

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION
Official Records*



FIRST COMMITTEE
57th meeting
held on
Thursday, 30 November 1978
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 57TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CHERKAOUI (Morocco)

later: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 35: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SECOND CONFERENCE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 37: CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 38: IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 32/78: REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 46: 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 47: 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 48: WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 49: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF USE OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE DEEMED TO BE EXCESSIVELY INJURIOUS OR TO HAVE INDISCRIMINATE EFFECTS: REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY CONFERENCE (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* 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.1/33/PV.57
1 December 1978

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 35, 37, 38, 46, 47, 48 AND 49

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French). We shall continue with the consideration of item 47 and the draft resolutions pertaining thereto. The Committee will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32 concerning study on nuclear weapons.

I shall call on the representative of Sweden who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32 entitled "Study on nuclear weapons".

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): In her statement here on 20 October of this year, the Under-Secretary of State, Mrs. Thorsson, made a rather comprehensive presentation of the proposed study on nuclear weapons. In my introduction today of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32 I can therefore be quite brief. On behalf of the co-sponsors - Australia, Austria, India, Indonesia, Mauritius, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Venezuela and Yugoslavia, in addition to my own country - I want to stress the following points.

It was solemnly established at the special session as our unanimous opinion that the United Nations has a central role and a primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament and that it should play a more active role in this field.

We have likewise agreed that the highest priority in disarmament negotiations should be assigned to nuclear weapons.

It is therefore an unacceptable anomaly that the United Nations does not dispose of its own up-to-date factual study on this priority issue. The study we have was published more than 10 years ago and is in great need both of updating and of broadening. What we now need is a study which will give us a sufficient factual basis for our future deliberations so that they can make their full impact.

Such a more comprehensive United Nations study will be a support for our future deliberations, thus increasing their impact. It will broaden the dissemination of carefully selected and presented information about arsenals, the existence of which is only too obvious, and about measures undertaken in order to remedy the actual critical situation of the armaments race.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

The study should therefore have a broad mandate and concern all nuclear arms. The study should comprise: first, a descriptive part dealing with the present status of nuclear arsenals, trends in the technological development of nuclear-weapon systems and the effects of their use; secondly, a part analysing the implications of the nuclear arms race in terms relevant to the disarmament efforts. In this context the study should also examine the various leading doctrines of the deterrence and other theories concerning nuclear weapons.

In the draft resolution the Secretary-General is requested to carry out such a study with the assistance of qualified experts. The group of experts need not be large. The study should be based on open material already available. To this material can be added such additional information that Governments feel possible to contribute for the purpose of the study. We are fully aware that the kind of factual information that is relevant in this context is in part of a sensitive nature. It is naturally not the intention that Governments should feel themselves pressed to furnish information which would clearly infringe upon their need of external security. We also feel, however, that there is a considerable difference between such restrictions and a reasonable selection and compilation of already available data about the all too obvious arsenals.

I also wish to recall in this context what was stressed by the Government in the statement of our Under-Secretary of State in the First Committee on 20 October of this year, namely, that

"... a general description of arsenals and technological trends could probably in substantial parts be carried out without relying on absolute figures."

(A/C.1/33/PV.10, p. 28)

Active participation in this study by the military leading States would be based on their goodwill to contribute to a common endeavour of greatest importance not least to the non-nuclear-weapon States. But we are convinced that they will consider it also to be in their own solid interest to contribute to a reliable conception of their nuclear arsenals and to the other elements which justify their defence postures, in particular if this, as we are convinced, is a necessary prerequisite for the mutual understanding which can lead to disarmament guaranteeing the security of all States.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

It is not only the nuclear-weapon States, however, that could contribute to such a study. For that reason, we propose a paragraph to the effect that all Governments would be invited to co-operate with the Secretary-General, so that the objectives of the study might be achieved.

It is important that the proposed study should be initiated and completed as soon as possible. On the other hand, we cannot assume that it would take less than one year. For that reason we have proposed, in the last operative paragraph of the draft resolution, that the Secretary-General should submit a final report to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session. At the same time we imagine that the Secretary-General would keep the thirty-fourth session informed of the progress of the study, in a form that he would find appropriate. We believe also that it would be useful for the Secretary-General to avail himself of the advice of the advisory board in the carrying out of the study, without causing delay.

