

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
52nd meeting
held on
Friday, 3 December 1976
3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 52nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland)

CONTENTS

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/ (continued)

General and complete disarmament /49/ (continued)

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

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

* 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.52
3 December 1976

ORIGINAL:

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 and 116 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: We shall continue consideration of the remaining agenda items relating to disarmament. We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32, relating to agenda item 116, "Implementation of the conclusions of the First Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons". I shall first call on the delegations wishing to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the vote on the draft resolution on the implementation of the conclusions of the First Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons contained in document A/C.1/31/L.32, the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement.

The Soviet Union has been and remains a convinced proponent of the strengthening of the system of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons under conditions where all States, without exception will have access to the benefits of the wide utilization of nuclear energy under effective international control, in accordance with the regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Soviet Union has supported all United Nations resolutions having that aim. We consider that draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32 also serves that aim. However, since the draft emphasizes "the particular responsibility of the two major nuclear-weapon States" in bringing about the cessation of the nuclear arms race and in nuclear disarmament, we should like to make a further comment.

Although the Soviet Union is making efforts in this area on a bilateral basis with the United States, it is obvious that any radical solution of the problem of nuclear disarmament can be brought about only if all States possessing nuclear weapons are involved in it. Those of them that do not wish to do so would carry a tremendous responsibility before the peoples of the world. However,

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

since draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32 as a whole is aimed at strengthening the system of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the Soviet delegation will vote in favour of that draft.

Mr. PAC (Poland): In connexion with the vote on the two draft resolutions concerned with non-proliferation, one of which is contained in document A/C.1/31/L.32, on the question of the implementation of the conclusions of the First Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and the other in document A/C.1/31/L.34, on the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency, I should like to say that Poland will vote in favour of both these drafts.

Believing as we do that measures to prevent any further proliferation of nuclear weapons have important immediate and practical significance in the efforts to scale down and halt the nuclear arms race, we consider it fitting -- perhaps symbolic -- that the Committee's action on draft resolutions concerned with non-proliferation should come almost as the final chord in its long and wide-ranging deliberations on matters of disarmament.

The Polish delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32 mainly for its general thrust, that is, the plea for the further strengthening of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. However, we have misgivings about certain specific aspects of the draft resolution. For one thing, we should have preferred that the appeal for universal adherence to the Treaty be incorporated in the operative part of the draft resolution rather than, as at present, in its preamble. We also feel that a greater sense of balance would be introduced in the draft resolution if it placed responsibility for the cessation of the nuclear arms race evenly on all the nuclear-weapon Powers.

(Mr. Pac, Poland)

The success of efforts to contain the nuclear arms race depends also, in our view, on concerted action by the international community in support of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, a treaty which must be conceived, first and foremost, as a political barrier to the spread of nuclear weapons and not as an all-embracing nuclear disarmament agreement.

It is generally recognized that the growing spread of nuclear technology, especially that relating to the nuclear fuel cycle, represents at present a major threat to the régime of non-proliferation. It is the considered view of the Polish delegation that unless early and determined steps are taken by the international community in accordance with the recommendations of the Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty to strengthen the efficacy of the existing safeguards against the diversion of fissionable material from peaceful purposes to weapons purposes, we may soon find that the spread of nuclear weapons is beyond control. We therefore consider most commendable the importance which Finland, in its draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34, attaches to effective international safeguards and to the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency in that regard. Poland is following with interest the efforts of the Finnish Government in seeking to strengthen the Agency's safeguards system by making it more comprehensive and fail-safe.

Mr. MISHRA (India): Given the position of India on the Non-Proliferation Treaty, my delegation cannot support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.32.

Further, the draft, in more than one paragraph, talks of "nuclear explosive devices". Thus the draft does not make a distinction between peaceful nuclear explosions -- that is, nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes -- and the testing or manufacture of nuclear weapons.

The draft resolution in a sense follows the régime of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and is thus discriminatory.

We recognize the sincere efforts made by the delegation of Sweden in preparing a draft resolution which could have commanded support from all quarters in this Committee. However, the existence of fundamental divisions makes that impossible, and I am sure that the delegation of Sweden will be the first to recognize that fact. Therefore, we shall abstain in the voting on the draft.

Mr. KHAN (Pakistan): I take this opportunity to explain briefly the reservations which the Pakistan delegation entertains about draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32.

Basically, the main difficulty that we face is the lack of clarity in focusing the objectives of the draft resolution. The second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution includes the term "further" before the word "proliferation", which appears to condone proliferation that has already taken place. This is a position which my delegation -- and, we are sure, a number of other delegations -- would find it difficult to endorse.

Secondly, in the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, the term "various appropriate means" has been used, and we are not clear what that term "appropriate" implies. It is open to various interpretations, and in our view it needs that essential clarification.

Finally, operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution introduces a new term, "non-proliferation restraints". We are familiar with the formulation "safeguards" in this context but we are not sure what is meant by the term "restraints".

These are our reservations in respect of substantive elements of this problem, and under the circumstances the Pakistan delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft.

Mr. KABINGA (Zambia): Zambia is not a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and nothing has happened since 1970 or, for that matter, since 1968, to make us change the position we have taken since 1968. If anything, all that has taken place during this period has confirmed the misgivings that our Ambassador to the United Nations at that time felt about the discussions on the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

This being the case the Zambian delegation considers the document before us irrelevant, and therefore we shall not participate in the voting.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic; Germany, Federal Republic of; Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: China

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Cuba, France, India, Mozambique, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania

The draft resolution was adopted by 99 votes to 1, with 17 abstentions.

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

Mr. NSABABAGANWA (Burundi) (interpretation from French): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution that has just been adopted, but our vote was not recorded. We ask that it be recorded.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement of the representative of Burundi will be duly recorded.

