

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**



THIRTY-SECOND SESSION  
Official Records \*

FIRST COMMITTEE  
33rd meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 15 November 1977  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 33rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 34: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 3473 (XXX) CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL I OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TIATELOLCO): REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

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

AGENDA ITEM 40: URGENT NEED FOR CESSATION OF NUCLEAR AND THERMONUCLEAR TESTS AND CONCLUSION OF A TREATY DESIGNED TO ACHIEVE A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 41: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 31/67 CONCERNING THE SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL II OF THE TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (TREATY OF TIATELOLCO) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 42: EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO IMPLEMENT THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DISARMAMENT DECADE (continued):

- (a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 43: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE DENUCLEARIZATION OF AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 44: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN THE REGION OF THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 45: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH ASIA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 46: PROHIBITION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND MANUFACTURE OF NEW TYPES OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND NEW SYSTEMS OF SUCH WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (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 A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/32/PV.33  
16 November 1977

ENGLISH

AGENDA ITEM 47: REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL  
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 48: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE  
OF PEACE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN (continued)

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

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

(a) REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT;

(b) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY;

(c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 52: SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT:  
REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 53: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE  
ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 34, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46,  
47, 48, 49, 51, 52 and 53 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon we will take decisions on draft resolutions A/C.1/32/L.4, L.5, L.10/Rev.1, and L.16.

The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 pertaining to the agenda item 46 entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons". The draft resolution has no financial implications. I shall now call on representatives wishing to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): My delegation in no way underestimates the significance of the attempt to prevent the development and manufacture of new weapons of mass destruction. However, we are not in favour of beginning the preparation of a draft treaty on those weapons at a time when the pressing and priority disarmament objectives, such as a complete test ban and a ban on chemical weapons, have not yet reached the stage of negotiations, after a lapse of many years. My delegation, therefore, has to register a strong reservation on starting negotiations on a disarmament question which is peripheral, is unclear with regard to the scope of the prohibition and presents difficulties of verification that are easy to foresee.

We take the view that the most practical and appropriate way to handle this question at this stage is not to request the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) to spend a lot of time preparing such a treaty but to keep the question under review in the CCD so that negotiations can start whenever concrete subjects of that nature come into the picture.

Accordingly, we shall abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4, and therefore support draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5, which gives full consideration to the position I have stated.

Mr. SOARES (Portugal): In the past two years the Portuguese delegation has supported the resolutions on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction, in view of the importance we attribute to

(Mr. Soares, Portugal)

that matter and despite some reservations on, or objections to, certain points of the texts approved.

This year two draft resolutions have been presented on the same item: one, contained in A/C.1/32/L.4, is similar to the resolutions approved in previous sessions of the General Assembly; the other, contained in A/C.1/32/L.5, seems to have a better approach to the problem and is closer to the views of the Portuguese Government in this matter. Therefore, my delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 and vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I wish to make a statement in explanation of my Government's vote in support of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.5 and its abstention on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.4.

The United States is committed to continuing and intensifying the search for meaningful restrictions on and the prohibition of all weapons of mass destruction. We agree that both existing and potential new types of weapons of mass destruction pose a particularly serious threat to mankind. My Government is dedicated to the objective of the elimination and prevention of future development of such weapons, under adequately verified agreements.

The problem of new weapons of mass destruction is one with which the United Nations has been concerned since 1948. It then adopted a definition of weapons of mass destruction which the United States believes to be valid today. This action defined weapons of mass destruction as atomic explosive weapons, radioactive material weapons, lethal chemical and biological weapons, and any weapons developed in the future which have characteristics comparable in destructive effect to those of the atomic bomb or other weapons that I have just mentioned.

In carrying out the purposes of that action, however, the United States is not convinced that it would be either desirable or effective to attempt to deal with them in a single treaty. We continue to believe that the most effective approach would be to keep this issue under review in order to identify potential new types of weapons of mass destruction as early as possible. When specific potential weapons are identified, we believe it would then be appropriate to develop a specific agreement dealing with the weapon in question. However, any new weapons of mass destruction will undoubtedly have different technical characteristics as compared with other weapons, and we believe it is particularly important and necessary for any agreement to control such a new weapon of mass destruction to be tailored to the specific weapon. That is true not only because the dangers of weapons of mass destruction may vary but also because the method of verifying compliance with an agreement to ban those weapons may be quite different, depending upon the nature of the threat posed by the weapon and its characteristics which might determine the means for its control.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

The United States does believe that certain action could be taken consistent with the definition given by the United Nations in 1948 and which in fact would be a further step in implementing the action called for by that 1948 decision. This would be the negotiation of a convention banning radiological weapons, that is, weapons which employ the destructive effects of radiation emitted by decay of radioactive materials. The United States has demonstrated that it is prepared to negotiate such a convention.