I should like to conclude with an appeal to the nuclear Powers on behalf of the sponsors of this draft resolution. In the Final Document of the special session it was recognized that all the nuclear weapon States, particularly those with the most important nuclear arsenals, bear a special responsibility for nuclear disarmament. We hope that that responsibility will be reflected in their contribution when it comes to accepting and contributing to this proposed study, as was the case 11 years ago. We hope therefore that the draft resolution will meet with broad approval.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I shall now call upon those representatives who have asked to speak in explanation of their vote before the vote.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States has asked to speak for the purpose of explaining its reservations about the draft resolution before the Committee, proposing a study on nuclear weapons. We question the wisdom and value of a new study on nuclear weapons but if one is to be mandated by the General Assembly we think it is important that the terms of reference should be carefully designed to ensure the most objective and useful product possible.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

The United States finds the terms of reference in the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32 inadequate in a number of respects. No provision is made for consideration of the progress already made and the experience gained in negotiating measures of nuclear arms control, nor is there any provision for analysis of obstacles to achieving balanced verifiable agreements to limit nuclear weapons or of the conditions which must be satisfied if such agreements are to be achieved. We question also the need for a fresh review of the effects of nuclear weapons, which were examined in the 1968 study.

Elaborating satisfactory terms of reference is a task for experts, not one which, we think, could be satisfactorily performed by the General Assembly or this Committee in the context of negotiating the text of a resolution. We believe the most reasonable approach would be for the General Assembly to mandate the Secretary-General, with the assistance of competent government experts, to develop terms of reference for a possible study of nuclear weapons and to report back to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session for consideration of the possibility of mandating a study along the lines proposed.

We would have been prepared to support a draft resolution along those lines but, in view of the inadequacies we perceive in the terms of reference of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32, my Government must abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

Mr. FOKINE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has already expressed doubts in connexion with the increase of the number of studies on questions on disarmament which are to be carried out within the United Nations. Those doubts fully apply to the proposal for the establishment of a group of experts to carry out a study on nuclear weapons and disarmament. As is known, the Soviet Union proposes that the nuclear-weapon States should get together in order to begin talks, with the participation of a certain number of non-nuclear-weapon States, concerning the cessation of production of nuclear weapons of all kinds and the elimination of stockpiles of nuclear

(Mr. Fokine, USSR)

weapons, leading to their total liquidation. Those would be practical steps in the field of nuclear disarmament.

From the point of view of genuine disarmament, what could possibly be achieved by carrying out a study of, for instance, the doctrines of deterrence, of present nuclear arsenals, of trends in the technological development of nuclear weapons, and so on? Obviously, nothing, apart from diverting the attention and resources of the United Nations from contributing to genuine disarmament. Such a study, in the view of the Soviet delegation, would not bring us any closer to the solution of the problem of the cessation of the nuclear arms race by a single step. That is why the Soviet delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32.

Mr. LENNUYEUX-COMMIÈNE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation has no objection in principle to an initiative aimed at increasing the volume of basic information in the field of disarmament. Moreover, we have insisted on the need to increase research in order to improve available data for the discussion and negotiation of questions of disarmament within the framework of the United Nations. Nevertheless, it seems to us that a study of such a complex and sensitive matter as that of nuclear weapons requires a particularly cautious, well-balanced and objective approach.

(Mr. Lennuyeux-Commene, France)

It is in this spirit that the French delegation joined other delegations in seeking some changes in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32, the purpose being to ensure that the proposed study would guarantee that information available on nuclear weapons would be sufficiently broad and well-balanced. These changes were not accepted by the sponsors of the draft resolution. My delegation, therefore, has decided to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32.