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

Mr. YANGO (Philippines): I wish it to be noted that I was pressing the "yes" button at my desk, but my vote did not register on the automatic machine.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Committee Secretary to give some clarification on that point.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee): May I just point out that the statement made by the representative of the Philippines will be noted on the record, as will the indication by the representative of Mauritania that his delegation wished to cast an abstention.

May I also point out, however, that once the machine is locked the voting buttons will not work.

The CHAIRMAN: One conclusion from that is that representatives should not hesitate too long before pressing the button.

Mr. KAMARA (Guinea) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I apologize for disturbing you. I merely wish to state that I came a little late but would have voted in favour of the resolution we have just adopted had I been here.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement of the representative of Guinea will be recorded, but certainly it is not the fault of the Committee that he was delayed in coming to participate in the work.

I now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The support of the delegation of Mexico for draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32, which we have just adopted, is to be interpreted in the light of the statement made by the head of my delegation on 30 May 1975 at the closing meeting of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

We also wish to place on record that the text of operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution can in no way be interpreted as negating the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons regarding the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Mr. CRAIG (Ireland): Mr. Chairman, I have abbreviated the remarks I planned to make out of courtesy to your request this morning for brevity in this matter. However, I would at the same time like to state, in relation to this morning's proceedings, that it does seem legitimate to my delegation that representatives should be at liberty to explain the views of their Governments on the very important issues with which this Committee deals, and at sufficient length to avoid any ambiguity as to their positions.

I should like briefly to stress the paramount political importance which my Government attaches to the principle of non-proliferation, in view of the obvious dangers to the world community which further proliferation of nuclear weapons will present. For this reason, the Irish delegation fully supported draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32, introduced by the representative of Sweden, which has now been adopted. We consider that it correctly lays stress on a number of aspects which are of particular importance, and we welcomed the wide support that it obtained in this Committee.

I should emphasize that, in our view, the Treaty -- and we stated as follows in our general address to the Review Conference -- remains the international instrument which offers the best hope to the international community of preventing the future spread of nuclear weapons. Adherence to the Treaty, and thorough and systematic fulfilment of its provisions, are the only means which exist at present for the development and codification of a system of international nuclear responsibility which will at once guarantee the security of States and provide a means of improving their access to the manifold benefits of nuclear energy and technology for peaceful purposes.

(Mr. Craig, Ireland)

We would have wished to see a call by the Assembly inviting additional States to accede.

The Irish delegation has always attached particular importance to the development of effective and comprehensive safeguards to ensure that the application of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, which we favour, does not contribute to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In the task of minimizing these dangers, we look to the International Atomic Energy Agency. We support the development of its activities in relation to safeguards and the studies which it has undertaken. It is for that reason that we welcome the initiative by the Finnish delegation in introducing draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34, which we warmly support.

The CHAIRMAN: In connexion with the first part of the statement of the representative of Ireland, may I say that I did not make reference to any particular statement in my remarks this morning. If the representative of Ireland took it to refer to himself, that was up to him. Certainly, it was not my intention, however, to deny any delegation an opportunity to explain its Government's position on any item deemed very important or just "important". I only appealed to delegations to be as brief as possible so that we could finish our business today in connexion with the items on disarmament, as had been decided by the Committee some time ago.

I also said that I might, if necessary, limit the time allotted to speeches, but so far I have not found that necessary.

Mr. MIHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32. However, this does not affect the position of my Government with respect to various questions connected with this resolution. In this respect, I would like to recall in particular the statement of the Yugoslav Government at the time it adhered to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and also the closing statement made by the chief of the Yugoslav delegation at the end of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Mr. MISTRAL (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32, on the implementation of the recommendations of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, although we are in agreement with a number of its provisions, in particular operative paragraphs 2 and 3.

However, inasmuch as my country is not a signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, it did not participate in the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty. It does not therefore consider itself qualified to take a decision on the recommendations of the States parties regarding the implementation of a Treaty which they have signed and which concerns them only.

For us, the Non-Proliferation Treaty is res inter alios acta. We would not be so presumptuous as to counsel Member States on how to implement it. That, essentially, is the reason for our abstention.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32, which has just been adopted.

Although my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, it wishes to make the following reservation on the fifth preambular paragraph. At the time of its ratification of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Japanese Government issued a declaration, which was reiterated by our Foreign Minister, Mr. Kosaka, in his statement in the general debate of this session of the General Assembly, as follows:

"The Non-Proliferation Treaty accords a special status to the 'nuclear-weapon States', allowing them to possess nuclear weapons, while all other States, including the potential nuclear-weapon States, are prohibited from possessing such weapons. It is the firm conviction of my Government that this inequality should be ... rectified, not through the proliferation of nuclear weapons ... but rather through the abolition by the nuclear-weapon States of all nuclear weapons."

(A/31/PV.6, p. 61)

My delegation is therefore of the opinion that the wording of the fifth preambular paragraph:

"Noting that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons ... implies a balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of all States parties to the Treaty, nuclear-weapon as well as non-nuclear-weapon States ..."

is incorrect.

In addition, my delegation doubts whether it is appropriate for the General Assembly to adopt in its resolution a passage that entails an interpretation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty itself.

Therefore, in place of that paragraph my delegation would have liked to have the wording of the final declaration of the Review Conference, as follows:

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

"Firmly convinced that, in order to achieve this aim /universal adherence to the Treaty/, it is essential to maintain, in the implementation of the Treaty an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of all States parties to the Treaty, nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States." (NPT/CONF/35/I, Annex I, p. 1)

That phraseology would reflect more faithfully and correctly the sentiment of all parties to the Treaty and the actual status of the Treaty itself.

