



Official Records

CONTENTS	Page
Agenda item 30: Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea ..	1449
Agenda item 35: 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 Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 36: Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 37: 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 Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 38: Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3467 (XXX) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) Report of the First Committee	1450
Agenda item 41: Effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 42: Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 43: Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Secretary-General Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 44: Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 45: Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 46: Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia Report of the First Committee	1451
Agenda item 48: Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of	

such weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament
Report of the First Committee

Agenda item 116:
Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review
Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
Report of the First Committee

**President: Mr. Hamilton Shirley AMERASINGHE
(Sri Lanka).**

AGENDA ITEM 30

Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea

1. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Nepal, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/31/L.4.
2. Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal): The Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, convened and sponsored by the United Nations, has held five sessions during this year and the past three years. This Conference has been dealing with one of the most challenging tasks before the international community—the task of establishing a harmonious relationship in the uses of the sea. The new developments in the field of technology and communication, along with the rising expectations and new aspirations of the nations of the world, have posed a formidable problem of reconciling the divergent interests of the nations. The immense opportunity of exploiting the resources of the sea and of using its vast potential should be considered in a manner that would benefit all the nations of the world. The formidable task of setting up new rules that minimize the possibility of conflict and tension, that recognize the needs and aspirations of all the countries in the world, on the basis of the principles of equity and justice, and that guarantee the peaceful uses of the sea, the sea-bed and the ocean floor is by no means something that can be accomplished overnight. It is therefore natural that so many sessions have been devoted to tackling all the aspects of the problem.
3. Different orders of priority are accorded by different States to various issues before the Conference. It will therefore not be possible to have a unanimous view on the assessment of the work completed so far. It can, however, be said that the Conference has devoted its time to most meaningful negotiation and has done sufficient spade work. It has laid down firm foundations upon which the new convention's structure could be built. In order to sustain the gains made so far, we need to deploy more vigorous efforts and to show an indomitable will to achieve success.

4. My delegation hopes that problems still outstanding will be tackled with courage and vision so that the forthcoming session can be a decisive one. Confident as to the tenacity of the delegations and encouraged by their understanding and achievements during the past session, I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/31/L.4 on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, El Salvador, Nigeria, Norway and Nepal. The draft before us today, which is of a procedural nature, is similar to the one adopted at the thirtieth session of the United Nations General Assembly except that it also indicates the possibility of private consultations among Governments and delegations before the next session.

5. The President of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, in a letter dated 20 September 1976 addressed to the President of the General Assembly [A/31/225], has hinted at such a possibility. The President of the Conference has been acknowledged by all the representatives at the Conference to be a man of great insight, in addition to his other good qualities. The sponsors, who hold his opinion in high regard, therefore introduced the necessary element in the draft resolution in its fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3. Operative paragraph 3 will render possible, as and when appropriate, the provision of the necessary facilities for private consultations among Governments and delegations.

6. In this connexion we have been informed by the Secretariat that an invitation may possibly be sent to the heads of the delegations of all participating States to meet in Geneva from 28 February to 11 March 1977, in order to concentrate mainly on problems related to the system of exploitation of the sea-bed. We should like to emphasize the importance we attach to those consultations, which in the past have proved conducive to a better understanding of possible areas of compromise.

7. The other new element introduced in the fifth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 4 is recognition of the need for continuity in the services of those staff members of the United Nations who have been associated with the Conference and have thus been effective in laying down the basis on which future progress can be made.

8. The draft resolution before the Assembly is aimed at continuing the activities carried out in the past without trying to judge past performances or to give future promises, and it is, therefore, of a strictly procedural nature.

9. I hope that delegations will give their support to draft resolution A/31/L.4 and that they may consider the possibility of adopting it without a vote.

10. The PRESIDENT: I should like to invite the attention of the General Assembly to the recommendation contained in paragraph 17 of the report of the Fifth Committee [A/31/396]. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts the Fifth Committee's recommendation without objection?