However, with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4, the United States does not feel that the negotiation of an over-all convention on weapons that we do not know or understand would be a workable action in the cause of peace. The United States is, however, prepared rigorously to support the purposes of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5. The United States is gratified that the Committee is united in its recognition of the potential danger of new types of weapons of mass destruction and pledges its vigilance against the threat posed by such weapons.

Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria): The Austrian delegation will abstain in the vote on the two draft resolutions which have been submitted under agenda item 46, entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons", that is to say, on draft resolutions A/C.1/32/L.4 and L.5. This should in no way be interpreted as a lack of interest on our part in the problem of the production of new weapons of mass destruction; on the contrary, Austria attaches and has always attached particular importance to the prohibition of any new kinds of devastating weaponry.

However, we can see only limited value in proposing draft resolutions which right from the beginning are faced with the disapproval of one or more of those countries to which they are mainly addressed. The Austrian delegation has therefore privately urged the authors of those drafts to do their utmost to arrive at a single text that would be widely acceptable. We deplore the fact that it has not been possible to achieve that goal, in spite of the declared preparedness of the authors of the two drafts to make sincere efforts to reach an agreement.

(Mr. Sucharipa, Austria)

Nevertheless, the Austrian delegation still hopes that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), which will have to take into account the two resolutions - which, I assume, will both be adopted in a few minutes - when it resumes its deliberations on the subject-matter, will in due course be able to present to the General Assembly the outlines of an agreed approach on how to proceed further with regard to the question of the prohibition of the manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction.

In our opinion, that would be in keeping with what we consider to be the main task of the CCD, that is, sincerely to discuss and debate disarmament proposals and, in co-operation among all its members, lay the necessary foundations for workable decisions by the General Assembly in order to promote effective disarmament and arms control measures.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): With the difficulties that we notice have been encountered in various forums or negotiations, we believe that it is now clear that it is easier to develop new weapons than to control their use - not to speak of banning them completely.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

We have noticed from statistics that the major military Powers already have in their arsenals enough weapons of mass destruction to destroy mankind many times over. We have also noticed that in spite of this research is still proceeding not only to discover new weapons of mass destruction but to perfect those in existence. Such perfection, of course, can only be designed to make these weapons more efficient in their destructive capacity. As long as the world situation remains what it is, the danger of the continuance of the race to possess the most efficient weapons of mass destruction will continue.

While realizing that the ultimate objective of complete and general disarmament is still very far from us and while settling, as we seem to have, for a step-by-step approach, we notice that progress in this approach has been very slow, partly for political but also partly for technical reasons. While negotiations are going on for the control of weapons already known we find that new weapons are coming on to the scene, or at least there are reports of the possibility of new weapons, which would probably be more efficient in their destructive capacity, coming on to the scene.

We all applauded the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) when it was concluded, and my own country was one of the first to sign it. But then we also know at this time, with the wisdom of hindsight, that perhaps one of the problems with the NPT, or at least the reason it has not commended itself to quite a number of countries that are not yet parties, is that while the NPT controls the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons it does not do much about the control of vertical proliferation. It seems to me, therefore, that if we think in terms of any new instrument to control the development of any new types of weapons we ought to make sure that the instrument controls vertical as well as horizontal development of such weapons.

It also seems to my delegation that the discussion of item 46 should be conducted in such a way as will result in an all-embracing prohibition which will not leave any loophole, preventing some but permitting others to refine weapons of mass destruction the principles of which they already know.

The Nigerian delegation has therefore considered the two draft resolutions A/C.1/32/L.4 and A/C.1/32/L.5 on the basis of its belief that any prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction should, as I have said, be all-embracing and leave no loophole.

First of all, we notice that while draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 is based on agenda item 46, which is entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons", draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 seeks, in our view, to modify the very title of the item. It is, as we see from the document, a draft resolution designed to prohibit "Weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles". We think that by this subtitle and by this modification the draft has left a very serious gap, one which we believe could be filled by the refinement of weapons of mass destruction which are already in the arsenals of the major military Powers but which could be refined to make them more efficient. We referred to one such weapon during our general statement in this Committee.