Mr. STEPHANIDES (Cyprus): During the general debate on the items now before the Committee the Chairman of my delegation had an opportunity to express in some detail our anxieties over the escalating arms race and its disastrous consequences. I take this opportunity, in explanation of my delegation's vote, merely to express our full accord with the main thrust of the draft resolution just adopted by the Committee and to commend the delegation of Sweden for submitting it. It is our firm conviction that there can be no alternative in the cause of international peace and security but genuine disarmament and international security through the implementation of Security Council resolutions. At the same time, I should like to express our conviction that there should be no inhibition whatsoever on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): My delegation voted in support of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.32 because it represents, on the whole, our position as a State party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). In doing so, we wish to express our sincere appreciation and gratitude to the Swedish Government and delegation for submitting the draft. But our support of operative paragraph 4 requires some clarification. It is our understanding that that paragraph places no limitation whatsoever on our right and entitlement to enjoy the full benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): I regret very much that I was not here during the voting and should like to request that an affirmative vote be recorded on Liberia's behalf.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement of the representative of Liberia will be reflected in the Committee's records.

Mr. PALMA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): I, too, should like to say that had we been present we would have voted in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement of the representative of Peru will also be reflected in the Committee's records.

We have thus concluded our consideration of agenda item 116 on the implementation of the conclusions of the First Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The Committee will now turn its attention to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.33, entitled "Strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States", and submitted under agenda item 49, "General and complete disarmament".

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

Mr. THAPA (Nepal): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan contained in document A/C.1/31/L.33 on strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. However, we have reservations concerning the third preambular paragraph, which reads:

"Convinced that only nuclear disarmament resulting in the complete elimination of nuclear weapons will assure perfect" -- and I repeat "perfect" -- "security in the nuclear era".

The word "perfect" in the draft resolution is not consistent with our policy and ideas expressed in this Committee on this subject. If the words "will greatly assure security in the nuclear era" had been incorporated in the said preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, that would have been in line with our policy.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): For a considerable time my Government has had a keen interest in searching for ways to strengthen the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, in particular with respect to countries which have formally renounced the nuclear option. Those countries have, in our view, a legitimate claim that their security shall not be threatened with precisely those weapons which they themselves have given up, in so far as they have not based their security, directly or indirectly, on accepting an alliance with a nuclear-weapon State.

It is therefore with great interest that my Government followed the attempts by Pakistan to find a solution for this very complicated question, laid down now in draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.33. However, we are not completely happy with the draft. In our opinion, it would have been wiser not to formulate an exact statement on negative nuclear security guarantees, but rather to take a procedural approach, and to press the nuclear-weapon States to report next year to the General Assembly on what measures they could undertake in this field.

Because of the great importance of this question, my delegation will nevertheless vote in favour of the draft, with the clear understanding that the nuclear-weapon States themselves may consider other solutions in this highly complicated and sensitive area.

This is our interpretation of the wording of operative paragraph 1, which only asks the nuclear-weapon States to consider the given formula.

Mr. MISHRA (India): My delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.33 on the question of strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. We shall abstain because, although in the preambular paragraphs the draft resolution talks of non-nuclear-weapon States without any qualification, in the operative part it does introduce qualifications. In fact, in operative paragraph 1 the non-nuclear-weapon States have been divided into three categories. In the first category are the non-nuclear-weapon States which are parties neither to nuclear-weapon-free zones nor to nuclear security arrangements. In the second category are the non-nuclear-weapon States which are parties to treaties on nuclear-weapon-free zones, and thus which are supposed to

(Mr. Mishra, India)

have what are called negative guarantees. Finally, the third category of non-nuclear-weapon States consists of those that are parties to military alliances.

In our view, this categorization does not serve the purpose of ensuring the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. In effect, it introduces the same kind of discrimination as is evident in some other resolutions which we have considered or will be considering in this Committee.

For these reasons, my delegation will not support the draft resolution, and will abstain in the vote.

A final point which I should like to make in this connexion is that the General Assembly, at least in one previous resolution, has very clearly indicated its opposition to the use of nuclear weapons. It does not qualify the non-use by introducing elements of one treaty or another.

Mr. MISTRAL (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.33, concerning the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. I should like to make some brief clarifications of the position of the French Government in this matter since France, which is a nuclear Power, is directly involved in this draft resolution.

The French Government fully appreciates the concern which prompted the sponsors of the draft resolution to introduce it. In specific circumstances -- for example, if it were so requested by States members of a nuclear-weapon-free zone -- the French Government would be prepared to give guarantees on the non-use of nuclear weapons. That is what the French Government did when it signed the Protocol as annex II to the Tlatelolco Treaty. But the draft which is before us today views the problem of safeguards given to non-nuclear-weapon States by nuclear-weapon States from a very general point of view. And I must say that this is not precisely in keeping with our views on matters of national defence.

The French nuclear force, which is of modest proportions, has a purely defensive role to play and it is designed to guarantee the independence and security of the nation. It is not directed against anyone nor does it

(Mr. Mistral, France)

threaten anyone. With respect to the conditions for its use, I can only quote what was said by the President of the French Republic, who would be responsible for the decision to make use of these weapons. At a press conference held on 24 October 1974, Mr. Valéry Giscard d'Estaing stated the following:

"Personally I can only speak of the exercise of my own mandate as President of the Republic. I consider that the French nuclear dissuasive force can be used only against Powers which themselves are nuclear Powers or against Powers -- and I would hasten to add that this is a very unlikely hypothesis, but we must cover all possibilities -- which threaten our own soil. The purpose of our nuclear dissuasive force, which would then have to be used, would be to oppose a nuclear threat to our own soil on the part of a nuclear Power or to respond to a threat to invade our territory. On the other hand, with respect to non-nuclear Powers I consider that France should neither utilize nor even threaten to utilize its nuclear capabilities, and it is my hope that this attitude will progressively be adopted by others so that the means of nuclear dissuasion will only be used against nuclear threats and not in any other type of conflict."

Those are the words of Mr. Valery Giscard d'Estaing and it is in the light of what I have just said that my country will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution we now have before us.

