

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records*



FIRST COMMITTEE
47th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 1 December 1976
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 47th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland)

CONTENTS

Reduction of military budgets: report of the Secretary-General [34]

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 [35]

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) [38]

World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference [40]

Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa [42]

Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Secretary-General [43]

Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [45]

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 [48]

/...

* 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 LX-2332.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/31/PV.47
3 December 1976

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

General and complete disarmament /49/

- (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency;
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General

Strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament:
report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of the Role of the United Nations in
the Field of Disarmament /50/

Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Parties to
the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons /116/

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 34, 35, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45, 48, 49, 50 and 116 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue its consideration of the agenda items relating to disarmament. We shall first continue with the general discussion on the draft resolutions and then proceed to a vote or to decisions on some of the draft resolutions.

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

Mr. KABINGA (Zambia): Last Friday, this Committee met to consider, among other draft resolutions, a draft resolution relating to agenda item 44, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East". I was not here at the time, but, due to a technical problem, Zambia was recorded as having abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 3 and on the draft resolution as a whole. I would request you, Mr. Chairman, through the Rapporteur, to put the record straight: Zambia abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 3 but voted for the draft resolution as a whole.

The PRESIDENT: The statement of the representative of Zambia will be duly recorded.

Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I have asked to be allowed to speak this morning, thanks to the privilege conferred upon me by a group of delegations, in order to put before the First Committee, under item 40 of the agenda -- World Disarmament Conference -- the draft resolution which has been circulated as document A/C.1/31/L.29/Rev.1. This draft resolution is co-sponsored by the delegations of Algeria, Brazil, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Sri Lanka, Yugoslavia, and, of course, my own delegation.

This draft resolution, like the resolutions adopted in 1974 and 1975 under the same item, is the result of lengthy and intense negotiations carried out not only among the co-sponsors and the group of non-aligned States, but with other delegations which are directly interested in this important item -- and, I particularly want to stress, with the delegations of the five nuclear-weapon States.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

The draft resolution begins by recalling its direct predecessors, namely, General Assembly resolutions 3260 (XXIX) and 3469 (XXX). By so doing, the co-sponsors wish to stress particularly the importance they attach to the initiative of holding a conference which has been properly prepared and commands the participation of all States on an equal footing, which is one of the aspects to which the greatest importance was attached by the non-aligned States and which has been reaffirmed by the Heads of State or Governments of those countries at their recent conference in Colombo.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

Accordingly, the second and third preambular paragraphs reiterate the conviction that a world disarmament conference, adequately prepared and convened at an appropriate time, could promote the realization of the aims expected of such a conference, and at the same time stress the co-operation of all nuclear-weapon Powers in the achievement of those objectives.

The importance of the co-operation of the nuclear-weapon States in this matter is also reflected in operative paragraph 1. Basically, the mandate given to the Ad Hoc Committee in operative paragraph 1 reflects not only the views of the co-sponsors but also those of many other delegations that took part in the general debate on the subject. This operative paragraph requests the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference to maintain close contact with the representatives of the States possessing nuclear weapons in order to keep currently informed of their respective attitudes. As a logical and natural sequence to that, it also requests the Ad Hoc Committee to consider any relevant comments and observations which might be made to it on the World Disarmament Conference. Bearing in mind that the United Nations is to carry out other extremely important activities in the field of disarmament during the next year and the year after, the draft provides that the meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee should be on the brief side so that a report can be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session.

The report submitted to us at the current session by the Ad Hoc Committee, like the one submitted last year, clearly shows the useful work that this Committee can perform. At the same time, that report also shows many of the restrictions it encounters in its work; that is why the main mandate entrusted to the Committee is to maintain contact with the States possessing nuclear weapons in order to ascertain if there are any variations in their respective positions which might enable a world disarmament conference to be held in the not too distant future.

As I said at the beginning of my statement, this text is the result of highly intense consultations and negotiations; we therefore trust that it will be the only text to be submitted on the World Disarmament Conference and that it will be adopted by consensus by the First Committee.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

In conclusion, I should like to mention one matter which, in my view, is extremely important: namely, the fact that this draft resolution, as well as all other draft resolutions on disarmament, are formulated in the First Committee through a genuine negotiating process. I want to stress this because I believe that the work that this Committee is doing under your skilful guidance and the work that it has done in previous years is an example that ought to be followed in other fields being dealt with by the United Nations; in holding consultations and negotiations, we are doing nothing more nor less than obeying the injunctions of the Charter when it speaks of the Organization as a body for harmonizing the views of the Member States. That, basically, is what we are doing in this Committee, and I believe that we have reason to congratulate ourselves on this fact and to hope that our example will be followed in other Committees of the United Nations.

For the reasons that I have just adduced, the co-sponsors trust that this draft resolution will be adopted by consensus without the need for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Argentina for his statement in the course of which he introduced draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.29.

Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to say a few words about the organization of work. As representatives are surely aware, the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions passed yesterday at 6 p.m. The deadline for the introduction of draft resolutions has been set for today at 6 p.m. Beginning with tomorrow, we shall devote our time exclusively to taking action on different draft resolutions, and so shall discontinue general discussion on draft resolutions. I hope that perhaps at Friday morning's meeting we can finish the consideration of all items relating to disarmament. I would request all representatives to be prepared as from tomorrow to take position on any draft resolution that has been submitted. Thus we shall proceed with the vote or with taking action on draft resolutions still remaining after today's meeting.

I am being approached by various delegations with a number of requests and proposals concerning changes in the established programme of work, more especially as far as the question of deadlines is concerned. I am sorry to say that it is impossible to accommodate the delegations because that would mean that we should not finish our work on time, moreover those decisions are the decisions of the Committee as a whole. I hope that representatives will understand my position and, for the benefit of us all, I would appeal for their kind co-operation in keeping to the agreed schedule of work.

Mr. HULINSKY (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to explain the views of the Czechoslovak delegation with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.10/Rev.2 relating to the important question of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons (Item 48 of the agenda). At last year's session of the General Assembly the Czechoslovak delegation supported the initiative of the Soviet Union to conclude an international convention on this question and sent its own expert to take part in the talks on the elaboration of the convention, which began this year in the Disarmament Committee in Geneva. At these talks, in which experts from 12 countries took part, the general outline was traced, in our view, for such a convention as were the main lines along which

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

such work might proceed in the future. I have in mind primarily an understanding of the problem at issue whereby the proposed prohibition would relate to such forms and systems of weapons of mass destruction as are based on physical, chemical and biological principles rather than any types and systems of weapons which existed at the time at which the proposed treaty would come into force.

From the report of the Disarmament Committee in Geneva presented to the General Assembly (document A/31/27), it is evident that various specific areas of scientific and technical research were indicated to the Committee where there was a real prospect and potential for the development of qualitatively new forms and systems of such weapons. For example, there was the danger of creating such forms of weapon as infra-sound weapons which would be used to interfere with the internal organs of men and weapons which would interfere with the natural cycle of reproduction and population and ethnic weapons which would be used selectively against individual ethnic groups, genetic weapons which would interfere with genetic processes and give rise to large-scale human degeneration, and other similar forms of weapons.

The criteria for the characterization of these weapons were identified based on qualitatively new principles of their operation in terms of means, target and nature of operation. The concept of new systems of weapons of mass destruction was identified in terms of concrete forms of weapons in the form of a complex of combat and support facilities. It was also made clear that such systems include such traditional systems of weapons also which acquire the properties of weapons of mass destruction, if any new technical elements for combat or support facilities are applied to them. There is the well-known possibility, for example, of the development of trans-uranium charges which could be used in the aviation and artillery systems of traditional weapons and air fuel ammunition, the destructive force of which could be compared with the effect of certain forms of weapons of mass destruction and so on.