Secondly, we also notice that draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 is a logical follow-up of previous resolutions, and in particular resolution 31/74 adopted last year. On the other hand, resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 seems to have avoided carefully any reference to the previous consideration of this item in the past two years.

Thirdly, we notice that, while the draft in A/C.1/32/L.4 requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) to continue negotiations already begun on this subject - and these are negotiations which were being advanced with the assistance of qualified governmental experts - draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 again seems to diverge completely from the previous negotiations and therefore to restrict the future work of the CCD on this subject.

We also notice that draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5, in its operative paragraph 3, seeks, in fact, to prejudge the conclusion which will be reached at the end of the negotiations on this subject.

The Nigerian delegation believes that work on an agreement to prohibit the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons is not inconsistent with ongoing negotiations. In this case perhaps reference should be made to the negotiations on radiological weapons. We do not believe that a comprehensive agreement to prohibit the development of these weapons would jeopardize the ongoing discussions on specific, identified weapons of mass destruction.

We therefore will not be in a position to support draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5, on which we shall abstain, but we will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4, which we believe seeks to advance the work of the General Assembly on this particular item in the past two years.

Mr. CHAMPENOIS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Speaking on behalf of the nine members of the European Community, I wish to state that those nine countries will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 and will abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4, dealing with the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

We recognize the value of the Soviet initiative to submit this matter to the attention of the international community. It is therefore with regret that the countries of the European Community will abstain again on the draft resolution sponsored by the USSR and other countries. The reason for this abstention relates to the proposed method - namely, the negotiation of an over-all treaty dealing with the whole question.

We are opposed to that over-all approach: first of all, we believe that, by its very nature, such a treaty can only be vague and ambiguous with regard to the definition of the weapons it seeks to prohibit. An over-all agreement would have to cover extremely different types of weapons, some of which are not yet known.

We also believe that the necessarily imprecise nature of the definition will make it difficult to devise any effective verification formula.

It is for those reasons, which are based on the approach taken, that the nine countries of the European Community will abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4.

Those countries would also like to take this opportunity to state their position on the efforts being made to prohibit new weapons of mass destruction. We believe that those efforts cannot imply any restriction with regard to the development of scientific research.

Mr. MADADHA (Jordan): The Jordanian delegation wishes to clarify its position on the two draft resolutions - A/C.1/32/L.4 and A/C.1/32/L.5 - which deal with the subject of prohibition of the development and manufacture of weapons of mass destruction.

We do not find a difference of substance and ultimate aim in these draft resolutions: both of them have as their objective to relieve mankind of the

(Mr. Madadha, Jordan)

danger of these destructive weapons. We believe that the differences lie in wording and reference, rather than in substance. The ultimate humanitarian goal is the same, and the substance is the same.

Therefore, we shall vote in favour of both draft resolutions.

Mr. PAWLAK (Poland): Poland has, from the very beginning, supported the efforts made towards the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. We are of the opinion that the approach in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.4 is more far reaching and attacks the problem more substantially than draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5. It will, I hope, lead to an international treaty prohibiting the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction.

My delegation believes that an early agreement to that effect would play a major role in halting the qualitative arms race and preventing use of the latest scientific and technological achievements for the purpose of war and mass annihilation.

That is why the Polish delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.4 and abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5.

Mrs. BORODOWSKY JACHIEVICH (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation considers that draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 fulfils our commitment to reach an agreement prohibiting the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. It takes into consideration the vast technical and material resources used not only in weapons manufacture but also in research into perfecting new, more deadly weapons which entail a latent danger to international peace and security. In addition, that draft contributes to the cessation of the arms race.

Since the CCD has not yet reached final conclusions on other aspects of disarmament, we must not fail to give this matter the urgent attention it requires.

Many delegations, throughout the general debate on disarmament, have indicated that at the present time it is necessary not only to achieve nuclear disarmament but

(Mrs. Borodowsky Jachievich, Cuba)

to adopt collateral disarmament measures that will lead to general and complete disarmament. Accordingly, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 because it maintains a logical sequence in dealing with the item, and we shall abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5, since it introduces new elements into this vital subject of disarmament.

Mr. KITI (Kenya): In explanation of my delegation's vote before the vote, I wish to say that my country, Kenya, believes in the eventual attainment of the objective of general and complete disarmament. We will therefore support any proposal that tends towards that objective.