Mr. BLACK (United States of America): In his intervention on 1 November, the United States representative stated my Government's recognition that alleviation of the legitimate security concerns of non-nuclear-weapon States is a critical component of international efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation. He pointed out then that the United States has sought through a variety of means to promote the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

(Mr. Black, United States)

He also observed, however, that we had not been able to accept proposals for universally applicable assurances on the non-use of nuclear weapons because we had not discovered any formulation that would effectively serve the varied security needs of such States.

I should like to reiterate today that the United States stands ready to consider appropriate means of strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, provided such means do not detrimentally affect existing security arrangements. However, since the non-use formulation contained in the draft resolution before us does not fully meet that criterion, my delegation will have to abstain in the vote.

We nevertheless appreciate the continued attention that the Government of Pakistan is devoting to this problem.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): My delegation will vote in support of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.33 because it relates to the vital question of nuclear guarantees for the non-nuclear-weapon States, particularly those which have foreclosed their nuclear options and which are not covered by existing nuclear defence arrangements.

The draft resolution is consistent with the stand which Nigeria and many other countries took during the First Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, where we argued for both positive and negative guarantees against the use of nuclear weapons in the form of an additional protocol to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

We hope that this draft resolution, if adopted, will prepare the ground for formal instruments which will secure for the non-nuclear-weapon States all the assurances and guarantees that they require in order to enable them to devote their energies to the pursuit of economic and social development in an environment of peace and security.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): The Liberian delegation believes that a resolution calling for the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States is in order. But, like my colleague from Nepal, I have certain reservations about the third preambular paragraph. The words "complete" and "perfect" raise some very serious doubts in my own mind as to whether we can accomplish what we are endeavouring to seek.

However, I do not propose to offer an amendment. But, with this reservation, I wish to say that the Liberian delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution. However, we express our concern at the use of the words "complete" and "perfect" as being unreasonable.

Mr. ITOUA (Congo) (interpretation from French): I have asked to speak merely to state that the Congo delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.33.

However, we should like to mention a detail in connexion with the French language version of the first preambular paragraph. I think that instead of "dissiper", the word "alléger" should be used, which would correspond to the word "allay" used in the English version.

My second comment is that the Congo delegation regrets that no emphasis was laid on the responsibility borne by nuclear-weapon States which are strengthening -- or endeavouring to strengthen the security of non-nuclear States by equipping them with nuclear weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.33.

The draft resolution was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 35 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Malta.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): I should like to indicate that had I been present I would have voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted.

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

Mr. SIMARD (Canada): Canada believes that continuing and active consideration should be given in all appropriate forums to ways of strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, particularly those which have adhered to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or otherwise made binding commitments to the solely peaceful, non-explosive uses of nuclear energy.

It was for this reason that my delegation participated in the unanimous adoption in 1974 of General Assembly resolution 3261 G (XXIX).

However, my delegation abstained in the vote on this resolution because the meaning of operative paragraph 1 is not clear and because the complexity of existing defence and security arrangements makes it difficult to apply general assurances relating to the non-use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States.

My delegation wishes to emphasize, however, that in Canada's view adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and participation in internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zone arrangements can be an effective means by which non-nuclear-weapon States can strengthen their security.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): The abiding interest of the Finnish Government in the strengthening of the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States promoting the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones is well known to this Committee and has also been demonstrated by our action in the particular instance of proposals on a South-Asian nuclear-weapon-free zone.

It is therefore with regret that this time my delegation has had to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.33. It has done so because certain formulations in operative paragraph 1, in particular, have remained unclear to my delegation.

Mr. SY (Senegal) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Senegal voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.33 because we deem it to be of vital importance that the security of non-nuclear-weapon States should be strengthened. We wish, however, to express our reservations on the wording of the third paragraph of the preamble, which seems to imply that nuclear disarmament alone can ensure perfect security. We wish also to express reservations on operative paragraph 1, because it makes no reference to the States that have signed and ratified the 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty. In my delegation's opinion, those States, which have renounced the acquisition of nuclear weapons and which often do not enjoy even the protection of the nuclear umbrella of a super-Power, should be given genuine guarantees of their security.

The CHAIRMAN: There are no other speakers in explanation of vote after the voting. I therefore now call on the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan, who wishes to make a short statement.

Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): I have asked to speak in order to express the sincere thanks and deep appreciation of the Government of Pakistan to the delegations that have voted in favour of the Pakistan draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.33. By doing so they have demonstrated that they share Pakistan's concern over the sense of insecurity felt by the non-nuclear-weapon States in a world bristling with nuclear weapons and the danger of the spread of such weapons to regions that have so far been free of them.

The draft resolution that has just been adopted is thus a timely call to all peace-loving States not to ignore this new menace any longer and to act while there is yet time to inhibit the emergence of an embryonic threat of the use of nuclear weapons and nuclear blackmail in certain regions of Africa and Asia.

In its statement introducing the Pakistan draft resolution, my delegation explained very clearly the meaning and purpose of our proposal. Let me reiterate and emphasize that the motive and intent behind the proposal is nothing other

than to assure a greater sense of security to the non-nuclear-weapon States -- more especially the countries of the third world -- and also to give expression to their anxiety to seek political insurance against the nuclear threat, without subjecting themselves to the nuclear arrangements of the two super-Powers.

The formulation in operative paragraph 1 is an attempt to focus the attention of the nuclear-weapon Powers on the kind of negative guarantees that are expected of them. We should like to assure the nuclear-weapon Powers that it is not our intention to bind them tightly and in advance to the formula spelt out by us. We believe that the framework of our draft resolution is sufficiently flexible to give a degree of latitude to the nuclear-weapon Powers to reach a consensus on a negative guarantee compatible with what they consider to be their military-strategic interests, while at the same time affording a full measure of satisfaction to the non-nuclear-weapon States.