The discussion of these questions is not the business of the Political Committee of the United Nations General Assembly; it is the task of the Geneva Committee on Disarmament. However, a decisive factor is the fact that this session of the General Assembly, in taking a decision on the future work in

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

dealing with this problem, has at its disposal the concrete results which in many respects are answers to questions we have encountered last year.

The Czechoslovak delegation has no doubts about the fact that the convention on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons should be of a universal character and should remove the possibility of the development of such weapons on the basis of any branch of scientific and technical research. We must also reliably ensure the prohibition of all qualitatively new forms of weapons of mass destruction which do not already fall under existing agreements or agreements which are now being contemplated. The question of what precise forms of weapons should be included in an inventory of qualitatively new types of weapon in terms of means, target and nature of operation, in other words the question of the scope of the prohibition contemplated by the convention, must still be resolved with the assistance of qualified experts in the Disarmament Committee in Geneva.

The Disarmament Committee in Geneva has more than once demonstrated its competence in overcoming obstacles and achieving positive results in cases where its members have demonstrated the necessary determination to work in a spirit of constructive co-operation. This year, for example, the Committee prepared the text of a convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. This convention will cover means of warfare already developed in principle and some which have actually been tried out in practice. Two years of intensive effort were needed to achieve this, before a compromise could be reached. The experience with chemical weapons talks about which are already in their second decade, have confirmed the conclusion that if certain forms of weapons have already been developed and if, moreover, they have actually been put into operation by armed forces, then it is very difficult subsequently to achieve any agreement about banning them. Therefore, in the view of our delegation it would be not only impractical but even extremely dangerous to divide up the question of the prohibition of the development and production of new types of weapons of mass destruction into separate parts and wait until new forms of weapons of mass destruction have been developed and the actual threat arises of their actual use in armed conflict.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

Therefore, in the view of our delegation it would not only be impractical but even extremely dangerous to divide the question of the prohibition of the development and production of new types of weapons of mass destruction into separate parts and wait until new types of weapons of mass destruction have been developed and the threat of their actual use in armed conflict arises. On the other hand, talks on each of the qualitatively new types of weapons of mass destruction, individually, before they have actually been developed, would inevitably lead us into a deadlock. How to resolve, for example, the question of control and verification before we even have a sufficient amount of information about the specific attributes of the weapons which have to be banned?

The value of the draft under discussion on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction lies precisely in its preventive nature and the idea that it would beforehand, prevent the danger of the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction in general.

In conclusion, we would like to express our conviction that the solution to this question, which undeniably affects the vital interests of all countries and peoples, is a matter for which those States which possess a highly developed scientific and technological potential bear a particular responsibility. We have noted that a number of Western countries here have stated in principle their positive approach to the question of banning the development of the production of new weapons of mass destruction and their interest in taking part in talks of experts in these questions next year, as emerged from the statement made yesterday by the representative of the Netherlands.

From everything that I have said, it must be clear now why my delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.10/Rev.2 and would like to go on record as a co-sponsor of that resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee notes that the Czechoslovak delegation wishes to become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.10/Rev.2. I would also like to announce that Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic have become co-sponsors of the same draft resolution. Also, Denmark has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32; Somalia, a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2 and Jamaica a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.4.

Mr. TAN (Singapore): I speak today in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20 on the transfer of conventional arms, of which Singapore is a co-sponsor. The reasons, the whys and the wherefors which prompted my country to co-operate with other like-minded delegations in putting forward this resolution, have, I hope, been adequately covered in both my Minister's and my own statements. We share the aspirations voiced by several delegations that something should be done to restrain the wasteful increase and alarming spread of conventional arms. This draft resolution is the culmination, the fruit of such aspirations. Permit me to spend some time, therefore, in explaining what are our objectives behind the draft resolution and what are not our objectives so as to allay some of the reservations expressed and unexpressed.

The co-sponsors believe that the quantitative and qualitative increase in conventional arms and their massive transfusion into the third world is a very real problem. We begin from this premise. The first objective, therefore, is to highlight the problem to bring it to peoples' attention and to publicize its import. No international problem can be solved unless nations are made aware of it. The replies of Governments, the factual studies by the Secretariat, and the debate in this Committee will help achieve this aim.

The discussion of this subject would be useful in keeping the conventional arms issue alive and on peoples' minds. It could help identify problem areas, pose and evaluate possible alternatives. To be sure, there would be much debate and compromise before any solution would be arrived at, but at least the first step on the long hazardous journey should be taken.

The second objective is to explore, with the help of all Member States, what could be done to restrain and reduce the escalating transfer of conventional arms. The United Nations is an appropriate body to examine the present transfer of conventional weapons and its implications and the means by which the inherent dangers may be curtailed by future policies. This is more difficult and subject to all forms of suspicion and mistrust built upon Member States' own unique position and needs. In fact, it is so difficult and sensitive that the working group preferred not to come to specifics in their draft resolution, as you may well have noticed. This, then, led to questions such as "But what exactly are the long-term intentions?". Ambassador Ogiso of Japan has already stated that the

(Mr. Tan, Singapore)

draft resolution leaves this entirely open to the General Assembly to decide and does not prejudice the position. The fact nevertheless remains that the directions it takes will be dictated by the majority, and the majority is made up by the third world developing countries. It will hardly be likely, therefore, that the issue can be utilized against the latter's interests. It can only be used for their good -- perhaps in highlighting that control should be exercised at the suppliers' end.

In pursuit of this broad objective we fully recognize two pertinent, and I think very important points: one, that it does not detract at all from the cardinal priority which we have set that nuclear disarmament is all important, and the problem in disarmament. Two, that every State is free to purchase or acquire arms for defence purposes as recognized by the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. Tan, Singapore)

Having said that, let me come to what are not the objectives of the resolution. I think I can speak for my fellow co-sponsors in stating that we have agreed to participate and lend our support because we are convinced that there is a problem, and that there are no other covert or overt, malicious or untoward intentions other than what we have stated. There is no truth at all behind the allegation that it is meant as a first move to impose selective control or discriminate against arms purchases by have-not developing countries. Neither is the resolution meant to pass judgements on Member States' arms policy or cast dispersions on them. It is not meant to control or alter the arms traffic to suit the purposes of certain countries or blocs. Finally, the resolution is not aimed against any countries, nor is it meant to favour any, least of all the manufacturers and suppliers of arms.

We fully realize that this point has never been made more clear than by the feedback we have received; that the subject is highly sensitive and that several countries have their hackles raised at the mere mention of it. The fact remains that the sensitivity of the subject should not be cited for avoiding this discussion. The resolution is therefore worded not to cast blame on anybody. All it calls for is a response from interested Governments in effectual study of conventional arms transfer in all its aspects. It could not be more innocuous as an opening salvo to the consideration of the subject.

At the same time, we cannot help wondering why there should be this strong concern. Surely, these countries admit that this is a real problem; that it does account for major diversion of much needed resources away from economic development and that the increase in conventional arms does lead to increase in regional tensions. Yet, we are made to believe that they prefer that this subject be swept under the carpet for fear that it may open a Pandora's box. I question this stand, for by doing so they are merely avoiding the issue. Just as we accuse the super-Powers of not coming to grips with disarmament by turning to peripheral, collateral issues, similarly are we not guilty of the same by stressing and being preoccupied with nuclear weapons and not paying adequate attention to conventional arms which concern us --- the developing countries --- more, in every other way. How many wars have been fought with conventional arms? How many developing countries are really involved or have the capacity to possess nuclear arms? Though, as admitted,

(Mr. Tan, Singapore)

nuclear disarmament remains the priority problem, I stress that for the majority of developing countries, the matter which concerns them directly and which governs their everyday concern is conventional weapons. How many of us realize that 79,000 persons died in one single night of 9 March 1945, when Tokyo was firebombed, as compared to 70,000 persons when the atomic bomb was dropped over Hiroshima a few months later. I am not condoning these acts, not being morbid; but, out of our concern for nuclear holocausts, are we not forgetting the conventional weapons? The problem is real; the problem is there, it exists. It leads to a terrible sapping of the scarce energies of the developing countries. The above initiative is the first attempt in the General Assembly to start the ball rolling. Let us face up to the problem and give the resolution our support.

Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden): I will this morning, on behalf of the delegations of Austria, Denmark, Iceland, Nigeria, Norway and Sweden, introduce draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32 under agenda item 116, dealing with the conclusion of the first Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will begin by giving an outline of the policy of my Government on the non-proliferation issue.

The first NPT Review Conference in 1975 recommended that opportunities should be provided during the General Assembly regular sessions of 1976 and 1978 to consider the implementation of the conclusions of the Conference and to prepare for the second Review Conference in 1980. We have now come to the first stage in this follow-up process.

The Swedish Government attaches great importance to the possibility now provided to consider the specific issue of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons at a high political level and with a broad participation of States both parties and not parties to the NPT. The seriousness of the problem and the urgency with which it must be dealt emphasize the timeliness of our deliberations.

The danger of a further proliferation of nuclear weapons continues to be the most urgent problem facing us in the disarmament field. This was also strongly underlined in the general debate of this Committee. The first NPT Review Conference was not able to halt trends which might lead to further proliferation of nuclear

(Mr. Rydbeck, Sweden)

weapons. The second Review Conference in 1980 will undoubtedly be looked upon by most States, whether parties to the NPT or not, as a moment of truth for the credibility of the non-proliferation régime. Determined efforts are urgently needed if the concept of non-proliferation is to survive. Each of us has to shoulder his particular responsibility in this context. We must act together in this matter where the future of all of us is at stake. If today, eight years after its conclusion, the NPT is still not universally adhered to and its efficiency is called into question, it is to a considerable extent due to the fact that the nuclear weapon States parties are still reluctant to accept the full consequences of their accession to it. The nuclear-weapon States party to the NPT must finally, after so many years, apart from public statements by their leading representatives to this effect, give concrete evidence that they take seriously their treaty obligations and solemn pledges to the world community to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures of disarmament to be taken at an early date. They must start a process of gradual eradication of nuclear weapons. Otherwise there will be no balance in the fulfilment of the obligations undertaken in the treaty by nuclear-weapon States on the one hand, and non-nuclear-weapon States on the other.

No one should underestimate the complexity of meaningful negotiations on nuclear arms limitation and reduction. The Swedish Government has welcomed the SALT negotiations, as representing a positive contribution in the super-Power relations and hopefully further reducing the likelihood of nuclear war. But we continue to voice, together with many other Governments, our strong criticism that the agreements reached so far do not lead to any disarmament. On the contrary, they permit further increases in strategic missile forces which can already now inflict death and destruction of an unimaginable order of magnitude. No limits have been placed on the rapid qualitative developments in the nuclear weapons field, which threaten to undermine the basis of further negotiations, in other words, the nuclear arms race continues unabated. We are deeply concerned at the lack of momentum in the SALT negotiations and we regret the lack of real efforts to come to grips with the problems of slowing down and halting the process of developing new, ever more sophisticated nuclear weapons. Thereby the nuclear Powers also contribute to upholding the dubious and dangerous military and political prestige attached to nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Rydbeck, Sweden)

Universal adherence to the NPT is essential if the treaty is to continue as a credible instrument of international law. The non-nuclear-weapon States are entitled to demand that the nuclear-weapon States should live up to their undertakings. This is necessary for creating such an international atmosphere that non-NPT States would find it more consistent with their own national interest to accede to the treaty. Lack of progress, on the other hand, would continue to provide the non-parties with an argument for not joining the treaty.

(Mr. Rydbeck, Sweden)

In this context, the matter of security guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the treaty must be solved. In the view of the Swedish Government, Security Council resolution 225 cannot be regarded as a realistic answer to a request for security guarantees. My Government favours a general pledge by the nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT not to use nuclear weapons and not to threaten to use these weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. Members of military alliances might require another type of commitment.

I have now mentioned issues which in our view are critical for the survival of the non-proliferation régime. But we must also act in other ways to further the idea of non-proliferation. I will in the following indicate the direction of the Swedish thinking in this respect. Underlying it all is our firm conviction that the chance of success will in the end depend on the attitude and actions by the nuclear-weapon States.

The expansion of civil nuclear energy programmes in many countries has placed the international community before new and complex problems. The Swedish delegation has already taken up important aspects of this issue several times in the CCD and the General Assembly.

The world total stock of plutonium produced mainly by nuclear power reactors as a by-product of electricity generation will soon exceed 100,000 kg. About 30 per cent of this plutonium will be owned by 19 countries which do not now possess nuclear weapons. Existing nuclear power reactors are capable of producing 20,000 kg plutonium annually. By the end of 1980 this figure will have risen to approximately 45,000 kg annually. The accumulated stock of plutonium will have increased to about 375 tons in 1982. The well-known fact that less than 10 kg of plutonium are needed to manufacture a nuclear explosive device illustrates the magnitude of the problem.

The Swedish delegation is of course aware of article IV of the NPT, which foresees the availability of nuclear fission to meet increasing energy requirements in the world. At the same time, we must be conscious of the fact that the management of the nuclear fuel cycle involves great problems and risks for present and future generations. These problems and risks as well as the non-proliferation aspects have led Sweden to give serious consideration to the question whether nuclear power really represents an acceptable solution to our own long-term energy needs. Therefore, the Swedish Government considers that it is of the highest importance that the international community devote much more attention and greater

(Mr. Rydbeck, Sweden)

resources in the development of alternative sources of energy. In this connexion special emphasis should be put on renewable energy sources. We believe that it is essential for all of us, not least for the developing countries, to take part in such efforts.

As to the non-proliferation dimension of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, my Government is encouraged that the seriousness of the situation finally seems to have been brought home in the international discussion. The threats of nuclear-weapon proliferation, sabotage and blackmail generated by the spread and development of peaceful applications of nuclear energy must be countered by resolute measures.

The NPT Review Conference recommended that concrete recommendations be further elaborated within the IAEA for the physical protection of nuclear material in use, storage and transit, including principles relating to the responsibility of States. This work should be speeded up with the aim of agreeing upon an international legal instrument establishing certain minimum standards in this respect. The leading nuclear exporting countries -- whether nuclear-weapon States or not -- have a special responsibility in devising such export policies as are most conducive to prevent the proliferation of nuclear explosive technology. A major step would be not to allow sales involving particularly sensitive elements of the fuel cycle, such as facilities for reprocessing and enrichment. Such facilities should preferably be established on an international rather than on a national level. I also wish to recall that the NPT Review Conference recommended that, in all possible ways, common export requirements relating to safeguards be strengthened, in particular by extending the application of safeguards to all nuclear activities in importing non-nuclear-weapon States. In other words, there should be basically the same type of comprehensive safeguard systems in both NPT and non-NPT States. Some progress has been achieved in efforts of the Conference, but so far they have regrettably fallen short of this goal. It continues to be our conviction that for the non-proliferation régime to be efficient in the long run, it is necessary that countries which are chosen to stay outside the NPT should not, as is the case today, be subject to less comprehensive IAEA safeguards than those applied to NPT countries. I wish, in this connexion, to say that the Swedish Government is attracted by the suggestion pursued by the Finnish Government of supplementing common import requirements in the nuclear field by common export requirements. This idea merits further study. The responsibilities of the IAEA in the field of safeguards

(Mr. Rydbeck, Sweden)

require that the organization be given adequate resources to fulfil these functions. It is essential that the IAEA Board of Governors and the General Conference accord a high priority to the IAEA programme of work in this area when allocating funds to different sectors. I also want to take this opportunity to express the strong support of my Government for the ongoing IAEA studies on multinational fuel cycle centres and on an international régime for plutonium storage. These studies fit very well into the long-term goal which we have advocated many times in the CCD, starting already in July 1974, and in the General Assembly for a system of international management of fissile material. No exclusive national solutions can, in our view, be adequate and satisfactory. My Government has taken note of and welcomed recent United States statements indicating that the international non-proliferation problems will lead to reappraisal of United States domestic and foreign policies in the nuclear field.