We have studied carefully the two draft resolutions with this principle in mind, and we should like, therefore, to state that we find draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4, in addition to the very valid statements made by our brother from Nigeria, more in keeping with the objective of general and complete disarmament; whereas draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5, while aiming at the same objective, has certain constraints and restrictions. We have been particularly concerned with operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 which, in our view, departs somewhat from the objective of complete disarmament, since that paragraph tends to call on the international community to wait until a weapon has been developed, and also requests the CCD to discuss not agreements but the "desirability" of formulating agreements on the prohibition of such weapons of mass destruction.

Therefore, having considered those two points very carefully, we will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 and very reluctantly abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 because we feel that, although it aims at the same thing, it is restrictive in a way.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to the voting on the draft resolutions. We shall vote first on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 87 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.

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

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden): The Swedish delegation, a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5, has abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4. We wish to explain the reasons for this position.

But first I would express our regret that it was not possible to amalgamate the two texts into one in view of their considerable similarity in purpose.

Sweden is deeply convinced of the importance of preventing at an early stage the use of scientific and technological progress for the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. We are therefore strongly in favour of the ultimate objective of both draft resolutions, which is to take measures in order that scientific discovery could be used for the benefit of mankind and not for its destruction. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4, we feel it, however, appropriate to restate views already expressed by Sweden on previous occasions.

Firstly, it is our understanding that the concept "new weapons of mass destruction" relates to such weapons as are developed on the basis of scientific principles other than those used in the weapons named in the 1948 definition of weapons of mass destruction. Secondly, I wish to recall the concern we have expressed about the idea of a general agreement in this field. One aspect of this concern is the problem of arriving at sufficiently clear definitions. We have noted with satisfaction that the draft opens the possibility for the conclusion of agreements aimed at specific new developments as need arises. In this respect it seems to be a similar approach to the one suggested in draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5.

My delegation's co-sponsorship of resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 is an indication of our support for the general approach advocated in the text: that is, to request the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) to keep under review relevant developments of new weapons of mass destruction and to consider the desirability of any specific agreements on their prohibition. This is a general line which the Swedish delegation has followed during the discussions in the General Assembly and in the CCD since this item was first introduced by the Soviet Union in 1975.

Mr. HSU Yi-min (China) (interpretation from Chinese): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4, which was just adopted, the Chinese delegation wishes to state that it did not participate in the vote. At the same time, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5, which is to be voted on, we are not going to participate in the vote. I would ask that our statement be included in the record.

U MAUNG MAUNG GYEE (Burma): By mistake my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4, but we wished to vote for it.

Mr. KONDE (Guinea) (interpretation from French): I just wanted it to be recorded that the Republic of Guinea, whose representative was absent from the room during the vote, wishes to state that had its delegation been present it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4.

Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) (interpretation from French): During the general debate on the question of disarmament, my delegation had an opportunity to state clearly its position in this Committee. After having studied carefully the two draft resolutions, A/C.1/32/L.4 and A/C.1/32/L.5, that we are considering, my delegation came to the conclusion that resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 was satisfactory since it supported the view that this draft resolution took of the question, and that is why we voted in favour of it.

On the other hand, my delegation noted that draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5, although it does contain certain positive features, does not positively embrace all the problems with which we are concerned, and so we will abstain in the voting on it.

The CHAIRMAN: As there are no further speakers in explanation of the vote after the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4, I declare consideration of that draft resolution concluded.

The Committee will now take a decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.5, pertaining to agenda item 46, entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons". The draft resolution has no

(The Chairman)

financial implications. It is sponsored by 11 delegations, and was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom on 9 November 1977.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): The Committee has just adopted by an overwhelming majority draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4, which was submitted by the German Democratic Republic, Hungary and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It is now going to vote on the other draft resolution on this subject, namely, A/C.1/32/L.5. My delegation, together with the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4, will abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5. The reasons for this attitude are as follows.

Draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 does not meet our concerns about the continuing arms race with new types of weapons of mass destruction based on new principles of action. In order to prevent the development and manufacture of these dangerous types of weapons in time, immediate and effective measures should be taken. The solution of this problem would include both the preparation and continuation of a global, all-embracing agreement, binding for all States, thus putting an end to the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction.

Draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 was very clear in this sense. It requested the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to continue negotiations with the assistance of qualified governmental experts aimed at working out the text 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 and, when necessary, specific agreements on this subject.