It was so decided (decision 31/407).

11. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/31/L.4. May I take it that

the General Assembly adopts the draft resolution without objection?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 31/63).

AGENDA ITEM 35

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

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/31/372)

AGENDA ITEM 36

Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/31/373)

AGENDA ITEM 37

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

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/31/374)

AGENDA ITEM 38

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3467 (XXX) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/31/375)

AGENDA ITEM 41

Effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/31/378)

AGENDA ITEM 42

Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/31/379)

AGENDA ITEM 43

Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/31/380)

AGENDA ITEM 44

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

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/31/381)

AGENDA ITEM 45

Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/31/382)

AGENDA ITEM 46

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/31/383)

AGENDA ITEM 48

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

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/31/385)

AGENDA ITEM 116

Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/31/388)

12. Mr. SHRESTHA (Nepal), Rapporteur of the First Committee: I have the honour to introduce to the General Assembly the reports of the First Committee on various disarmament items.

13. This year the First Committee had before it altogether 18 agenda items on disarmament, and it considered all the agenda items together during the period from 1 November to 3 December.

14. Today I present to the General Assembly 12 reports on disarmament items on which the Committee adopted a total of 12 draft resolutions, the texts of which appear in the reports as I shall now indicate.

15. The report on agenda item 35 appears in document A/31/372, paragraph 7 of which contains the recommendation adopted by the Committee.

16. The report on agenda item 36 appears in document A/31/373. The relevant recommendation of the Committee is contained in paragraph 7 of the report.

17. Document A/31/374 contains the Committee's report on agenda item 37, paragraph 7 of which contains the recommendation of the First Committee.

18. Document A/31/375 contains the report on agenda item 38. The recommendation of the First Committee is contained in paragraph 6 of the report.

19. The report of the Committee on agenda item 41 appears in document A/31/378, paragraph 7 of which contains the recommendation of the Committee.

20. The report on agenda item 42 appears in document A/31/379. The relevant recommendation is contained in paragraph 6 of the report.

21. Document A/31/380 contains the report on agenda item 43. Paragraph 7 of the report contains the recommendation of the Committee.

22. The report on agenda item 44 appears in document A/31/381, paragraph 6 of which contains the relevant recommendation of the Committee.

23. The report on agenda item 45 appears in document A/31/382, and the recommendation of the Committee is contained in paragraph 15 of the report.

24. Document A/31/383 contains the report on agenda item 46 and paragraph 6 of the report contains the recommendation of the Committee.

25. The report of the Committee on agenda item 48 appears in document A/31/385, and paragraph 8 of the report contains the recommendation of the Committee.

26. Document A/31/388 contains the report on agenda item 116. The relevant recommendation of the Committee is contained in paragraph 7 of the report.

27. On behalf of the First Committee, I have pleasure in recommending to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolutions to which I have just referred.

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

28. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will first consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 35 [A/31/372]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons" recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of that report. As the First Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote, may I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 31/64).

29. The PRESIDENT: We shall now take up the report of the First Committee on agenda item 36 [A/31/373]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons", recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of that report. The First Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 31/65).

30. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 37 [A/31/374]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban", recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Albania, China.

Abstaining: Algeria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Equatorial Guinea, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, 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, Zambia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 105 votes to 2, with 27 abstentions (resolution 31/66).¹

31. The PRESIDENT: We shall now take up the report of the First Committee on agenda item 38 [A/31/375]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3467 (XXX) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)" recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 6 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia,

Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Hungary, Maldives, Mongolia, Poland, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 14 abstentions (resolution 31/67).²

32. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to take up the report of the First Committee on agenda item 41 [A/31/378]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Effective measures to implement the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade" recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. The First Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 31/68).

33. The President: We shall now proceed to consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 42 [A/31/379]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa" recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 6 of its report. Since that draft resolution was also adopted by the First Committee without a vote, may I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 31/69).

34. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 43 [A/31/380]. We shall now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free-zones in all its aspects" recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

¹ The delegation of Guatemala subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

² The delegation of Guatemala subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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 Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

The draft resolution was adopted by 132 votes to none (resolution 31/70).³

35. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 44 /A/31/381/. We shall now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East" recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 6 of its report.

36. A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraphs 2 and 3 together. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan,⁴ Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany,

Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, France, India, Israel, Portugal, Spain, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

Operative paragraphs 2 and 3 were adopted by 117 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

37. The PRESIDENT: I shall put the draft resolution as a whole to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

³ The delegation of Guatemala subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

⁴ The delegation of Bhutan subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as an abstention.

The draft resolution, as a whole, was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 31/71).

38. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 45 [A/31/382].

39. I call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

40. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico wishes to place on record its position on the so-called Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, which appears as an annex to the draft resolution in paragraph 15 of document A/31/382. By adopting this draft resolution the General Assembly would refer this Convention “to all States for their consideration, signature and ratification”, and would request the Secretary-General, “as depositary of the Convention, to open it for signature and ratification at the earliest possible date”. Similarly, the General Assembly would express its hope that the Convention will receive the “widest possible adherence”.

41. The delegation of Mexico, much to its regret, will be unable to support that draft resolution, since we consider that the scope of the prohibition contemplated in the so-called Convention is totally unacceptable, and that the procedure being followed to win its acceptance by the international community is equally unacceptable.

42. Paragraph 1 of article I of the so-called Convention reads as follows:

“Each State Party to this Convention undertakes not to engage in military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques having widespread, long-lasting or severe effects as the means of destruction, damage or injury to any other State Party”.

43. That text is the same as that which appeared in the identical drafts submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in August 1975 by the Soviet Union and the United States, respectively. True, in 1976 the delegations of the States participating in the work of that body succeeded in introducing some changes in the identical texts proposed by the super-Powers. It is also true, however, that, despite the intense negotiations held in the Conference in Geneva this year, almost all of the changes accepted by the super-Powers are purely cosmetic and, from every point of view, of secondary importance. The text of article I, which defines the scope of the prohibition, is identical to the joint proposal of the super-Powers. From the outset, one of them had indicated that that text was not subject to negotiation; this intransigent attitude was supported unreservedly by the other super-Power, whose original proposal for a total prohibition had already received the general support of the Assembly.

44. Indeed, in the draft Convention submitted to the General Assembly by the Soviet Union in 1974, complete prohibition was envisaged. Article I of that draft Convention (*resolution 3264/XXIX*, annex) was drafted as follows:

“Each of the Parties to this Convention undertakes not to develop meteorological, geophysical or any other scientific or technological means of influencing the environment, including the weather and climate, for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health, and, furthermore, never under any circumstances to resort to such means of influencing the environment and climate or to carry out preparations for their use.”

45. In comparison with that original Soviet text, a text all-encompassing in its prohibitions, and categorical and unequivocal in its concepts, article I of the so-called Convention which we are now called upon to endorse is, from every standpoint, insufficient and ambiguous and entails very grave risks. To illustrate this, it will suffice to give paragraph 1 of article I of the so-called Convention positive wording equivalent from a legal point of view. It would then read as follows:

“Each State Party to the Convention shall have the right to use environmental modification techniques for military or any other hostile purposes as the means of destruction, damage or injury to another State Party, as long as such techniques have no widespread, long-lasting or severe effects.”

46. The risks that that would entail, not only from the legal standpoint, but also in practice, can be even better appreciated if one takes into account the explanations given to the scope of the words “environmental modification techniques” in article II, whereby that phrase would include, *inter alia*, the deliberate manipulation of natural processes to bring about earthquakes, tidal waves, various types of cyclones and hurricane storms, or to modify the condition of the ozone layer or the ionosphere and ocean currents.