Finally, before turning to the possible action to be taken by the General Assembly let me say a brief word about the question of peaceful nuclear explosions (PNE). We have on several occasions, and I repeat this today, expressed our doubts as to the desirability of PNEs. The value of PNEs was in fact overrated in the days when the NPT was negotiated.

The Swedish Government considers that the PNE question should be seen mainly in the arms control perspective. Ways must be found to prevent PNEs from becoming shortcuts to the acquisition of a nuclear weapons capability. Further we have difficulties in seeing how PNEs could be accommodated under a comprehensive test ban agreement. In our opinion that interest to conduct PNEs should yield to the urgency of achieving such an agreement, to which the CCD will continue to give the highest priority.

Mr. Chairman, I will now turn to the action which the General Assembly may wish to take under this agenda item. In doing so I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32 on behalf of the delegations of Austria, Denmark, Iceland, Nigeria, Norway and Sweden.

First, I wish to underline the strong support of the sponsors for the NPT as the best available instrument at present for the promotion of the idea of

(Mr. Rydbeck, Sweden)

non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. An international non-proliferation régime, of which the treaty is the basis, is a touchstone of unprecedented importance for the international community in its efforts for peace and security. At the same time we cannot disregard the present difficulties facing the treaty stemming from the lack of progress towards the fulfilment of some of its provisions.

In the view of the sponsors, the main task of the General Assembly at this moment is to give an as authoritative as possible support for the overriding objective of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. This support, we believe, can be found also in quarters where we do not, for various reasons as matters stand today, find the most ardent supporters of the NPT.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Sweden, Ambassador Rydbeck for his statement in the course of which he introduced draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32.

Mr. MELESCANU (Romania): My delegation wishes to make some brief comments on draft resolutions A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2 and A/C.1/31/L.20.

The importance my country attaches to the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament is too well known to need any further statements on behalf of my delegation. At this stage of our debate, I should like just to recall the position expressed in the document on the question of disarmament distributed by Romania at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly. I refer to document A/C.1/1066, in which it is stated that it is imperative to convene a special session of the United Nations General Assembly in order to "organize comprehensive debates on the armaments situation and the principles that should govern disarmament, making recommendations that might serve as a basis for disarmament negotiations and the conclusion of a treaty on general disarmament". Romania welcomed the decision taken on this question by the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Colombo, in which my country participated as an invited guest. Against this background, it is only natural to find the name of my country among the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2 and among the countries wishing to actively participate in the preparations for the session.

In our view, the special session should mark the beginning of a new stage in which the United Nations, and especially the General Assembly, should fully exercise its powers with respect to disarmament and make it one of its fundamental preoccupations. In our opinion, the main objective of the special session is to secure real progress towards disarmament and to remove some obstacles which hamper this progress. In doing so, the special session has to approach on a commonly agreed basis the elaboration and achievement of a complex of measures which should ensure the realization, step by step, of the objective of general and complete disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament, in a framework ensuring the participation of all States and duly taking into account their proposals.

To this end, in our view, there are three kinds of decisions to be worked out and adopted at the special session: firstly, a declaration on disarmament

(Mr. Melescanu, Romania)

strategy which could contain a code of principles that could be applied to all disarmament negotiations; secondly, an action programme containing comprehensive measures for attaining the final goal of general and complete disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament; thirdly, new structures for disarmament negotiations under the aegis of the United Nations on the basis of the redefining of the existing structures.

Such a session should be properly prepared, with the participation of and duly taking into account the views of all States. We wish to stress here the important role that the United Nations Secretariat is expected to play in the preparatory work by supplying background, statistical and descriptive information relevant to the objective of the special session.

My delegation wishes now to make some brief comments on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20 concerning the question of international transfer of conventional arms. The active stand of my country in favour of general and complete disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament, has been expressed many times during the debates of our Committee and in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva and other disarmament forums. If I stress it today once again, it is only in order to point out that, in our view, in disarmament negotiations absolute priority is to be given to nuclear disarmament. Today's conventional weapons race derives from the nuclear arms race and, consequently, should be dealt with taking into account this situation. At the same time, we understand the legitimate concern of many States Members of our Organization to curb the arms race in every possible field and to adopt military disengagement and disarmament measures, both partial and at the regional level. It is our assessment that the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20 are expressing the genuine concern of their countries over the possibility of keeping their nations out of the ruinous arms race.

In our view, the factual study on the international transfer of conventional arms which is to be made by the Secretary-General with the assistance of qualified governmental experts should be elaborated in such a way as to constitute a practical basis for the adoption of resolute measures that will enable us to adopt resolute and decisive measures to bring about the reduction and liquidation of armaments and to safeguard mankind against the danger of a new war. Only if conceived in this way will the factual study represent a valuable contribution to our efforts to curb the arms race.

(Mr. Melescanu, Romania)

Secondly, I want to stress that, on the basis of the above-mentioned considerations, my delegation is of the view that the factual study envisaged in draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20 should cover not only the international sale of arms but the whole matter of existing competition in the acquisition, production and development of armaments as well as the refinement of military devices. Only in doing so will the study give us a true picture of the arms race. Otherwise, it may lead us to false conclusions.

A certain improvement of the draft resolution along these lines is achieved, in our view, by the amendments just distributed by the Pakistan delegation in document A/C.1/31/L.36. Having in mind our basic position on disarmament issues and expressing the hope that our observations and suggestions will be duly taken into account, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20 and the above-mentioned amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to announce that the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic have become co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.10/Rev.2 and that Chad and Bahrain have become co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2, and that Ecuador has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32.

Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): I should like to say a few words about draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.11/Rev.1, of which New Zealand is a co-sponsor. My delegation listened with considerable sympathy to the comments made by the representative of Mexico on 24 November, when he drew the Committee's attention to the under-representation of third world countries in the Disarmament Affairs Division of the Secretariat. I must emphasize that my country strongly supports the principles set out in Article 101 of the Charter. We recognize that the principle of equitable geographical distribution cannot always be given full effect in every individual section of the Secretariat, but that objective must be to achieve an over-all balance throughout the Organization. Nevertheless, we would hope that able candidates will offer themselves from the developing countries and that over a period of time the present disparity will be reduced by the appointment to the proposed disarmament centre of well qualified nationals of such countries, as and when vacancies arise. My delegation cannot unfortunately go all the way with the suggestions made by the representative of Mexico. We do not believe that the Secretary-General's choice should be limited in any way to nationals of a particular country -- or class of country -- when he makes an appointment to a particular position.

There is a further point I should like to make in this connexion arising from the staffing proposals contained in the Secretary-General's Memorandum (A/C.1/31/L.23). My delegation, in the Ad Hoc Committee and elsewhere, has consistently stressed the importance of making the best use of existing staff resources and keeping numerical expansion to a minimum. In accepting the recommendation put forward by the Ad Hoc Committee that the Disarmament Affairs Division should be transformed into a centre for disarmament, with an Assistant Secretary-General at its head, we are not convinced that this proposal necessarily requires the creation of a completely new post. We note that this would cost \$77,000 or more than a third of the total cost of the proposals which the Committee is being asked to endorse. In our view, further consideration needs to be given to the possibility of implementing this particular proposal by upgrading an existing position. It is with the foregoing considerations in mind, that my delegation has accepted the amendments which are now incorporated in the revised version of resolution A/C.1/31/L.11.