Before concluding, I should like to make a brief comment or two on some statements that have been made and which have been in the nature of substantive criticism of the Pakistan draft resolution.

It is not that the Pakistan draft resolution divides the non-nuclear States of the world into three categories: those which are parties to nuclear-free zone arrangements; those which are parties to nuclear military alliances; and those which are outside either of those blocs. The only division it acknowledges is between nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States. This division is a fact of life. It is not possible for the General Assembly to ignore that basic situation. If it were to do so, if it were to proceed on the assumption that any resolution that is put forward in the interest of the prohibition of nuclear weapons or in the interest of nuclear disarmament or on behalf of non-nuclear-weapon States would be divisive, then the General Assembly would be prevented from considering the grave problems that have to be faced in the field of disarmament.

The Pakistan draft resolution merely takes into account a dichotomy that exists in the world -- that is, the dichotomy between the nuclear-weapon States and the non-nuclear-weapon States. This dichotomy has been acknowledged in the

(Mr. Shahi, Pakistan)

Non-Proliferation Treaty and in the security assurances resolution 255 (1968) adopted by the Security Council. Therefore, we were not introducing anything divisive in putting forward our draft resolution. The so-called separate category of non-nuclear-weapon States that are parties to treaties establishing nuclear-free zones is a false one. We take those States to be part of the general grouping of non-nuclear-weapon States. What our draft resolution seeks to do is to protect the provisions of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, so that our draft resolution should not be interpreted as militating in any way against that Treaty.

I should like to express my thanks and the thanks of my Government to those countries which voted in support of the Pakistan draft resolution. In particular, we should like to thank our co-sponsors: Iran, Kuwait, Morocco, Nicaragua and Panama. We are deeply grateful for the confidence they have shown in us.

Finally, I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your courtesy and your consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.33, which has just been adopted, under agenda item 49, "General and complete disarmament".

We shall now turn to the last draft resolution under agenda items relating to disarmament, namely that in document A/C.1/31/L.34.

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

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): My point of order concerns the sub-title of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34, sponsored by the four Nordic countries, Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Finland. The sub-title now reads, "Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency". From some of the remarks that have been made I understand that some delegations have been confused by this title, since they feel that the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency has already been dealt with by the General Assembly in plenary meeting and the item has already been concluded.

To dispel that confusion, we should like the sub-title of the item to read as follows: "The strengthening of the safeguards régime of the International Atomic Energy Agency: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency".

I should like to recall -- as you, Mr. Chairman, no doubt recall also -- that I have asked that the First Committee take action on this proposal on the basis of consensus. I have done so because the operative part of the draft resolution makes it quite clear that the draft is largely procedural in character. All it does is request the IAEA to study and to report.

The CHAIRMAN: The Finnish representative's oral amendment to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.34 has been noted. It is that the draft, entitled "General and complete disarmament", should be subtitled "The strengthening of the safeguards régime of the International Atomic Energy Agency: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency".

I have also noted his wish that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus.

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

Mr. MISHRA (India): Mr. Chairman, through you I should like to request the representative of Finland to inform us concerning the nature of the document mentioned in the preambular part of the draft resolution -- that is, document A/C.1/32/6. I have tried my best to get hold of that document, but it has not been possible to obtain it. Could he enlighten us as to the contents of that document?

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): I am very glad to enlighten the representative of India on that point.

That particular document was distributed to this Committee as a General Assembly document on the first day of the Committee's work on these disarmament items. It contains a memorandum from the Finnish Government to the Board of Governors of the IAEA, which was transmitted to the Board of Governors in June. It should still be available; I hope it is.

Mr. MISHRA (India): But this document refers to the thirty-second session of the Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the representative of Finland wish to make any further clarification to satisfy the representative of India? It appears not, so I would appeal to the representative of India to clarify the matter in private with the representative of Finland.

I am afraid I cannot accommodate the representative of Finland as far as a consensus vote is concerned because I have just received a request for a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34, so we shall have to proceed accordingly.

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

Mr. OTEGUI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): At this, the last meeting of five weeks devoted to disarmament, the First Committee is called upon to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34, introduced two days ago by the representative of Finland -- the title of which has just been amended -- under agenda item 49, "General and complete disarmament".

The delegation of Argentina was surprised at the appearance of this proposal, and must explain the reasons for its surprise.

First, we wish to emphasize the importance we attach to the matters dealt with in the Finnish text and our great respect for the work of the Vienna Agency, which lead us to wonder at the reason for the haste in asking for a Committee decision on a document submitted only a few days ago, the contents of which merit consultations that regrettably have not taken place.

Secondly, we must point out that the items covered in draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34 appear to be a repetition of the contents of two other documents of the present session of the General Assembly. I refer, on the one hand, to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.11, which was adopted by consensus on 10 November last under the item "Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency".

(Mr. Otegui, Argentina)

That resolution, based on a draft sponsored by the delegations of India, Poland and Senegal, covers all the activities of the Vienna Agency by means of balanced drafting, which made it possible to adopt the text without objection. I must also recall that, when in years past an attempt was made to include in the resolutions on this item considerations of a partial nature reflecting the criteria of an international treaty to which approximately 40 Member States of the United Nations are not parties, no consensus was possible.

The second document I would like to refer to is document A/C.1/31/L.32, which was submitted to us by the delegation of Sweden under item 116 after prolonged and exhaustive consultation. Even though my delegation does not completely agree with the philosophy that inspired it, we express our gratitude to the members of the Swedish delegation for having been so good as to request our views. Here too we believe that the Finnish draft repeats the contents of the draft resolution we adopted at the beginning of this afternoon's meeting.

