

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1341st
MEETING

Tuesday, 19 November 1963,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 74:</i>	
<i>Denuclearization of Latin America (concluded)</i>	
<i>General debate and consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.329 and Add.1 (concluded)</i>	151
<i>Agenda item 27:</i>	
<i>Question of convening a conference for the purpose of signing a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.330 and Add.1-2 (concluded)</i>	155

Chairman: Mr. C.W.A. SCHURMANN
(Netherlands).

AGENDA ITEM 74

Denuclearization of Latin America (A/5415/Rev.1, A/5447 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.329 and Add.1) (concluded)

GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.1/L.329 AND ADD.1 (concluded)

1. Mr. LACHS (Poland) said that the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in central Europe had been proposed by Poland six years earlier. With the passage of time, the concept of nuclear-free zones had been supported by an increasing number of nations as a means of reducing tension in their respective areas. Today, the need for such measures was more imperative than ever. The total elimination of nuclear weapons was fraught with serious difficulties, and was at present envisaged only as the final step in the process of general and complete disarmament; but it obviously lay within the sovereign rights of each State to ban such weapons from its territory. By helping to arrest the cancerous proliferation of nuclear weapons, denuclearized zones would reduce the risk of a general conflagration, and by limiting the means and dimensions of war might finally help to prevent it altogether. The growing support for the idea of denuclearized zones was illustrated by the fact that while in 1962 about 72 per cent of the representatives in the First Committee had spoken on the subject, the proportion had risen during the current session to 90 per cent. His delegation welcomed the initiative taken by the Latin American States, which confirmed that trend and encouraged the Polish Government in its belief that the plan it had originally proposed for central Europe could be applied to other areas.

2. All denuclearized zones, wherever located, comprised a territorial element, an objective element and a subjective element. The main territorial re-

quirement was that the area envisaged must be cohesive; that being so, the feelings of those who objected to the artificial exclusion of certain territories from a zone were entirely understandable. With regard to the second element, which related to the exclusion or withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the zone, the safeguards provided must be sufficient to dispel even the suspicion that such weapons might be retained or readmitted in the zone at the wish of a nuclear Power; in that respect also the misgivings expressed by the Cuban representative were fully understandable.

3. The subjective element was that other States, particularly the nuclear Powers, must respect the commitments freely entered into by the denuclearized States and the inviolability of the zone as a nuclear target. States setting up a denuclearized zone had a legitimate right to demand from the nuclear Powers guarantees comparable to the guarantees, based on mutual interest, which had been given in the past in respect of neutral States.

4. The argument that the creation of nuclear-free zones must be conditional on the preservation of the balance of power was hardly compatible with the purpose of such zones, which was to improve the prospects of peace without favouring any one nation or threatening its security. Moreover, the concept of the balance of power was a highly elusive one which had been responsible for countless wars. In the last analysis, the principle of the sovereign equality of States laid down in the Charter of the United Nations required that the will of States not to become involved in the arms race must be respected. Indeed, any efforts on their part to extricate themselves from the arms race should be encouraged.

5. In the light of those considerations, his delegation whole-heartedly supported the proposal for the denuclearization of Latin America. He wished to repeat, however, that every region had its own peculiarities and special requirements, and that his delegation appreciated the misgivings expressed by the Cuban representative and regretted that the United States had taken no steps to remove the source of those misgivings. It hoped that future efforts to overcome the difficulties involved in achieving the goal set forth in the declaration of the Presidents of five Latin American Republics (A/5415/Rev.1) would prove successful, and that by freeing political thinking from the fetters of strategic considerations the creation of nuclear-free zones would restore the world to sanity and contribute to peaceful international co-operation.

6. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said it was gratifying that not a single representative had opposed the idea of denuclearizing Latin America or challenged its appropriateness or timeliness. With respect to certain criticisms voiced regarding the form and content of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.329 and Add.1), he said that the sponsors had been faced with

two alternatives: either to include in their draft resolution all the basic points to be ultimately incorporated in a denuclearization agreement, or to frame an essentially procedural text, the only substantive aspect of which was the expression of the General Assembly's moral approval for the idea of a denuclearized Latin America. Had they followed the first course, the First Committee would have had to declare itself in permanent session; moreover, such a course would have violated the universally accepted principle that the General Assembly could not impose on States the principles or rules to be applied for the denuclearization of their area.

7. The fact that the second alternative had been chosen did not mean, however, that the sponsors had overlooked the fundamental problems that would have to be solved by the States involved. So far as concerned the question of verification, for example, he had already pointed out that that problem, like that of the geographical definition of "Latin America", was a complex one which would have to be resolved by the conference convened to give effect to the denuclearization of Latin America.

8. The draft resolution was couched in flexible terms which left the future negotiators every possible latitude. He hoped that its critics would study it anew in the light of the explanations that had been offered, and that the draft resolution would receive the Committee's unanimous support.

9. Mr. QUINTERO (Panama), replying to representatives who had alluded to the Panama Canal Zone, said that the Canal Zone had never been sold, ceded or leased by the Republic of Panama to any other State, nor had it been conquered or annexed by any other State. Thus it had always been and still was part of the national territory of Panama: it was not a possession or territory of the United States, which merely exercised certain rights in the area in connexion with the operation of the Canal as an international public service under a concession granted for that purpose.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that the general debate on the item before the Committee was concluded. He called on representatives wishing to explain their votes on the draft resolution before the voting took place.

11. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) said that his Government had always welcomed any steps taken toward the establishment of denuclearized zones. His delegation would therefore vote for draft resolution A/C.1/L.329 and Add.1, which was procedural in character, demanding the moral support of the General Assembly for the idea of denuclearization.

12. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) said that while his delegation appreciated the peaceful purposes underlying the draft resolution, it had always maintained that individual disarmament measures should be considered only within a broad context including conventional as well as nuclear armaments. In addition, it held that disarmament could only be achieved by stages, and that in each stage the nuclear and conventional balance of power should be preserved under effective international control. Those principles, which were not touched on in the draft resolution, applied no less to regional than to world-wide disarmament. Furthermore, it appeared from the draft resolution that the contemplated denuclearization would be political and not geographical, since the text referred only to the States of Latin America, whereas the region included other States and territories which did not fit

that description; that would remain true even if Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago were included in the nuclear-free zone. The measures called for would thus be inoperative in the case of Venezuela, which was situated in the area where the territories in question were located. Although it neither possessed, manufactured, received, stored nor transported nuclear weapons, Venezuela accordingly felt that a declaration of intention such as was embodied in the draft resolution would be inappropriate in its own case. It would therefore abstain in the vote.

13. Mr. JAYANAMA (Thailand) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution, first, because it had been initiated and prepared, after protracted consultations, by a number of countries in the region concerned itself, and secondly because Thailand approved of the cautious and gradual approach that the sponsors were taking. However, the question of nuclear-free zones was one which must be treated individually in the light of the circumstances of each case; his delegation's affirmative vote should therefore not be interpreted as a precedent.

14. Mr. BUDO (Albania) said that the denuclearization of Latin America would not only strengthen the security of the peoples concerned but also do much to reduce international tension. While it sympathized with the intentions of the sponsors of the draft resolution, his delegation had some criticisms to make of that document. The denuclearization of Latin America would be effective only if it was also binding on the United States, the only nuclear Power in the area. The United States Government maintained a number of military bases in the Panama Canal Zone, in Puerto Rico and on the territory of other Latin American countries—including a naval base at Guantánamo in Cuba, which it held against the will of the Cuban people. The essential condition for the denuclearization of Latin America, therefore, was that the United States should denuclearize its possessions and bases in the area and pledge itself not to set up any more such bases in the future. No agreement which did not provide for that condition could meet "the vital necessity of sparing present and future generations the scourge of a nuclear war", referred to in the first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

15. In the light of those considerations, his Government fully supported the position of the Cuban Government as expressed the previous day by the Cuban representative. Moreover, it regretted to note that the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution contained a reference to the partial nuclear test ban treaty of 5 August 1963, to which his Government was opposed for reasons that were well known. Under those circumstances, his delegation was not in a position to support draft resolution A/C.1/L.329 and Add.1, and would refrain from taking part in the vote.

16. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) said that the draft resolution was important not only because of any immediate or future role that might be played in the matter by the United Nations but also because a group of Member States had thought it fit to inform the Assembly of their intention to free their continent of nuclear weapons. His Government welcomed the Latin American initiative, which was in complete harmony with its conviction that mankind should be saved from the disastrous effects of the use of nuclear weapons. Moreover, it maintained cordial relationships with the Latin American countries and

was convinced of the sincerity of their desire to strengthen world peace and security by their action.

17. There were a number of principles applicable to the general problem of denuclearization. First, the denuclearization of any geographical entity, whether on land or on sea, should be examined on its merits; secondly, in some areas denuclearization had to be examined in conjunction with conditions prevailing in other neighbouring areas; thirdly, the denuclearization of any area should be worked out and agreed upon basically by the countries most concerned; fourthly, in order to have political or military effect, a denuclearization programme must have the solemn support and respect of the nuclear Powers; fifthly, a limited but technically adequate system of verification was sufficient for avoiding loopholes in the denuclearization of an area, no very elaborate system of physical inspection being required; sixthly, any system of verification must respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States concerned and must therefore be based mainly on resources and personnel recruited from those States; seventhly, a system of verification must not be used as a pretext for interference in the internal affairs of the countries concerned; and lastly, the definition of any area should embrace not only the independent States but all other territories in the area, even if the latter were under the authority of a foreign State.

18. With those principles in mind, his delegation was glad to support the draft resolution.

19. Mr. SOW (Chad) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution before the Committee. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chad had said in his statement to the General Assembly (1215th plenary meeting), no effort to reach a compromise on such vital problems should be spared. He paid tribute to the sponsors of the draft resolution, whose adoption would be a step toward freeing mankind from the nightmare of nuclear danger.

20. Mr. HAY (Australia) said that as a result of the Australian Government's general approach to the question of nuclear-free zones, his delegation had certain reservations about draft resolution A/C.1/L.329 and Add.1. In its statement on the question of general and complete disarmament (1321st meeting), the Australian delegation had said that proposals for the establishment of nuclear-free zones deserved serious consideration, provided that four basic requirements were satisfied: unanimity, balance, verification, and absence within the zone of nuclear targets. While none of those requirements had been prejudiced by the terms of the draft resolution, the very fact that a draft resolution had been submitted might have given rise to the impression that the United Nations was being asked to endorse immediately the principle of nuclear-free zones in general and the denuclearization of Latin America in particular. He was therefore glad that it had been made clear in the statements of the sponsors and of other representatives from the area that the draft resolution did not, in their view, seek to have the General Assembly impose denuclearization upon Latin America, and that it could not be interpreted as a kind of pressure by the Assembly on Latin American countries.

21. The approach taken by the Latin American States was broadly consistent with the Australian approach to the problem of nuclear-free zones. The draft resolution also had some persuasive features: it had been prepared by the Latin American countries themselves;

it did not call for the actual establishment of a nuclear-free zone but, rather, expressed the hope that the Latin American States would initiate studies of the question, as they deemed appropriate; and it left the timing, the content and the means of initiating those studies to the Latin American States themselves. He welcomed in particular the recognition in operative paragraph 3 that effective denuclearization required the co-operation of all States, particularly the nuclear Powers. That was a most important point, which had connexions both with the requirement of verification and with that of the absence of nuclear targets within the zone.