(Mr. Templeton, New Zealand)

I should also like to take this opportunity to lay special stress on the recommendation put forward by the Ad Hoc Committee for improving the methods of work of this Committee in dealing with the topic of disarmament. One of the greatest difficulties which is faced by small delegations such as mine is the seemingly endless proliferation of resolutions, some of which are tabled only at the very last minute. The proposals contained in A/31/36 clearly envisage the emergence of draft resolutions at a much earlier stage in the Committee's work and I hope that these proposals will not be forgotten, but will be carefully reviewed by the Secretariat and brought to the attention of the Chairman of the Committee at the thirty-second session as soon as he is elected. In our view, the informal consultations envisaged by the Ad Hoc Committee should begin as early as possible in the session. From our point of view, they could usefully start while the general debate is still in progress in the plenary, even before the First Committee begins to meet, although they might be resumed and completed during the disarmament general debate. Their purposes in our view should be first, to group -- and where possible amalgamate items -- and, secondly, to circulate draft resolutions on an informal basis and to reduce their number to the essential minimum.

It should then be possible, in our view, to set a deadline for the formal submission of resolutions at the outset of the general disarmament debate and that deadline should be substantially earlier than has proved possible this year.

I would also commend for the consideration of your successor the other procedural proposals in the Ad Hoc Committee's report.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure that my successor at the thirty-second session will take into consideration the New Zealand representative's kind advice and also the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. van der ZEE (Netherlands): Speaking on behalf of the nine States members of the European Community, I should like to make some observations on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.11/Rev.1 on the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

We would have preferred to have seen in operative paragraph 3 the language of

(Mr. van der Zee, Netherlands)

the original version. In a spirit of accommodation we have accepted the new language, since some delegations expressed a strong desire for a rewording of the original text to the effect, inter alia, of making specific reference to one of the agreed proposals contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, namely, the proposed United Nations Centre for Disarmament. Our regret is that the selective approach adopted in operative paragraph 3 of the revised draft resolution does not take into due account all the elements contained in Article 101 of the Charter. We are, of course, aware that there are still countries seriously under-represented in the Secretariat. A wide geographical basis in the selection of personnel is certainly of great importance but we do maintain that all the recruitment principles set out in Article 101, paragraph 3, of the United Nations Charter should be upheld, including the principle that:

"The paramount consideration in the employment of the staff shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity."

Failure to adhere to this principle, first and foremost, can only mean that the ability of the United Nations to do its job in the manner its members have every right to expect would be compromised.

On the understanding that the present wording does not in any way modify the accepted and existing principles governing the employment of staff by the Secretary-General, the delegations of the nine European Community countries accept the text of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.11/Rev.1 before us.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the representative of India wish to speak on a point of order?

Mr. MISHRA (India): Mr. Chairman, I never need to raise a point of order when you are in the Chair, but I had inscribed my name to speak in the debate this morning.

The CHAIRMAN: My understanding was that the representative of India wished to address himself to a particular draft resolution before the action was

(The Chairman)

taken on that resolution, but if he insists on speaking now I can give him the floor.

Mr. MISHRA (India): There were certain statements -- or at least one statement -- made this morning on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20. I should like to have the same privilege, if I may, to address myself to this question before you close the debate this morning.

The CHAIRMAN: We had an agreement to start voting at about noon, which is just now, but I hope that perhaps the statement of the representative of India will not be too long, and in that case I give him the floor before we proceed to vote on the draft resolutions before us.

Mr. MISHRA (India): I am grateful for your kindness, Sir. I wish to speak very briefly on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20, entitled "Question of international transfer of conventional arms".

(Mr. Mishra, India)

At least on two previous occasions, the First Committee has discussed this matter, once in 1965 and then again in 1968. In 1965, the draft resolution proposed by certain delegations was defeated. In 1968, the draft resolution on the subject was not pressed to a vote.

In 1968 the delegation of India, at the 1,624th meeting of the First Committee, made a statement on this subject which remains pertinent today. With permission I should like to quote briefly from that statement in order to bring out our position on the question. The Indian representative at that time said:

"At the outset, I should like to say that as a matter of principle, the Government of India favours all proposals which promote relaxation of tension and foster relations of mutual trust between States and thus pave the way for disarmament. It is claimed in the preambular part of the draft resolution before us" /the reference is to the 1968 draft resolution/ "that publication of information about arms transfers between States, whether by way of trade or otherwise, would promote relaxation of tension and foster relations of mutual trust between States. But it is not clear how universally it is proposed to secure an undertaking to register with the Secretary-General all imports, exports and transfer otherwise of arms and ammunition between States. Does it, for example, cover transfer of arms and ammunition between States within military alliances? Would it cover the placement of arms and ammunition in foreign territories not covered by commercial transactions? Would it include manufacture under licence of arms and ammunition in other countries? It is necessary to ask those questions so as to ensure that the attempt now being made to restrict the freedom of small Powers in the field of defence would not be a repetition of the unequal obligations of the non-proliferation Treaty under which the nuclear-weapon States continue to augment their arsenals, while those which do not possess them undertake never to think of possessing them. We need to ask, is it justifiable that while nuclear-weapon Powers and" /this is important/ "other armament-producing Powers, in the name of national security and global responsibilities, reserve to themselves secrecy and freedom of action, the smaller, non-armament-producing Powers should be subjected to a discipline which would adversely affect their security? We need to be sure that the imbalance created by the possession of nuclear weapons by a few Powers is not going to be further

(Mr. Mishra, India)

accentuated by creating monopolies in the field of conventional weapons also, thereby intensifying tensions and distrust among nation." (A/C.1/PV.1624, pp. 8 and 9)

The second objection which we have to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20 refers to the question of priorities which the international community should have before it in the field of disarmament. On this also there was a very small passage in our statement in 1968, which I should like to quote:

"India considers that nuclear arms pose the most serious danger to international peace and security. At the same time we are mindful of the danger posed by conventional arms. We consider that both problems should receive balanced treatment in the context of a disarmament treaty and that the big military Powers should be the first to adopt bold and far-reaching measures for substantial reductions in their armaments. India is totally opposed to any proposal which diverts attention from the important question of disarmament and which would virtually lead to control of the smaller nations by the nuclear and other large military Powers." (Ibid., p. 10)

Our views have not changed at all on this question. We have considered with serious attention the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.20, but find ourselves unable to go along with it. There are some consultations going on amongst delegations here in the First Committee and it is our hope -- and now I speak on behalf of Algeria, Egypt, Mexico, Nigeria, Yugoslavia and my delegation -- that there will be no decision on this draft resolution today.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Japan who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): It was the intention of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20 to meet after this First Committee meeting to discuss the new development in view of the fact that an amendment was circulated this morning by the Pakistani delegation. Since we have never been consulted informally on this amendment, as is usually the case, and the sponsors have not had time to consult among themselves what should be their view on this amendment, I myself cannot understand why it was suddenly circulated this morning without any prior

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

consultation, but anyway, since this is the situation, the sponsors would like to meet and discuss this new amendment, and for that reason although you had planned to put the draft resolution to the vote today, I should like to ask you to postpone the vote on it until tomorrow. I also understand that in that case the sponsors will have a right to speak on their own draft resolution as well as the amendment tomorrow morning before the voting starts.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Japan. As a matter of fact, the delegation of Japan has approached me earlier with the suggestion that we postpone the voting of the draft resolution, in view of the submission of an amendment by another delegation. I think that with the Committee's agreement we can postpone action on that particular draft resolution until tomorrow, and before the voting procedure starts I think that the delegation of Japan will be able to present the position as it will stand tomorrow.

I now call on the representative of Pakistan, who wishes to raise a point of order. I should like to appeal to the delegations to put an end to this procedure. The positions are absolutely clear, and after the Pakistani delegation speaks I intend to proceed with voting as we agreed earlier.