In brief, my delegation seriously doubts the desirability of supporting draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34, since we consider that we have not had time for an adequate analysis, because its contents could be interpreted as making a change in the delicate balance which was obtained by means of resolution 31/11, which was adopted by this Assembly only 23 days ago, and because we firmly believe that, in regard to items as important as the ones we are dealing with, our best tribute to the cause of general and complete disarmament would consist in making sure that there has been an opportunity for each decision to have been reached as the result of a process of harmonizing of our positions, and thus achieving such satisfactory results as, for example, the consensus that was so carefully attained when we adopted draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.1, on the convening of a special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

I should like to end this statement with the words of the Permanent Representative of my country in this same Committee on 2 November:

"I do not believe it would be appropriate here to state how many and how important would be the present and future benefits of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. However, I do believe it essential to stress the need to make a very clear distinction, conceptually and practically, as regards

(Mr. Otegui, Argentina)

research which leads to the manufacture of nuclear weapons. To permit confusion between these two fields would be tantamount to granting the monopoly of nuclear technology to a few Powers and to condemning the developing countries, as was the case in previous centuries, to remain in a constant state of scientific dependency. Furthermore, to permit discriminatory criteria devised to benefit a minority to acquire a universal nature would be tantamount to tacit acceptance that the world is divided, as some would contend, into responsible and irresponsible nations, into suppliers of wisdom and minors incapable of governing their own actions." (A/C.1/31/PV.21, p. 53)

Mr. OXLEY (Australia): Australia will support draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34. We agree with its substance, which reflects important matters.

My delegation had received instructions to propose an amendment to operative paragraph 3 of document A/C.1/31/L.34, which makes reference to the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on multinational fuel cycle centres and an international régime for plutonium storage. My delegation had been instructed to see whether, in addition to those points, reference might also be made in that paragraph to the important work of IAEA being carried out by its Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Peaceful Nuclear Explosions and the Standing Advisory Group on Safeguard Implementation. These are important aspects of the work of IAEA relating to non-proliferation. Achievement of results in the work in all these areas will have a bearing on whatever more effective safeguard régime might be implemented. In this particular respect, I note that the resolution adopted in plenary meeting on the report of IAEA contained a reference to the work of the Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Peaceful Nuclear Explosions. Australia was motivated to consider this action because of the importance it attaches to the work of IAEA. My delegation regrets that the Finnish delegation was not able to give us time for adequate consultation about and consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34. The sponsors, I might add, were unable to accept the amendments that I had proposed to them.

(Mr. Oxley, Australia)

My delegation appreciates that the subject matter of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34 and of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32, which we have just adopted, is important. They embrace many contentious questions, but the overriding concern of my delegation had been to see a common spirit of endeavour in this Committee to promote the cause of non-proliferation. For this reason we consider that the endeavour by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32 to tap that common spirit was a sensible and constructive approach.

Out of this same concern and out of a wish not to prolong the debate in this Committee on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34 or to present difficulties to delegations which themselves could not have had time to seek instructions on the amendments which my Government would have liked to see made to operative paragraph 3 of that draft resolution, my delegation does not intend to beg this Committee's indulgence or to extend its suffering or yours, Mr. Chairman, after this somewhat trying debate. Therefore, we shall not propose the amendments.

If I may reiterate my opening comment, my delegation supports this draft resolution because of the important support it gives to the work of IAEA, and we commend it to all delegations.

The CHAIRMAN: I certainly appreciate the concern of the representative of Australia for the well-being of the members of the Committee, as well as for mine.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Mexico will be compelled to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34. It is true that, in connexion with agenda item 49, "General and complete disarmament", the First Committee has before it the relevant chapters of the annual report of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

It is likewise true, however, that the item on that report has already been considered in the plenary Assembly. What is more, draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34 refers to a subject that is of far-reaching importance for the international community and with which we cannot deal lightly. This text was distributed on 30 November and was introduced only two days ago. Regrettably, the introduction given by the author of the text was not sufficient to allay our doubts regarding its approach or the reasons for its submission.

Mr. MISHRA (India): The delegation of India has two basic objections to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34. First, it seeks to prop up the régime of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. As is well known, India is opposed to the Non-Proliferation Treaty since it is an unequal and discriminatory treaty. The draft resolution refers to the Treaty and then, in operative paragraph 1, it mentions "States accepting effective non-proliferation restraints". Thus there is a very clear link between the two ideas.

India is of the firm view that the benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be available to all States without any discrimination whatever, whether or not they are parties to any particular treaty.

Secondly, the draft resolution seeks to impose certain views on the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). As should be well known to all representatives here, in its programme of facilitating international co-operation and promotion of peaceful uses of nuclear energy as well as its safeguards functions in this regard, the IAEA must be guided by its own statutes. A resolution of the General Assembly that seeks to impose discriminatory safeguards cannot bind the IAEA.

Mr. NEAGU (Romania): My delegation will be compelled to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/31/L.34 because of the following considerations.

First of all, this draft resolution has been introduced quite late in our debate. In fact, even today, just before the vote, it was amended by the delegation that submitted it, altering the content and the form of the previous draft. This draft resolution, as has been noted, has not been negotiated.

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

It has many-sided implications. A text of such import has to be carefully considered, and any haste might be counterproductive.

Further, this morning the Committee adopted a draft resolution submitted to us and duly, I would say, negotiated by Sweden that included the subject of the draft resolution now under consideration.

Thirdly, the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency has been considered in the General Assembly, which heard the General Director of the Agency and adopted a considered resolution.

Because of all these considerations, my delegation, as I have said, will abstain in the voting.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the representative of Finland wishes to speak on a point of order, because, as a sponsor of the draft resolution, he cannot, of course, speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): I think that I owe the courtesy to my colleagues from Argentina, Mexico, Romania and Australia of raising a point of order before we take a vote.

The representatives of Argentina, Mexico and Romania have drawn attention to the fact that our draft resolution was submitted only two days ago. We have taken action on two other draft resolutions today that were also submitted two days ago. Procedurally, this is something that happens at times when consultations are going on.