In comparison with that clear and unambiguous intention, draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 is considerably less explicit. Instead of requesting the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to continue the search for an understanding on a global and all-embracing agreement, it only asks that Committee to keep this problem under review and to consider the desirability of formulating agreements on the prohibition of any specific new weapons which may be identified. Thus,

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

it disregards the progress that has already been achieved by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament over the last two years on the road to the preparation of a comprehensive and global prohibition.

This draft lags far behind our concerns and the texts of resolutions which have been adopted in this respect by the General Assembly since 1975.

This is the main reason why the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 when it is put to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/32/L.5. The United Kingdom has asked for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Austria, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Jamaica, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Poland, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Zambia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 35 abstentions.

Mr. LIMA (Cape Verde) (interpretation from French): My delegation intended to abstain on this vote, but we inadvertently voted in favour. I should like to have that corrected.

The CHAIRMAN: Your request has been noted.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour both of resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 and A/C.1/32/L.5. We did this because we do not believe these texts are incompatible in their substance. We could not accept that draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 should be interpreted in a restrictive manner. Even if the procedure is a little different in each case, we do hope that the sponsors of those two texts will continue informally their relations and their talks at Geneva, apart from the formal meetings of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. There are imperative priorities that should be fixed for those meetings. I hope, therefore, that they will continue to meet informally with a view to reaching agreement on a text which will satisfy both groups and which might serve as a basis for future consideration of this question in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

Miss FAROUK (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): My abstention on the draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.5 should not be interpreted as meaning opposition to that draft. My delegation had already voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4 which, it seems to us, meets more specifically and more comprehensively the requirements of agenda item 46, namely, the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

Having voted for draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.4, my delegation decided in the interests of consistency, not to support a more restrictive draft.

Mr. GARBA (Niger) (interpretation from French): We have already said in our statement of Friday, 11 November, that we note that draft resolutions A/C.1/32/L.4 and A/C.1/32/L.5 do have some points of agreement and that the two parties ought to have been able to reach a single text. But since that has not been the case, we have supported both drafts. In doing this, we wanted to encourage any initiative in the direction of disarmament; we think that no initiative in that direction should be disregarded.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to explain its vote, I shall declare the consideration of this draft resolution concluded.

This concludes consideration of item 46.

(The Chairman)

The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.10/Rev.1 pertaining to item 43, entitled "Implementation of the declaration on the denuclearization of Africa". This draft resolution has no financial implications. It is sponsored by 39 delegations and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria on 9 November 1977.

I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their position in that connexion.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States is pleased to be able to support the objectives of this resolution. First, we strongly support the concept of nuclear-free zones in Africa as in other regions of the world. As recently as 19 October of this year President Carter reiterated our belief that arrangements of this sort would contribute to efforts to control the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In particular, we believe that it is essential that Africa be kept free of nuclear weapons, for their introduction into that continent could only threaten the security of all its nations.

Secondly, my Government has shared the concern of the international community that South Africa's advanced technology and, in particular, its unsafeguarded nuclear facilities could be employed to develop a nuclear-weapons capability. Reports that nuclear test preparations might be under way at a site in the Kalahari Desert in South Africa have clearly added to world concern. We are in consultation with the Government of South Africa and have urged it to take concrete action to allay the fears of the international community on this account. As you are aware, these consultations have resulted in assurances that, first, South Africa does not have or intend to develop nuclear explosives for any purpose, peaceful or otherwise; secondly, South Africa is not developing a test facility for nuclear explosives; and, thirdly, there will be no nuclear explosive testing of any kind in South Africa. My Government regards these assurances as a vital step in assuring the world of South Africa's intentions. We would regard with the utmost gravity any indication that they would not be honoured.

In voting for this resolution, the United States wishes to reaffirm its view that nuclear co-operation under appropriate full-scope international safeguards and controls does not contribute to the proliferation of nuclear weapons and need not enhance national capabilities to achieve a nuclear-explosives status. Quite

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

the contrary, we are persuaded that such co-operation can be a major incentive to recipient States to avoid programmes which would lead to nuclear weapons development. We believe that the denial of co-operation on the grounds that a country might be on the threshold of developing nuclear weapons can do nothing to prevent that risk and, more than likely, will precipitate national decisions to cross the line between exclusively peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the acquisition of a nuclear explosives capability. We must not lose sight of the fact that the common objective should be to ensure that nuclear energy is developed for peaceful purposes and to avoid measures that may in the last analysis defeat this fundamental purpose.