Mr. KHAN (Pakistan): I wish to state, for purposes of record, that my delegation had informally informed the delegation of Japan about certain reservations which constitute the spirit of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare now the beginning of the voting procedure, in accordance with rule 128, on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.8 pertaining to item 43 of the agenda, "Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects". As the representatives may recall, the sponsor of the draft resolution, the delegation of Finland, expressed the wish and the hope that the resolution might be adopted by consensus; but since I have been approached by a delegation with a request to put the draft resolution to a vote, we shall proceed accordingly.

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

Mr. MISTRAL (France) (interpretation from French): Last year, my delegation was very happy to associate itself with the consensus around the draft that was submitted by Finland dealing with the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all their aspects -- a draft which later became resolution 3472 A (XXX). We would have wished to adopt the same attitude this year and we would have been happy to do so had the draft resolution that is now presented to us for a vote in document A/C.1/31/L.8, been such as to be considered as an immediate, direct and logical sequel to resolution 3472 A (XXX). Unfortunately, that is not the case and we have noted that the draft resolution submitted to us by the representative of Finland prejudices particularly important aspects touching on political problems of the creation of the denuclearized zones. In fact, paragraph 2 of the preamble, without being specific, refers only to resolution 3472 (XXX) of 11 December 1975 as a whole. But that resolution includes a section -- 3472 B - which was adopted at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly on the suggestion of Mexico and other co-sponsors. That text was intended to define standard status of denuclearized zones and enumerates the obligations to which the nuclear Powers should commit themselves regarding the denuclearized zones.

(Mr. Mistral, France)

The Permanent Representative of France, Mr. de Guiringaud, stated the position of the French Government in this matter on 26 November 1975 in the First Committee. He gave the reasons for which that proposal was not acceptable to us and it was those reasons which led us, together with other Powers, to vote against that document. Opposition has not changed and my delegation wishes, as formally and emphatically as possible, to stress that we cannot agree with the concepts contained in resolution 3472 B (XXX) of the General Assembly. It was these views that led us -- so that there will be no ambiguity in the minds of any regarding the position of the French Government -- to ask that draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.8 be put to the vote and that the second paragraph of the preamble be voted upon separately. My delegation will vote against that paragraph and will abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): My delegation would have hoped that draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.8, introduced by Finland, could have stayed outside any controversy. Indeed, resolutions in the past on "The Comprehensive Study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects" were of a procedural and non-controversial nature. To our great surprise, therefore, we noted in the preamble a reference to a resolution on which my country, together with the other member States of the European Communities, cast a negative vote last year. Although my country, also on behalf of the nine, repeatedly asked the Finnish delegation to remedy the situation, the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.8 declined to take our views into account. It is regrettable that such a basically non-controversial issue was spoiled.

Mr. di BERNARDO (Italy): My delegation supports the views expressed by the representative of the Netherlands.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on the second paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.8.

The paragraph was adopted by 95 votes to 1, with 18 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, 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, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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: France.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/31/L.8), as a whole, was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

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

Mr. SCHÖN (Denmark): The Danish delegation voted in favour of the resolution just adopted. We did so in spite of the fact that a reference in its preambular paragraph 2 to resolution 3472 (XXX) is unclear. That is why we abstained on the vote on that particular paragraph. However, since the preambular paragraph in question, in substance, refers solely to operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of last year's resolution 3472 A (XXX), my delegation will interpret 3472 (XXX) in the preambular paragraph as meaning 3472 A (XXX).

In this connexion, I want to point out that last year Denmark voted against resolution 3472 B.

Mr. JAY (Canada): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.8 on the comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all of its aspects. However, in recalling resolution 3472 of the thirtieth session it does not distinguish between part A and part B of that resolution. For that reason my delegation abstained in the separate vote on preambular paragraph 2. Accordingly, our affirmative vote on draft resolution in A/C.1/31/L.8 does not imply our post hoc endorsement of part B of resolution 3472 (XXX), on which Canada abstained for reasons it explained in this Committee last year.

Mr. SCHLEICH (Federal Republic of Germany): The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.8 as a whole but has abstained in the vote about preambular paragraph 2. We have done this because preambular paragraph 2, referring originally to resolution 3472 A (XXX) in the first version which was not circulated, now refers to resolution 3472 (XXX) as a whole. An explanation for the omission has not been given by the distinguished delegate of Finland in his introductory remarks on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.8. It is all the more inexplicable since preambular paragraph 1 refers to resolution 3261 F (XXIX) and maintains that F. I may just recall that whereas we went along with last year's consensus on resolution 3472 A (XXX), we voted against another resolution on 3472 (XXX) mainly against resolution 3472 B (XXX). An explanation of vote was given in last year's General Assembly by the delegation of Italy on behalf of the nine member States of the European Community. This position remains unchanged.

(Mr. Schleich, Federal Republic of Germany)

With our abstention on preambular paragraph 2, we want to make clear that our positions concerning the two resolutions just mentioned under last year's number 3472 A (XXX), on the one side, and 3472 B (XXX), on the other side, have remained different from each other, and cannot therefore be brought together under one reference number. We also want to underline our conviction that a clear reference to resolution 3472 A (XXX) immediately preceding A/C.1/31/L.8 would certainly have avoided the present complications in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.8

Mr. MISHRA (India): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.8. We should like, however, to indicate that in operative paragraph 3, it would have been preferable to add the words "wherever suitable conditions exist" after the words "establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones". This would have been in accordance with the general tenor and recommendations of the comprehensive study. Nevertheless, and despite this omission, we were happy to vote in favour of the draft as it does serve some purpose.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): My delegation shares the views already expressed by a number of delegations concerning the second preambular paragraph of resolution L.8. We interpret that paragraph as referring to resolution 3472 A (XXX). Our position with respect to resolution 3472 B (XXX), which we voted against last year, remains unchanged.

Mr. KHAN (Pakistan): My delegation voted in favour of this resolution A/C.1/31/L.8. However, I take this opportunity to express our view that we would have preferred, for the sake of completing the whole picture, the inclusion in the preambular part of the draft resolution, a reference to the Secretary-General's introduction to the annual report for 1975 to the effect that the interested countries of different regions should consult together with a view to the establishment of additional nuclear-weapon-free zones in their respective regions.

Mr. ULUCEVIK (Turkey): The Turkish delegation voted in favour of the preambular paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.8. If, however, the reference in this paragraph was clearly to the second resolution 3472 B (XXX), my delegation would have abstained during the vote on the preambular paragraph 2.

Mr. OXLEY (Australia): My delegation voted in favour of the second preambular paragraph in resolution A/C.1/31/L.8. We do not, however, consider that that indicates any endorsement of resolution 3472 B (XXX). We note that preambular paragraph 2 of resolution A/C.1/31/L.8 merely recalled resolutions which had been adopted last year.

The CHAIRMAN: I have no more delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting and therefore we have concluded the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.8. I might mention that the resolution carries no financial implication. We have thus concluded our consideration of item 43 of the agenda; "Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects".

(The Chairman)

We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.10/Rev.2 relating to item 48 of the agenda, "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, 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 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, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Spain, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/31/L.10/Rev.2) was adopted by 101 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions.

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

Mr. ELIAV (Israel): I wish to state that an error was committed in my voting, and I should like to have it recorded that Israel would normally have abstained.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement of the representative of Israel will be reflected in the records of the Committee.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of their votes after the voting.

Mr. JAY (Canada): My delegation has voted in favour of the resolution in L.10/Rev.2 because we hope that it will be possible for the international community to take effective steps to prohibit the development of new weapons of mass destruction. My delegation stresses, however, that our affirmative vote must not be interpreted as any prejudgement on our part of the specific steps, treaties or agreements that might be most appropriate to achieve the objectives foreseen in the resolution, or of how compliance with such treaties or agreements could be adequately verified.