I would, however, draw the attention of this Committee -- and also of my colleagues whom I just mentioned -- to the fact that one cannot say that the substance of the draft resolution has come as a surprise. I had earlier drawn attention to the fact that the first substantive document circulated among this First Committee appeared under the symbol A/C.1/31/6 and bore the date of 28 October 1976. That document, as I had explained earlier, contained a memorandum by the Finnish Government on this same subject, and if members will compare the text of the draft resolution they will find that it is taken almost line by line from that document.

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

In my statement of 5 November, I particularly said that one of the lines of action that the Finnish delegation would be pursuing during this session of the General Assembly was further elaborated in that document (A/C.1/31/6), which had already been distributed.

I owe, however, an apology to the representative of Australia for not being able to entertain his amendment, and this is because, for reasons beyond the control of my delegation, our draft resolution was delayed and, not wishing to prolong unduly the work of the Committee, which we are all anxious to conclude, I was no longer able to obtain instructions on his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of; Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudia Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

Against: China

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Ehtan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, France, India, Lesotho, Mexico, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Romania, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia

The draft resolution was adopted by 97 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34, of which my delegation voted in favour, I wish to put on record that my country attaches particular importance to operative paragraph 1, which recognizes the right of States accepting effective non-proliferation restraints to enjoy fully the benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

My country, which recently ratified the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty, considers that care should be taken to ensure that the right of parties to the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty to participate fully in the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy is not impaired in any respect.

Mr. MIHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): Inasmuch as draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34 was submitted at a very late stage in our deliberations. My delegation has found it impossible to study all its aspects and implications. Without prejudging our position on its substance, my delegation, for the aforementioned reasons, abstained.

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): The Swedish delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution which underlines the importance of increased efforts to make the international system of safeguards more effective and comprehensive. At the same time, and in connexion with operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution, I wish to recall the statement made two days ago in the Committee by the Swedish Permanent Representative, Ambassador Rydbeck. In that statement, he said, inter alia:

"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."

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34 because it believed that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has the responsibility and competence under appropriate agreements, to regulate peaceful applications of nuclear energy. We particularly welcome the objectives and significance of operative paragraph 1, which recognizes that States, particularly the developing countries, accepting effective non-proliferation restraints, have the right to enjoy fully the benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. However, in the context of the non-proliferation Treaty, we do not try to overestimate the scope, nature and importance of the guarantees provided by the IAEA safeguards. We believe it is the political will not to proliferate that counts more than the safeguards system.

Secondly, we do not accept the thesis that the safeguards system should be used to qualify the right of States that have already decided not to acquire nuclear capability to gain full access to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Nor do we view lightly the attempt by some States to create a parallel system to the one provided for under the non-proliferation Treaty, thereby dividing further the categories of States under that Treaty, to the detriment of the non-nuclear weapon States.

Mr. KABINGA (Zambia): Broadly speaking, the Zambian delegation accepts the general thrust of the draft resolution on the question of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. But since operative paragraph 1 discriminates against States not parties to the non-proliferation Treaty, and since Zambia is not a party to that Treaty, we thought that we could not go along with the draft resolution, and therefore abstained.

Mr. LOPEZ CHICHERI (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to explain my vote by saying that my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34 because we have no objections to the text as a whole. However, the position of the Government of Spain is well known regarding the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Therefore, if the preambular paragraphs concerning that Treaty -- to which Spain is not a party -- had been voted upon separately, my delegation would have abstained.

Mr. DUMAS (Trinidad and Tobago): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.34. However, my delegation, in line with the statement I made to this Committee on 17 November during the general debate on disarmament, would like to express the hope that the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) will indeed be strengthened. I say this particularly in the light of the existence and activities of the London "club" of nuclear suppliers.

In this context, my delegation would also like to take this opportunity to say, with reference to the third preambular paragraph, that it hopes that non-nuclear weapon States that have accepted the principle of safeguards on all their peaceful nuclear activities will not one day find that such acceptance has locked them into a position of dependence on other States.

Lastly, my delegation notes with interest the similarity of language between operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34 and operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32, just adopted, and between operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.34 and operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.32. My delegation is confident that such co-operation among the Nordic countries will augur well for the future.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus, with the adoption of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.34, concluded our consideration of agenda item 49, "General and complete disarmament".

Let me add that none of the draft resolutions adopted today entail financial implications.

I call on the representative of Turkey, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. ULUCEVIK (Turkey): It is a very minor point to which I want to draw the Secretariat's attention.

In operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2 concerning the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which was adopted yesterday by consensus, the number of members of the Preparatory Committee was given as "54"; whereas in paragraph 1 (b) of document A/C.1/31/L.40 relating to the administrative and financial implications of the same draft resolution, the number is "35". I assume that the discrepancy will be corrected on the basis of the draft resolution already adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Turkey's statement will, of course, be reflected in the Committee's records.

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

Mr. AL-IMAM (Kuwait): With reference to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.34 which has just been adopted, we Arab-speaking representatives notice that in the penultimate paragraph of the Arabic text the symbol "A/C.1/31/6" appears, while in the English text the symbol given is "A/C.1/32/6". There is obviously a discrepancy between the two. I personally do not know which is right, but we would be extremely grateful to have the correct symbol in all texts.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall request the Secretariat to investigate, and I hope that before the end of this meeting the Secretary will be able to supply some information on that particular point.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to make statements after the conclusion of the consideration of the draft resolutions.

Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)(interpretation from Russian): The First Committee has concluded its consideration of disarmament matters. Our attitude to the draft resolutions that have been adopted has been clearly revealed in the statements made in the general debate on those matters and by the fact that the Byelorussian SSR delegation joined in sponsoring draft resolutions on such questions as the draft convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and the conclusion of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, as well as by the votes we have cast on the various draft resolutions.