47. It seems to us most alarming that one can think of legitimizing in an international convention actions so monstrous as those, on the condition that they have no “widespread, long-lasting or severe effects”, especially when we bear in mind that there will always inevitably be an important subjective element involved in the description of these effects.

48. For a better appreciation of the meaning of the text, we must bear in mind that among the effects of techniques of waging environmental warfare which are allowed by virtue of their not being considered to be sufficiently “widespread” there would be those which, according to the clarifications of the super-Powers which sponsored the draft, would cover an area of less than “several hundred square kilometres”; and among those that would similarly be tolerated since they would not fall into the category of “long-lasting”, in accordance with the so-called Convention, would be included those of a duration of less than “several months or approximately a season”.

49. This becomes all the more stark if we consider that we are legislating on a subject environmental modification for military purposes which may be described as totally virgin. Hence any multilateral instrument adopted on the subject will constitute a precedent of incalculable consequences for the evolution of common law in this field, which will have such far-reaching consequences for the future of mankind.

50. For all the reasons I have stated, my delegation considers indispensable the omission of the limiting clause "having widespread, long-lasting or severe effects".

51. Both at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and in the debates in the First Committee on this item, the super-Powers have insisted that, despite the present wording of article I of the so-called Convention, it will be possible effectively to prohibit the use of environmental modification techniques for military or other hostile purposes. Hence the following sixth preambular paragraph has been included in the preamble to the draft resolution we are now considering:

"Noting further that the Convention is intended to prohibit effectively military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques in order to eliminate the dangers to mankind from such use".

52. But if what is at issue is complete prohibition, then we absolutely fail to realize why the super-Powers refuse to delete the limiting clause "having widespread, long-lasting or severe effects". It also seems to us, quite frankly, to be contradictory to have operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, which reads:

"Calls upon the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, without prejudice to the priorities established in its programme of work, to keep under review the problem of effectively averting the dangers of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques".

53. Furthermore, the delegation of Mexico wishes to emphasize the fact that the text of the so-called Convention is the result of inconclusive negotiations. That text does not have the general support of the countries which participate in the work of the Geneva Conference. Contrary to the impression that some delegations have tried to give, the Conference did not "recommend" that the General Assembly adopt this draft; so that it is a mistake to affirm in the fifth preambular paragraph that "the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has completed and transmitted" to this draft to the Assembly.

54. The delegation of Mexico understands very well that, after five years of sterile efforts, the States exercising the co-chairmanship of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament want to present "results" to the Assembly. We realize, too, the importance accorded by the super-Powers to anything that might be interpreted as furtherance of the policy of détente. Nevertheless, as a State Member of the United Nations, we cannot accept that an attempt should be made to deceive the General Assembly by imposing on it a multilateral instrument that has not been properly negotiated; nor can we accept that the most representative organ of the international community should be made use of for bilateral political purposes.

55. The disagreement of the States Members of the United Nations with the text of the so-called Convention, as well as with the procedure which, or the urging of the super-Powers, was followed in the First Committee to obtain

blind acceptance of the draft, was registered in the voting held at the 51st meeting of that Committee on 3 December last. As will be recalled, the First Committee had before it two draft resolutions on agenda item 45: draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4/Rev.1, which requested that the text of the so-called draft convention be transmitted to Governments for study by them, and draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.3, which requested that the Convention be open for signature and ratification as early as possible.

56. The super-Powers, using parliamentary techniques and manoeuvres that are somewhat irregular and with the assistance of a selective application of the rules of procedure, succeeded in having a vote taken on a motion to give priority to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.3. They obtained that priority but only with 59 votes in favour, while 61 delegations expressed their disagreement either by voting against it or abstaining.

57. It is true that draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.3 was adopted by 89 votes to 11, with 25 abstentions; but it is also true that a large number of the votes in favour were cast under the influence of an intense campaign carried on by the super-Powers. Time will tell whether the so-called Convention will be ratified by the same number of States which at that stage gave it an affirmative vote.