22. In those circumstances, the Australian delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

23. Mr. CHANDERLI (Algeria) said that his delegation, while it favoured the establishment of denuclearized zones, had been one of the many to express reservations concerning a draft resolution on the denuclearization of Latin America submitted during the seventeenth session of the General Assembly. Since that time, Algeria had welcomed the declaration on the subject signed by the Presidents of five Latin American Republics (A/5415/Rev.1), which was echoed by the draft resolution now before the Committee.

24. In the Algerian delegation's view, a draft resolution aimed at the effective denuclearization of Latin America should have been framed along the lines of resolution 1652 (XVI), by which the General Assembly explicitly called upon Member States to consider and respect the continent of Africa as a denuclearized zone. The idea of the necessary co-operation of Member States, particularly the nuclear Powers, was one which his delegation would have wished to see expressed in more unconditional and imperative terms than those of draft resolution A/C.1/L.329 and Add.1.

25. If Latin America was to be declared a denuclearized zone, it was important that the testing, stockpiling and transport of nuclear weapons should be banned in all territories of the region, whether they constituted independent States or were under the control of Powers outside the region; to declare denuclearized a region in which nuclear enclaves remained would be a gesture of doubtful effectiveness.

26. His delegation believed that before the United Nations took any part in the matter, the States of the region should reach an accord which would include the Powers having special agreements with Latin American territories or States. The five-Power declaration represented a promising basis for a future Latin American draft resolution providing for the genuine and effective denuclearization of the region; the Algerian delegation would gladly support such a proposal. It did not, however, consider it useful and necessary to associate itself with the Latin American intentions at the present stage, since there remained some points of uncertainty relating to the geographical and political definition of the zone to be denuclearized; it would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

27. Mr. PAPAGOS (Greece) said that all the members of the Committee seemed to be agreed that the establishment of a denuclearized zone required the unanimous consent of the countries of the region involved. Only those countries were capable of deciding whether such a measure was possible and desirable. They would have to base their decision not only on their own interests and the avowed intentions of their neighbours but also on the possible effects of

denuclearization on the over-all problem of world disarmament, since the establishment of denuclearized zones was simply a collateral measure ancillary to general and complete disarmament. Only that approach would ensure the observance of the accepted principle that the balance of existing forces should not be disturbed at any stage of disarmament.

28. Consequently, the initiative for the establishment of a denuclearized zone should not come from the General Assembly; the United Nations should do nothing that might be interpreted as exerting pressure on certain States to adopt such a measure. Denuclearization could indeed be useful under certain circumstances, but the initiative for it should always come from the Governments concerned. The task of the United Nations was to recognize a denuclearization agreement after it had been reached and to guarantee that it would be respected by all other States by relating it to the broader context of general and complete disarmament. It could also provide any technical or other assistance requested by the parties concerned during the stage of study or negotiation.

29. The establishment of a denuclearized zone raised highly complex technical and political problems, any of which might prove a stumbling-block to the conclusion of an agreement. The United Nations should therefore act only after an agreement had been concluded and ratified; a simple statement of intention on the part of the Powers concerned was not enough.

30. The draft resolution before the Committee had been submitted by several Latin American countries and appeared to have the support of almost all the other countries of the region. The Greek delegation would therefore vote for it, subject to the express reservation that the draft resolution could in no way constitute a precedent for other geographical areas.

31. Mr. HAYDER (Tunisia) said that the draft resolution was consistent with his Government's position on the general problem of denuclearization. Such a regional project, however, could be of value only if the countries of the region concerned agreed unanimously on the principles of denuclearization and on the conditions and means of implementing it. In the absence of unanimity on the part of the Latin American countries, the Tunisian delegation, without prejudice to the merits of the case, would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