Canada would not be able to take decision on these questions before the weapons and weapon systems to which the resolution is intended to apply have been clearly identified. In our view, the principal proponents of an agreement to prohibit the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons have not, since the adoption last year of resolution 3479 (XXX) adequately clarified the kinds of weapons and weapon systems they have in mind. Moreover, my delegation is concerned that some of the examples provided by the Member States that have proposed such an agreement seem to call in question the interpretation those States placed on the scope of some arms control treaties that are already in force or are under negotiation.

Finally, my delegation wishes to emphasize strongly that consideration of steps to prohibit new weapons of mass destruction or systems of such weapons must not detract from the priority to be given to the CCD and elsewhere to efforts to prohibit limits or reduce already existing weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): The Swedish delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution since we are convinced that the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such new weapons should be prevented. Last year in the corresponding situation we expressed the view that a generally accepted clear definition of the scope and content of this new field must be reached before a draft convention is presented to the General Assembly. A sharp delineation must be made in relation to disarmament agreements in existence or already being negotiated, covering atomic, biological and chemical weapons. We believe that recent meetings with qualified governmental experts in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament have confirmed this view. We therefore welcome further assistance of experts for this purpose as has been envisaged in resolutions.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): I pointed out in my statement in this Committee on 2 November that although my delegation is in sympathy with the idea of banning weapons of mass destruction, it finds it hard to see the reason why the question of mass destruction weapons (MDW) should be given priority in terms of urgency and be discussed in preference to nuclear disarmament and the ban on chemical weapons. Strictly in line with this basic position, my delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.10/Rev.2 with the clear understanding that, at the CCD, priority in discussion would continue to be given to nuclear disarmament and the ban on chemical weapons.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): The United States abstained in the vote on this draft resolution in view of our continuing doubts concerning the approach reflected in that resolution. On the basis of our experience to date, we believe that controls on arms, including new types and systems of weapons, should be applied through the development of specific agreements that establish a clearly defined scope and that are susceptible to adequate verifications of compliance.

My Government is willing to participate constructively in exchange of views on the arms control aspects of new development as they may arise. At the same time, the United States attaches great importance to maintaining the integrity of existing arms control and disarmament agreements. Confidence in the faithful

(Mr. Martin, United States)

observance of treaty undertakings is necessary if we are to sustain the momentum of ongoing arms control efforts. These points should be kept clearly in mind during any further consideration of possible measures dealing with new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. STEPHANIDES (Cyprus): My delegation finds itself in full accord with the scope of the resolution the Committee has just adopted. We would like, however, like the distinguished representative of Canada, to express the hope that the adoption of this resolution will in no way inhibit the efforts under way in the CCD for the prohibition of the existing weapons of mass destruction regarding the consequences of which my country has its own tragic experience.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to explain its vote after the vote, I should like to inform the Committee that the draft resolution we have just adopted carries no financial implication, and to declare that we have thus concluded the consideration of item 48 of the agenda, "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons".

We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.21 pertaining to item 34 of the agenda, "Reduction of military budgets".

I shall first call on those delegations which expressed the wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.21 on which we are about to vote, my delegation wishes to make a brief statement for the explanation of my vote. In the General Assembly discussions on the question of the reduction of military budgets which have been proceeding since 1973, there has been the initial difficulty of how to define and measure the military expenditures of various countries. The answer was finally given as a report of the Secretary-General on this question, document A/31/222. The report is conscientious and objective and is also thoroughly practical. The Japanese delegation appreciates greatly the contribution by the experts who have made the report a dependable international standard permitting a fair comparison of the military budgets of the various countries.

My delegation shares the view expressed by the distinguished British Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Lord Goronwy-Roberts, in this Committee. "Nations continue to believe", he said, "that they need weapons for self-defence and that their possession acts as a deterrent and keeps the peace" (A/C.1/31/PV.21, p. 76). But it is an uneasy peace in many parts of the world and we should feel much safer and consume less of our scarce resources if it is defended by a far lower level of armaments. This is what should be a product of real détente -- a determination to take practical measures to reduce the burden of military expenditure.

In addition to urging the nuclear-weapon States to proceed with nuclear disarmament, we ourselves, the non-nuclear weapon States, should without just

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

waiting for nuclear disarmament to arrive -- begin to tackle the enormous leviathan of armaments which is casting dark shadows on the world by throwing a spotlight on it. Our proposal to give serious consideration to the question of international transfer of arms which is an important aspect of the growing global military expenditures is a step in the same direction. The draft resolution now before us, which has been submitted by Mexico and Sweden, make another complete step in the same direction. My delegation is in full agreement with the view of the delegation of Sweden who stated when she introduced the draft resolution that the definition and scope and content of military expenditures as recommended in the Secretary-General's report should constitute the basic framework for future procedures and that the task which faces all of us is to translate the recommendations in the report into practical ways and means. My delegation supports the Swedish-Mexican draft resolution in the hope that the tremendous military expenditures weighing on many countries will be reduced, thus permitting the use of the resources now being diverted to them for the improvement of economic and social conditions in all countries and in particular, the developing countries.

Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal): When the question of reduction of military budgets was discussed during the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, my delegation had come out strongly in support of the proposal. My delegation continues to support the underlying principles of the proposal to reduce military budgets and distribute part of the savings thus made, for assistance to developing countries. The continued increase in the military budgets of almost all the major countries has led us further to believe in the need and urgency for such a reduction. Two basic considerations have led us to lend our support to the proposal of the reduction of military budgets, first, the resultant restriction or limitation in all national spending for military purposes. These may have various effects, either the reduction of the number of armed forces, the reduction of an accumulation of weapons, curtailment of military staff and development activities, the reduction of personnel and/or commitment in foreign military bases, cutback in foreign military assistance programmes and so on and so forth. Whatever shape or form a reduction of military budget takes, it will undoubtedly be a step towards

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

arms control in one way or the other and to that extent a qualitative step towards the goal of disarmament. Secondly, my delegation is ever more convinced of the close link between disarmament and development. The substantial portion of the colossal amount of money that is now being spent on military purposes, could have been put to better utilization for more productive purposes. Assuming that an agreement reducing the military budget by 10 per cent as mentioned in the original proposal is reached, this would make huge funds available for development assistance. The current estimates of total world military expenditure run at \$US 300 billion annually of which a share of the five permanent members of the Security Council and the few other major countries account for almost 80 per cent. It can be safely estimated that an annual saving of around \$25 billion could be made if a 10 per cent reduction is agreed upon and effected. Even 10 per cent of this \$25 billion savings will mean an additional source of economic assistance to developing countries to the tune of \$2.5 billion which can go a long way towards solving many of the immediate and pressing needs of these countries.

When we discussed this item in this Committee three years ago, we were mentioning military budgets estimated to be in the range of \$220 to \$230 billion annually. Today, this figure has reached \$300 billion and it is bound to go on increasing year after year, if we fail to do something effective to halt this trend. The proposal to reduce military budgets would have been one sure way to deal with the problem of rising military expenditures. Unfortunately this resolution seems to have received very little positive response from the countries that would have the main responsibility of cutting their military budgets as envisaged therein, and thus no substantial progress has been made in the direction of the reduction of military budgets.

My delegation is fully aware of immense difficulties that could arise in the implementation of the resolution. The question of what does and what does not constitute military spending is indeed of a most complex nature. Different systems of accounting in different countries present yet another formidable problem. The question of verification regarding adherence to agreements in this regard remains, as in other areas of disarmament agreements, a major source of doubt and suspicion.