We are urging South Africa as well as other countries which have not yet become parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty to do so and to put all their nuclear facilities under full scope international safeguards. We hope that our efforts will bear fruit soon in the case of South Africa. Meanwhile, we consider it unwise and impractical to cut off peaceful, safeguarded nuclear co-operation with South Africa. We would not be able to support proposals for the Security Council to take such steps under the present circumstances.

In closing, permit me to pay a tribute to the efforts of the representatives of the African countries, and particularly the efforts of the representative of Nigeria, which led to formulating a resolution capable of attracting the widest possible support.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): My delegation considers the draft resolution proposed, A/C.1/32/L.10/Rev.1, to be an important expression of the view of the African countries and, indeed, of the international community that nuclear weapons should not spread to the continent of Africa. Pakistan welcomes in particular the fact that the draft resolution pinpoints the precise source from which the danger of proliferation arises today in Africa, that is, the racist régime of South Africa whose ambitions to acquire nuclear status are now well known, despite its protestations to the contrary. Important nuclear facilities in South Africa remain outside of any international safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). We therefore believe that the concern voiced, in the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, that South Africa may detonate a nuclear explosion, to be most timely, and also the demand contained in operative paragraph 3 that South Africa refrain from conducting any nuclear explosion.

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

Operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution is the first occasion where the Security Council has been called upon to prevent an attempt by a State to develop nuclear weapons. That is an important development. We also agree that while South Africa fails to give sufficient assurances about its intentions, nuclear co-operation with it should be reconsidered. In our view it is strange that nuclear co-operation with South Africa is to be continued while some of its important facilities are outside IAEA safeguards and while such co-operation is hindered in other cases where all facilities are under safeguards.

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

It is our hope that the determination exhibited by the international community in this case, that is on the proposal for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, will be matched by a similar determination in other areas of the world, particularly where other nuclear-weapon-free zones have been proposed and are under consideration.

For all those reasons, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/32/L.10/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.10/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America,  
Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen,  
Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

The draft resolution was adopted by 118 votes to none.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): We pressed the "yes" button, but our vote was not recorded.

The CHAIRMAN: One cannot vote after the machine has been locked. Your vote will be recorded accordingly.

Mr. BANDORA (United Republic of Tanzania): I regret that the representative of Tanzania was out of the room while the voting was taking place, but it is the wish of my delegation to vote yes on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The wish of the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania has been noted.

Mr. RIOS (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): At the time when I came into the room the voting machine was being locked, and I am sorry that Panama's affirmative vote was not registered.

The CHAIRMAN: It will be noted.

I call on the representative of France, who wishes to explain his vote.

Mr. MISTRAL (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation was happy to vote in favour of the draft resolution concerning the denuclearization of Africa. I should just like to make one thing clear. Our recognition of Africa as a denuclearized zone, so far as the French Territories are concerned, should be seen in the light of the clarification given by the present Minister for Foreign Affairs of France, Mr. de Guiringaud, when he was Permanent Representative to the United Nations, in this very Committee on 26 November 1975, when he stated France's over-all position concerning denuclearized zones. I should like to quote the relevant passage on this point:

(Mr. Mistral, France)

"... the denuclearization régime established by a treaty cannot affect the status of Territories under the sovereignty of France which may be geographically located within a denuclearized zone. Nor could the French Government accept injunctions from other States with a view to compelling it to agree to a denuclearization status for all or part of the territories under its sovereignty." (A/C.1/PV.2098, p. 61)

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.10/Rev.1, which has just been adopted, the Committee has concluded its consideration of agenda item 43.

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.16 pertaining to agenda item 52, entitled "Special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". The financial implications of that draft resolution are set forth in document A/C.1/32/L.30, which has been circulated. The draft resolution is sponsored by 37 delegations and was introduced by the representative of Norway on 11 November 1977. The sponsors have expressed the wish that it be adopted by consensus.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it, that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.16 by consensus.

The draft resolution was adopted.

Mr. HSU Yi-min (China) (interpretation from Chinese): With regard to the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.16, the Chinese delegation wishes to state that it dissociates itself from the consensus. We request that our statement be included in the record.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement of the Chinese delegation has been noted.

I should like to propose that the Committee take decisions on the following draft resolutions at its meeting tomorrow morning: A/C.1/32/L.17, L.18, L.25 and L.27. Draft resolution A/C.1/32/L.25 has not been formally introduced in the Committee; however, under rule 120 of the rules of procedure it is not necessary for the authors or sponsors of a draft resolution to introduce it formally from the floor.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.