32. Mr. KASSE (Mali) said that the submission of draft resolution A/C.1/L.329 and Add.1 by several Latin American countries was a praiseworthy step. Unfortunately, the establishment of denuclearized zones raised difficult problems which must be approached with the greatest caution. The excellent intentions of the Latin American countries would be ineffectual unless the nuclear Powers undertook clearly and unequivocally not only to encourage the creation of denuclearized zones but also to respect them. That was possible only to the extent that the great Powers would consent to give up their bases in foreign territories. Mali had always favoured the liquidation of foreign bases, whether they belonged to the United States, the Soviet Union or any other State, for no State could be truly independent while a portion of its territory was under foreign control. Military bases, while allegedly serving to preserve the peace, were most often a source of tension and a means of influencing the internal affairs of the countries in which they were situated. For those reasons, his delegation, while welcoming the declaration made by the Heads of

State of five Latin American Republics (A/5415/Rev.1), would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

33. Mr. VELLODI (Secretary of the Committee), speaking in accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, referred to operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.329 and Add.1, which would request the Secretary-General to extend to the States of Latin America, upon their request, such technical facilities as they might require in order to achieve the aims set forth in the resolution. In the absence of any amplification of the requirements envisaged in that paragraph, the Secretary-General assumed that the intention was that the Secretariat should provide such facilities as could be made available within its normal resources; on that understanding, he was not requesting any additional appropriation for the financial year 1964.

34. The CHAIRMAN noted that in the penultimate preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the mention of document A/5415, referring to the declaration of the Heads of State of five Latin American Republics, should read A/5415/Rev.1.

35. He called for a vote on the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.329 and Add.1).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Ethiopia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, Hungary, Mali, Mongolia, Poland, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 89 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

36. Mr. MATSUI (Japan) said that the text of the draft resolution and the explanations given by its sponsors made it clear that its purpose was not to obtain a General Assembly decision on denuclearizing Latin America but to seek the encouragement of the world community. It was his delegation's understanding, therefore, that the aim of the draft resolution was to encourage the States of Latin America to initiate studies of the measures and conditions which would constitute the basis for the denuclearization of that area once a decision was made to seek its realization;

it was in that sense that his delegation had cast its affirmative vote. The Japanese delegation's general views on the question of establishing nuclear-free zones had not been altered in any way; furthermore, its vote had been cast with the clear understanding that the resolution could in no way be interpreted as constituting a precedent for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in some other region of the world. The question of denuclearizing any given area would have to be studied most carefully and evaluated from the point of view of its feasibility, taking into account the specific conditions of the area and the possible effect of such denuclearization on international peace and security.

37. Mr. MALITZA (Romania) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it represented a possible new contribution to the establishment of a climate of détente in international relations and to the promotion of confidence in relations among States. Romania supported the argument that the agreement of the States concerned, in the free exercise of their sovereignty, was a principle fundamental to the establishment of nuclear-free zones; in its view, however, the other elements put forward as prerequisites, such as the balance of power, could not be invoked without prejudice to that principle.

38. The Romanian delegation fully supported the legitimate claims of the Cuban Government, believing that unless they were met the establishment of a denuclearized zone would be highly questionable. The inclusion of the United States bases in the Panama Canal Zone, Puerto Rico and other parts of Latin America as part of the denuclearized zone, and the dismantling of such bases, was a justified demand, which was supported by his delegation. It was regrettable that the United States delegation's statements had failed to indicate that the United States was prepared to provide the necessary guarantees in that respect.

39. He wished to make it clear that his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution in no way affected its position with regard to resolutions mentioned in the preamble for which it had not voted at past sessions.

40. He recalled that as early as 1957 and 1959 the Government of the Romanian People's Republic had addressed to the Governments of the Balkan countries proposals concerning the conversion of the Balkans into a zone of peace and co-operation free from nuclear weapons and missiles. The broad support for the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in Latin America, coming two years after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1652 (XVI) on the denuclearization of Africa, showed that States everywhere were more and more recognizing that nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world were useful and necessary.

41. Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) said the fact that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution did not mean that it did not support the idea of establishing denuclearized zones in various parts of the world, including Latin America. It felt that the establishment of such zones would strengthen the cause of peace, and it welcomed the initiative taken in that regard by the Latin American countries. In his delegation's view, however, a Latin American denuclearization agreement would have little meaning unless it applied to the United States military bases in the Panama Canal Zone, in Puerto Rico and at Guantánamo and unless the United States gave full assurances that it would respect the agreement. It

was clear from the United States representative's statement the day before (1339th meeting) that the United States would not agree to the inclusion in a Latin American denuclearized zone of its military bases, which posed a threat to the peace-loving countries of the region, especially Cuba. His delegation supported the Cuban Government's position in that regard, which reflected a desire to safeguard world peace and Cuban national security.

42. Mr. KURAL (Turkey) said that his delegation would have preferred to see the countries concerned discuss the question of Latin American denuclearization among themselves first and then inform the General Assembly of the results of their discussions. Since, however, the draft resolution did not prejudice the issue in any way and had been generally supported by the Latin American countries, his delegation had voted for it. He nevertheless wished to emphasize that it must not be regarded as setting a precedent applicable to other areas in which different conditions prevailed.

43. Mr. JABRI (Syria) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution reflected the conviction that any effort to save mankind from nuclear destruction was deserving of support. It should not, however, be taken to indicate endorsement of any of the differing viewpoints on certain controversial provisions of the draft resolution.

44. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) said that his delegation, which two years earlier had sponsored the draft resolution on the consideration of Africa as a denuclearized zone—adopted by the Assembly as resolution 1652 (XVI)—had voted for draft resolution A/C.1/L.329 and Add.1 because it favoured any action to establish such zones, whether they embraced a single country or an entire continent. He hoped that the remaining areas of foreign rule in Latin America would soon disappear and that the entire region would be denuclearized. He also hoped that the nuclear Powers, which unfortunately had not all provided the necessary guarantees concerning the denuclearization of Africa, would support the denuclearization of Latin America in accordance with operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

AGENDA ITEM 27

Question of convening a conference for the purpose of signing a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons: report of the Secretary-General (A/5518, A/C.1/L.330 and Add.1-2) (concluded)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.1/L.330 AND ADD.1-2 (concluded)

45. Mr. JAYANAMA (Thailand) said that under existing world conditions nuclear weapons represented a necessary deterrent to aggression and could be banned only within the framework of an agreement on general and complete disarmament. Thailand, which was not a nuclear Power and had no desire to become one, had always supported measures designed to prepare the way for general and complete disarmament and was in full sympathy with the motives actuating the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.330 and Add.1-2. However, his delegation felt that the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons was not an end in itself but must be accompanied by gradual disarmament under proper supervision so as not to upset the present balance of power. He would therefore be unable to vote for the draft resolution.

46. Mr. MATSUI (Japan) said that while his delegation sympathized with the motives of the draft resolution's sponsors, it felt that the question of banning the use of nuclear weapons could be realistically considered only in the context of general and complete disarmament and should not be dealt with separately by the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. It would therefore be unable to vote for the draft resolution.

47. Mr. BURNS (Canada) said that his delegation, which at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly had voted against resolution 1653 (XVI), continued to feel that the use of nuclear weapons could be effectively banned only through a comprehensive disarmament agreement and that the convening of a special conference on the question would adversely affect disarmament negotiations already under way. In particular, the request made in the draft resolution to the Eighteen-Nation Committee to study the question urgently, together with the fact that all mention of specific collateral measures had, at the request of the Soviet delegation, been omitted from the recently adopted draft resolution on disarmament, would tend to delay discussion of various questions which, in the view of most members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee, offered the best prospect for early agreement. His delegation, although it sympathized with the sponsors' motives, would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

48. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India) said that the proposed convention could not be effective unless it was actively supported by all States, including the nuclear Powers. His delegation would vote for the draft resolution, which merely referred the question to the Eighteen-Nation Committee for study and report, because it felt that the matter could be considered in the context of disarmament negotiations. Its vote should not, however, be regarded as prejudging that Committee's decision.

49. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution since it would enable the Eighteen-Nation Committee to consider the views expressed by Member States concerning the desirability of the proposed conference and to advise the General Assembly on the matter. His delegation felt, however, that the only way to prevent the use of nuclear weapons was to eliminate the weapons themselves through a disarmament agreement, and that the matter should not divert the Eighteen-Nation Committee's attention from other, more important problems.

50. Mr. HANSEN (Denmark) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution because it felt that the question of banning the use of nuclear weapons should be discussed within the framework of general and complete disarmament and that its consideration as an isolated matter might adversely affect the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee.

51. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) said that while his delegation appreciated the motives of the draft resolution's sponsors, it would vote against it because it felt that a ban on the use of nuclear weapons could be achieved only within the framework of general and complete disarmament and that separate consideration of the matter by the Eighteen-Nation Committee would delay progress towards disarmament.

52. Mr. SOW (Chad) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution, which might constitute some small advance towards establishing the neces-

sary conditions for further agreements designed to reduce tension.

53. Mr. HAY (Australia) said that any disarmament agreement must cover both conventional and nuclear weapons and must provide for disarmament balanced not only as between those two types of weapons but also in relation to the fact that a given measure could affect different countries in different ways. Although his delegation was prepared to see the question of the proposed conference referred to the Eighteen-Nation Committee for study, it felt that it must be discussed in conjunction with general and complete disarmament and, in particular, with the Soviet and United States disarmament plans, both of which now provided for the retention of a "nuclear umbrella" during the process of disarmament. Since the draft resolution did not take those considerations sufficiently into account, his delegation would be unable to vote for it.

54. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution, since the latter did not prejudice the question of convening the proposed conference but merely referred it to the Eighteen-Nation Committee for study. His delegation's vote did not commit Mexico to any particular position on the matter in the Eighteen-Nation Committee, whose basic task must be to bring about an agreement between the nuclear Powers.

55. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa) said that while his Government was in favour of holding the proposed conference, it felt that it should not take place until there was much wider agreement among the great Powers on the general question of nuclear disarmament. Since the draft resolution placed excessive emphasis on the matter and gave the impression that it should be accorded priority over various other questions relating to general and complete disarmament, his delegation would be unable to vote for it.

56. Mr. REYES (Philippines) said that inasmuch as the nuclear Powers had expressed diametrically opposed views on the draft resolution and certain other members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee felt that it would establish an excessively rigid timetable, it was clear that the question of the proposed conference could not be considered by the Eighteen-Nation Committee in a constructive, dispassionate manner at the present time. His delegation still in principle favoured the consideration of the question by the Eighteen-Nation Committee within the context of general and complete disarmament. Since, however, the sponsors of the draft resolution had failed to revise it so as to make the time-table more flexible, his delegation would be obliged to abstain in the vote.

57. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) said that he wished to appeal for support of the draft resolution to delegations which had indicated their intention of voting against it or abstaining. The draft resolution did not deal with the substance of the question but merely referred it to the Eighteen-Nation Committee, which would take account of all the views expressed during the debate in the First Committee. He noted that the draft resolution was sponsored exclusively by African delegations and that the African members of the First Committee had decided that none of them would vote against it.

58. Mr. JABRI (Syria) observed that the draft resolution would merely request the Eighteen-Nation Committee to study the question of convening the proposed conference and that that Committee was well equipped

to provide the General Assembly with guidance on the matter. His delegation would therefore vote for the draft resolution; it failed to understand the objections to it raised by some delegations.

59. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.330 and Add.1-2).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Malaysia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tanganyika, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia.

Against: Netherlands, Nicaragua, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of

Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg.

Abstaining: Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Burma, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, Iran, Israel, Japan, Lebanon, Madagascar.

The draft resolution was adopted by 54 votes to 17, with 24 abstentions.^{1/}

60. Mr. GALLIN-DOUATHE (Central African Republic) said that his delegation had arrived after the voting had started and its vote had apparently not been recorded. He wished to state that the Central African Republic would have abstained.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that that statement would go into the record.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

^{1/} See paras. 60 and 61 below.