Today the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR would like to make a few comments on the documents before the Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions under consideration. There are eight in all, but we shall refer only to those connected with the draft resolutions adopted by the Committee. As representatives will recall, one of them was deferred and, therefore, its financial implications were not considered.

Only in one case did the United Nations Secretariat inform us that the proposed expenditure was already covered in the programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 and did not call for additional appropriations. In four cases the draft resolutions adopted envisaged the continuation of work which had already been going on or the holding of meetings that did not take place this year. In all those four cases additional expenditures were requested for 1977; furthermore, they were larger than for the current year. I should like to give one example.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

A measure was enacted in 1976 that will again be carried out in 1977, but in 1977 the length of the meetings and the volume of documentation will be reduced by one third in comparison with 1976. The languages to be used and the number of interpreters remain unchanged from 1976; nevertheless, additional funds approximately 30 per cent greater than for 1976 have been requested. Furthermore, this year all expenses were covered by funds that the Department of Conference Services already had, but now additional appropriations are being requested, including sums to cover the expenses of the Office of General Services. Let us suppose that all those measures were covered by the 1976 allocations and that after those activities had taken place the entire staff connected with their servicing were released. In that case, why have allocations been requested for events that did not take place in 1976? Obviously, there should have been some savings that could be used when those conferences are held in 1977.

In two cases the draft resolutions adopted call for new activities; naturally, expenditure is inevitable. But we wonder to what extent in those and in all other previous instances the permanent staff and other facilities of the United Nations Secretariat have been taken into account.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

It is not entirely clear why in all cases, even in the case of small meetings, additional interpreters, revisers and others are required, why there have to be travel allowances and per diem, even when a conference is held in New York and when, consequently, the staff of the Secretariat should be working for their normal salary, and why, in all cases, the expenses of the Department of General Services have to be increased.

In six of the resolutions adopted which involve financial implications, an additional appropriation for 1977 has been requested in the amount of \$837,300, which is equivalent to the total contribution to the United Nations budget of 12 Member States of the Organization. Furthermore, in four cases of the six, reference is made to the fact that after the evaluation of the over-all pattern of conferences for 1977, even at the present session of the General Assembly additional funds may be requested for staff to service conferences. In one case it is suggested that additional funds will be requested to pay for the services of experts in accordance with the provisions of the resolutions of the General Assembly on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses.

The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, like many other delegations, considers that the United Nations Secretariat must be as scrupulous as possible in its treatment of budgetary questions since the expenditures involved are financed by Member States of the Organization, and that it must make maximum use of internal resources and reserves by redeploying funds which already exist and by being stringently economical in making full and effective use of the existing personnel and the time allocated for the meetings of various bodies.

In connexion with my last comment regarding full use of the time allocated to meetings, the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic would like to congratulate you, Comrade Chairman, on the fact that under your skilful guidance the First Committee has already saved 20 meetings which, as we can see, will make it possible for the United Nations Secretariat to reduce its request for additional allocation of funds.

It is our hope that our comments will be taken into account by the United Nations Secretariat, by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and also in the work of the Fifth Committee when it considers the relevant sections of the United Nations budget. At the same time, we believe

that our comments should be taken into account not only in connexion with disarmament questions, but in connexion with all decisions taken at the thirty-first session and subsequent sessions of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the Foreign Minister of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic for his kind reference to me. I am sure that the Secretariat will duly take into consideration his remarks, which to me at least seem to be very reasonable.

Before concluding the meeting, I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee to make some announcements.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee): With regard to the point raised by the representative of Turkey, we have noted his remarks and the correction will be made.

With regard to the point raised by the representative of Kuwait, he is quite right in thinking that the symbols that appear in Arabic, French and Russian are the correct symbols. We are taking the necessary steps to rectify this typographical error in the other languages.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus come to the conclusion of our discussion of the agenda items, 18 in number, relating to disarmament. Consideration of this important subject has taken us 33 meetings, including 20 meetings devoted to an over-all general debate. We have adopted 21 resolutions on disarmament, seven of which have been adopted by consensus.

I am pleased to state that both the general debate and the ensuing discussion on draft resolutions have provided for an extensive exchange of views on a wide range of problems and have once more confirmed the significance which Member States of our Organization attach to the need to end the arms race and achieve progress in disarmament. Indeed, this healthy trend is but a reflection of the strong yearning of nations to save mankind once and for all from the frightening scourge of war.

(The Chairman)

If only in a token and modest way, we did succeed during our consideration of the disarmament items in scoring quite a record of achievement. In so saying, I am encouraged, inter alia, by the progress accomplished in the opening for signature of the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques. That important document appears to be the first agreement and arms limitation measure of the kind in the last five years, which excludes yet another environment from the global arms race. It has also been encouraging to see considerable attention paid in our debates to the importance of banning the use of and eliminating nuclear weapons, including the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. In the same context I conceive of the significance of the discussion and of the resolution concerning the elaboration of an agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. I believe, too, that we have managed to move forward the cause of the effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their elimination from the arsenals of all States.

We have devoted proper attention to the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. This has been best exemplified by the unanimous resolution on the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. That important resolution, together with the one on the world disarmament conference, represents a fitting approval by the First Committee of one of the conclusions of the latest report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference which has stipulated that:

"... efforts towards creation of appropriate conditions for convening a world disarmament conference should continue and, in this connexion, opportunities which present themselves and which, in view of the general membership of the Organization, would be conducive to the achievement of progress in the field of disarmament, should be seized and fully explored" (A/31/28).

(The Chairman)

I take this opportunity to thank all the members of the Committee, including numerous speakers in the debate as well as sponsors and co-sponsors of draft resolutions, for the constructive and diligent share of work they have contributed to our deliberations on the vital issues of disarmament.

I am sure I shall be expressing the sentiments of all of us who remain in New York for the concluding week of the Committee's work, when I wish our colleagues from Geneva -- and those others who will be leaving us in the next couple of days -- all good luck and bon voyage.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.