58. There can be no doubt that the great majority of delegations would have preferred to give their respective Governments an opportunity carefully to study the so-called draft Convention as it deserves to be studied. That was clearly shown when, with only 49 votes, the super-Powers succeeded in not putting to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4/Rev.1. Indeed, the First Committee decided to take no further action on that draft resolution by 49 votes to 42, with 35 abstentions; that is to say, 77 delegations were prepared, in one way or another, to support draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4/Rev.1.

59. From an objective analysis of the votes it is clear that no fewer than 43 of the delegations which supported draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.3 were prepared to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4/Rev.1.

60. The procedure followed in the First Committee for the adoption of the draft resolution that we are now considering cannot but redound to the detriment of the Committee itself and of the credibility of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament as a multilateral negotiating body.

61. For all the foregoing reasons, the delegation of Mexico will vote against the draft resolution in document A/31/382, since we openly refuse to be accomplices in this attempt to legitimize, in an instrument allegedly concerned with disarmament, activities of a warlike character.

62. Mr. GUTIERREZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of the delegation of Bolivia, which was a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.5/Rev.3 on the draft Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Tech-

niques, I should like to make the following statement on its significance and scope.

63. As a whole, this is a viable document which is necessary for the policy of disarmament and which enhances the confidence of nations in the possibility of agreement between the great Powers on the subject of guaranteeing international peace and security.

64. It might not be a perfect instrument, but it cannot be denied that it is good, that intrinsically it limits environmental warfare in such a way as to make it militarily impracticable and establishes legal machinery to regulate the application of the wise prescriptions it contains.

65. The imperfections of the draft can be overcome by the system of amendments, set out in article VI, and the periodic review conferences referred to in article VIII. That is the usual way in which human societies shape their institutions in seeking the attainment of their higher goals.

66. It is noteworthy that the draft Convention deals with two fundamental aspects of environmental modification: techniques used "for military or any other hostile use" and those used "for peaceful purposes"; they are specifically referred to in articles I and III, respectively. While this distinction seems to be clear and objective, it is nevertheless difficult in certain areas to draw the line, so that it is wise to be aware of this.

67. Let us look at it. A given environmental modification can be carried out on a civilian basis and cause manifest "hostility" to a neighbouring State that could thus lead to war. In other words, techniques used in the exploitation of natural resources can cause "destruction, damage or injury" that might be "widespread, long-lasting or severe". Thus we see that in that case such an act assumes "paramilitary" significance and, therefore, is "hostile" and comes within the scope of this convention.

68. Our concern about this should not be surprising. It is similar to that shown by the Government of Austria when considering "the need for adequate definitions of basic concepts" which it pointed out in the "comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-free zones in all its aspects". "One of the problems in this connexion," it emphasized, "is the differentiation between nuclear weapons and nuclear devices for peaceful purposes," an aspect of the question to which it "attaches particular importance".⁵

69. Some matters overlap and have to be differentiated as much as possible so that we may confine our approach to each one separately and so that we will not in the future end up with divergent and controversial rules. Apart from the example that I have just given, others can be given that are equally significant.

70. When the item on the "exclusive economic zone" was dealt with in the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, it was said that it both "is and is not" a "jurisdictional sea" and that it both "is and is not" at the same time "the high seas". But nobody ventured to say what "it would become," in brief, what the "exclusive

economic zone" would be when the Convention was approved.

71. In the same way on the item before us we cannot give a legally precise definition that will make it clear when we are dealing with "environmental modification techniques for military or any other hostile use" and when those modifications are "for peaceful purposes." Perhaps what is applicable is the Biblical rule that "by their fruits ye shall know them".

72. That is to say, if the effects of the environmental modification techniques lead to "widespread, long-lasting or severe 'destruction, damage or injury'" to the countries suffering therefrom, we would be witnessing one of the modifications of the environment of the type covered by the draft, and the parties could not refuse to comply with the Convention.