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

However, a study conducted by an expert group appointed by the Secretary-General in accordance with resolution 3462 (XXX) and contained in document A/31/222 should prove to be very helpful in our deliberations. My delegation feels that this report could prove a very valuable basis for reaching agreement on various contentious issues concerning the measurement and international reporting of military expenditures.

My delegation has for the last four years emphasized the need to freeze military budgets at a particular level. The freezing of military budgets would have given a breathing time for the pursuit of the formidable goal of reduction of military budgets. My delegation would again like to reiterate its conviction that the freezing of military budgets is a most desirable step to begin with at this stage and that such an agreement to freeze could pave the way for an agreement towards reduction of military budgets.

My delegation continues to believe in the need for concerted efforts towards reaching an agreement on the freezing of military budgets and will keep on pursuing this objective. In the meantime, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.21.

Mr. ENDREFFY (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation would like to put on record that it continues to support the idea of reducing military budgets with the aim of limiting expenditures for military purposes, thus saving funds for economic and social development, and as a means of increasing the aid to be channelled to developing countries. We have been in favour of this disarmament method in principle, whenever it was touched upon in international discussions. We therefore added, wholeheartedly, our vote to that of the overwhelming majority, when a Soviet proposal, in concrete terms to this effect, was adopted by the General Assembly in 1973 as resolution 3093 A (XXVIII).

It is with growing dissatisfaction that we have been compelled to follow the way the First Committee has handled this subject ever since. Instead of serious political discussion of the issue in the appropriate body set up by the resolution mentioned, the problem has been made the theme of what appears to be an endless series of technical studies. In the three years elapsed since the original resolution, we have been presented with two such studies and if this course

(Mr. Endreffy, Hungary)

continues next year we may have the third one. Neither the two existing reports nor the terms of reference of the one envisaged by draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.21 submitted by Mexico and Sweden suggest that this flow of technical studies would come to an end. On the contrary, they hold out the prospect of further expert studies.

This Committee, during the debate on disarmament items on the agenda, has listened with great concern to many statements describing and rightly condemning the squandering of resources through the seemingly uncontrollable growth of military expenditures. Yet, when it comes to pass resolutions in connexion with the subject, can we satisfy ourselves with a so-called solution which would effectively keep the handling of the problem on a side-track? We all know that it is in the nature of such exercises to postpone serious and purposeful consideration. Is it not indicative that the Committee has avoided discussing the merits of these reports which, as the theorizing experts themselves submitted, are neither conclusive nor exclusively applicable?

By abstaining in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.21 the Hungarian delegation wishes to reaffirm its support for the reduction of military budgets related in a concrete manner to arms limitation aims and to increased development aid.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.21 on the reduction of military budgets, the Soviet delegation deems it necessary to make the following statement.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly put forward the proposal for the reduction of military budgets. We abide firmly by the conviction that instead of the constant growth of military expenditure on the part of many States, there should be a practice of systematic reduction of such expenditures. This would be an important measure for the limitation of the arms race. As we know, the General Assembly in resolution 3093 A (XXVIII) called for a reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries. The major sums released in this way could be devoted to purposes of economic and social progress. It is not the fault of the Soviet Union that the practical realization of this proposal has been delayed. Certain permanent members of the Security Council continue to display reluctance to implement the appeal of the General Assembly.

The Soviet Union, as has already been stated from the rostrum of the General Assembly by the Foreign Minister of the USSR, is ready to be flexible on this and to look for mutually acceptable concrete figures from which we could begin to reduce military budgets. It would be possible to come to an agreement on a higher figure than 10 per cent or a lower figure, as a first step for 1977. However, the important thing is to make this question the subject of businesslike negotiations, among all interested States. The Soviet Union, for its part, is ready to undertake serious steps in this direction, if other permanent members of the Security Council show a similar readiness.

I would like to draw the attention of members of the Committee to the statement of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Illyich Brezhnev, of 30 November which inter alia stated:

"The whole world knows the concrete and persistent proposals of the Soviet Union designed to curb the arms race and to bring about disarmament. I would remind you here of such proposals as, for example, the prohibition on the creation of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction; the complete and general cessation of nuclear weapon tests; and the world treaty on renunciation of the use of force in international relations. Supporting our proposals by deeds, we have recently, once again, reduced our military budget."

Draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.21 in our view -- and we are convinced of this -- would not promote the solution of the problem of the reduction of military budgets. It reflects the line which unfortunately has been detected in our Organization last year, a policy designed for further delaying technical research into the military expenditures of States and the proposed preparation of reports which become ever more complex, contradictory and abstract and divert us more and more from the political solutions which we need if we want to reduce military budgets.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The efforts of the States Members of the United Nations should be aimed, in our view, not at abstract searches for things which do not yield practical results, but at the implementation of genuine realistic measures to reduce military budgets.

For the reasons I have mentioned therefore, the Soviet delegation will be unable to support the draft resolution which is to be put to the vote shortly and will abstain in the voting.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to give us some information on the financial implications of the draft resolution.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the First Committee): I have here a statement submitted by the Secretary-General under rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Under the terms of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.21, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for the report which was requested in resolution 3463 (XXX) to be issued as a United Nations publication and widely distributed. Under operative paragraph 4 of the same draft resolution the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to prepare with the assistance of an intergovernmental group of budgetary experts appointed by him a report containing an analysis of the comments provided by the State pursuant to paragraph 3 of that draft resolution, including any further conclusions and recommendation.

It is estimated that the cost of printing the requested report in six languages, Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish, would come to about \$12,000. It is considered that the preparation of the new report would require the services of 12 experts who would meet in Geneva between June and August 1977 for a total of three weeks. At these meetings, interpretation and translation would be required from and into three or possibly four languages. In addition, intersession documentation would total some 300 pages and the post-session documentation, some 100 pages. Additionally, five weeks of consultants' services would be required for the technical preparation of the draft report as well as travel and subsistence for 21 days for two substantive staff members. Based on these needs, the related costs are estimated as follows: travel and subsistence of the experts: about \$40,600; temporary assistance for meetings including interpretation, translation and production, if into three languages: \$104,700, and if into four languages: \$142,800; for five weeks' work of consultant's services, his fee, travel and subsistence: \$7,400; travel and subsistence for two substantive staff members for 21 days: \$6,400.

In accordance with the practice adopted at this session, the Secretary-General will not request additional appropriation at this time in respect of conference

(Mr. Banerjee)

servicing costs but will towards the close of the session advise to what extent this can be absorbed within existing resources.

Accordingly, should draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.21 be adopted by the General Assembly, additional requirements amounting to \$74,000 would be needed. Additionally, conference servicing costs of up to \$142,800 might be required at a later date depending on the number of languages and the extent to which the servicing of the meetings can be met from within existing sources.

The statement I have just made will be circulated to the members of the Committee this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Mexico, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Following unofficial consultations the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.21 have decided to introduce a very slight amendment to operative paragraph 3, namely to change the target date for the presentation by States of their comments with regard to the matters covered in the report from 31 May 1977 to 30 April 1977.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that all the representatives have taken note of the proposed amendment which in fact changes the date by which the States Members are invited to communicate to the Secretary-General their comments with regard to matters covered in the report.

We shall now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.21.

The draft resolution was adopted by 104 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We have a number of delegations wishing to explain their votes after the vote. However, in view of the lateness of the hour, I suggest that we hear them at our afternoon meeting. I should like also to inform the Committee that I have been requested by a number of delegations to postpone somewhat the beginning of this afternoon's meeting in order to give them the opportunity to consult on some drafts which will come up for action this afternoon.

(The Chairman)

I suggest that we meet at 4 p.m. on the understanding that we shall continue our meeting if and when necessary beyond 6 p.m.

I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mrs. SHELL (Libyan Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation was absent during the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.10/Rev.1. I should like it to be placed on record that the Libyan Arab Republic would have voted in favour of that draft.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement of the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic will be duly recorded.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.