73. There is a further consideration. In the section on "Understandings", it is stated that "the interpretation [of the limitations that have been established] is not intended to prejudice the interpretation of the same or similar terms if used in connexion with any other international agreement" /see A/31/27, p. 91/. But "widespread, long-lasting or severe effects" have not been mentioned in previous declarations or treaties; so that when they do occur and cause "destruction, damage or injury" to a country, it will be in vain to seek similar or identical interpretations in documents other than the present, and we shall have no other recourse than what is stated in the principles and rules which we are now considering.

74. Furthermore the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament considers that "earthquakes; tsunamis; an upset in the ecological balance of a region; changes in weather patterns (clouds, precipitation, cyclones of various types and tornadic storms); . . . changes in ocean currents; changes in the state of the ozone layer; and changes in the state of the ionosphere" are "illustrative of phenomena that could be caused by the use of environmental modification techniques" /ibid., p. 92/.

75. This presumption is unique and peculiar to the treaty which we are considering, and therefore should any of these phenomena occur—and the list is not exhaustive—through the use of environmental modification techniques, we shall have to subject the affected area to the procedure provided for under our Convention, since there is no other adequate and clear international instrument.

76. But that is not all. The Convention furthermore establishes the presumption that any of the phenomena indicated, and others not listed "when produced by military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, would result, or could reasonably be expected to result, in widespread, long-lasting or severe destruction, damage or injury" /ibid/. Such a presumption exists in no other document previously subscribed to by Member States.

77. In the context of the interpretation which I am explaining, we must note the understanding expressed by the delegation of Pakistan in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament when he said that the phrase

⁵ See document A/31/189/Add.2, p. 2.

“ecological balance” encompassed a given region’s hydrological balance as well *ibid.*, p. 94]. With that observation we really come to the very heart of the matter.

78. One may say that man lives in water. The relationship between man and the environment may basically be expressed as a direct function of the liquid element which he needs for survival. Water is the basis of human existence. More than by the destruction of the soil or the depletion of the oxygen in the air, man’s life is threatened by any impairment of the quality of the water. Therefore the core of the ecological balance can be nothing other than the hydrological balance.

79. By means of water we can cause widespread, long-lasting or severe “destruction, damage or injury”. History has shown this to be true. God himself, to punish man for his unbridled appetites, brought on him a universal deluge. In the exodus of the Hebrews escaping from the slavery of Egypt, Moses used the technique of the miracle of dividing the waters of the Red Sea so that his people could cross; he then caused the waters to come together again in order to trap their pursuers in the raging waves. When my country was still a colony, the Indians rose up and besieged the city of La Paz. In order to force it to surrender they diverted the waters of the river Choqueyapu with their primitive techniques and thus left the population without that precious element.

80. Any alteration to the hydrological balance of a region, will naturally lead to changes in its “climate patterns.” A serious diminution in the volume or extent of water flows will result in fewer clouds and an alarming decline in the rainfall and natural water courses will decrease or disappear. The temperature will rise, the soil will become parched, the seedlings will disappear and there will be no water with which to irrigate the earth. Life, in sum, will become difficult, not to say precarious, just as in the deserts.

81. The delegation of Pakistan indicated in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament quite rightly that it would have “preferred the draft Convention to include a provision on the obligation of States to ensure that their use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes would not result in adverse effects for other States” *ibid.*, p. 94].

82. The delegation of Italy, for its part, maintained in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that “article II! should contain a provision establishing the responsibility of States Parties for damages or injuries deriving from the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes”; he further pointed out that “such a provision would, *inter alia*, greatly help to prevent that prohibited activities under the draft convention might actually be disguised as peaceful ones” *ibid.*, p. 95].

83. In accordance with this thinking, the delegation of Egypt noted that in article III “no mention was made . . . about the liability of States parties concerning the peaceful use of environmental modification techniques which might cause damage or injury to any other State, a principle already applicable in the field of international law” *ibid.*, p. 96] but one which is without legal effect, as is borne out by present-day experience.

84. The delegation of Bolivia, which enthusiastically agrees with these ideas, wishes to add that, in addition to the liability of States for damage caused as a result of technological changes which are detrimental to the environment, mention must be made of the means of preventing any given disturbance and of the obligation to restore the *status quo*.

85. To sum up these ideas, we can affirm that any environmental change for the benefit of the perpetrator and to the detriment of another State is an act of geographical aggression. That is true with respect to every phenomenon considered in the Convention. We wish in particular to emphasize that such geographical aggression is involved in the alteration of the hydrological régime which, of necessity, changes the condition of man’s habitat.

86. Franz Tamayo, the Indian eagle of Bolivia, said: “To touch the waters and claim that one has not touched the territory of a country is to add a stupidity to a crime.”

87. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution entitled “Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques” recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 15 of its report *A/31/382*. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Albania, Ecuador, Grenada, Kenya, Kuwait, Mexico, Panama, Zambia.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Burundi, Chile, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, France, Gabon, Gambia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mauritius, New Zealand, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Rwanda, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen.

The draft resolution was adopted by 96 votes to 8, with 30 abstentions (resolution 31/72).

88. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take up the report of the First Committee on Agenda item 46 [A/31/383].

89. I now call on the representative of India, who wishes to explain his vote before the voting.

90. Mr. MULYE (India): When the First Committee considered the draft resolution now before us, the Indian delegation explained its position. We then proceeded to say that this year we could be brief because at the twenty-ninth and thirtieth sessions of the Assembly our position on this question of a nuclear-weapon-free-zone in South Asia had been explained in great detail. I am happy to be even briefer now. I shall merely say that, for the reasons then explained in some detail in the First Committee,⁶ my delegation was not in a position to support this draft resolution and that in fact it would vote against it.

91. The PRESIDENT: I very much wish that delegations which have already expressed their views in the First Committee would not repeat them at length in this plenary meeting of the Assembly.

92. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia" recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 6 of its report [A/31/383]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire.

Against: Bhutan, India.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Singapore, Sweden,

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, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 91 votes to 2, with 43 abstentions (resolution 31/73).

93. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to explain his vote after the voting.

94. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom delegation saw considerable merit in the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, which was introduced in the First Committee in document A/C.1/31/L.6 by the delegation of Pakistan. The creation of such a zone would be an effective contribution to the cause of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to the reduction of the nuclear arms race.

95. It is unfortunately, however, a fact that the concept could only become a reality if all States in the area were to work together to that end, and it was noticeable in the First Committee as well as in this plenary meeting that this draft resolution did not command the support of all such States.

96. It seems, therefore, to my delegation that the factors weighing both for and against this draft resolution are in present circumstances balanced, and the appropriate course was for us to register this fact by abstaining.

97. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 48 [A/31/385]. We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons" recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Syrian

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, First Committee*, 45th meeting, pp. 33-36.

Arab Republic, 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: Australia, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden,⁷ Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 120 votes to 1, with 15 abstentions (resolution 31/74).

98. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 116 /A/31/388/.

99. I call on the representative of Zambia, who wishes to explain his vote before the voting.

100. Mr. KABINGA (Zambia): As my delegation indicated in the First Committee, nothing that has taken place since 1968 has made the basis of our position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons untenable. We still maintain the position that we cannot be a party to the non-proliferation Treaty. This being the case, the Zambian delegation considers the item before us irrelevant and it will therefore not participate in the voting.

101. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report /A/31/388/. A recorded vote has been requested.

⁷ The delegation of Sweden subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Albania, China.

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Comoros, Cuba, France, India, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nigeria,⁸ Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania.

The draft resolution was adopted by 115 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions (resolution 31/75).

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.

⁸ The delegation of Nigeria subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.