However, France will not refuse to co-operate actively with the Secretary-General in carrying out such a study, providing that all nuclear Powers do the same, the more so since everyone here knows that the constituent elements of the French nuclear force are, in the main, common knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Since there are no other speakers wishing to explain their vote before the vote, we shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32. I wish to inform the Committee that this draft resolution has 15 sponsors and that it has financial implications which are contained in document A/C.1/33/L.48.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32 was adopted by 89 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.*

* Subsequently, the delegations of Barbados, Cape Verde, the Ivory Coast, Mali, Mauritius, Niger, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Tunisia advised the Secretariat that had they been present they would have voted in favour.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I shall now call on those representative wishing to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. PRZYGODZKI (Poland): Poland was among the countries which 12 years ago initiated a comprehensive study of the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons. The contents of this study have been widely disseminated, contributing undoubtedly to a better understanding of the threat posed by nuclear weapons.

We are convinced that there still is a continuous need to acquaint world public opinion with the dangers stemming from the nuclear arms race and the immeasurable disasters which could befall mankind were nuclear war ever to erupt. My delegation nevertheless abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32. We did so for the following reasons: first, we believe there is quite an ample amount of available factual information relating to the subject under consideration. It is essential that concrete steps be taken by respective Governments, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations to increase the dissemination of such information in accordance with the recommendations of the tenth special session and of resolution A/C.1/33/L.10/Rev.1 adopted in this Committee only a few days ago. Our efforts in this Organization should rather concentrate on promoting actual measures of disarmament and in particular on an early start to negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Secondly, we have heard some reservations as to the scope of the proposed study as envisaged in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. Thirdly, it is the considered view of the Polish delegation that prior to any decision which the General Assembly might take on the proposals to initiate new disarmament studies, such proposals should be carefully examined by the advisory board set up by the Secretary-General in accordance with paragraph 124 of the Final Document of the tenth special session to advise him on various aspects of studies to be made under the auspices of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, including a programme of such studies.

Such an approach by the Polish delegation to the question at hand derives from our firm conviction that in order to avoid undue dissipation of efforts it is necessary to undertake the elaboration of only those studies which can really prove conducive to disarmament endeavours and particularly to initiating or facilitating the conduct of disarmament negotiations.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian).

During the vote on the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32 my delegation abstained although it is well known that the German Democratic Republic has systematically been in favour of adopting effective measures towards the prevention of a future nuclear war. We have genuine doubts concerning the usefulness and need for the preparation by experts of yet another study on nuclear weapons. We have on several occasions expressed the view that the preparation of studies cannot and must not replace steps towards disarmament.

In the specific instance, doubts are strengthened by the following facts: the appeal to Governments to provide appropriate information for the compilation of the study will not for well-known reasons meet with any response and, therefore, the study would be based upon material which, as experience has shown, has frequently been of doubtful quality and, therefore, the results of the study cannot lead to any new conclusions. The only conclusion indeed from such a study could be the fact that the destructive power of nuclear weapons is sufficient seriously to threaten the life of mankind. This observation is not challenged and has been universally accepted even in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

Accordingly, in our opinion, it is inadmissible in these circumstances to appoint a group of experts and to spend vast financial resources on this. As was stated by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty at the recent conference of the Political Consultative Committee effective measures should be adopted which would lead to the cessation of the arms race. The top priority task in this respect is to agree on the beginning of talks on the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons in all its forms, and the gradual reduction of its stockpiles down to their total liquidation. The enactment of such measures could be an effective contribution to the prevention of the threat of the outbreak of a world-wide nuclear war. All actions should be refrained from that might divert attention from performing these principal tasks.

Mr. PEARSON (Canada): Canada voted for this draft resolution for two principal reasons. First, we think the United Nations ought to play a more central role in matters of disarmament than it has in the past, even though the actual negotiations may take place elsewhere. Secondly, we believe that research on questions relating to disarmament is inadequate and ought to be improved as well as made more widely known.

On the other hand, we do have two reservations which we should like to make about the terms of reference. Such a study, even though based on public sources, will be less credible if the major nuclear Powers do not co-operate in its design and formulation. Therefore, the mandate is of critical importance and ought to be considered at greater length and with more expert scrutiny than has been possible at this session. The advisory board to the Secretary-General has as one of its functions to make this kind of appraisal, and we are glad to note that the representative of Sweden has proposed that this be done. Moreover, the board can and should offer advice on priorities for studies. If too much is attempted at once, the quality of all studies may suffer. My Government will consider whether and how it can co-operate with this study in the light of the conclusions of the advisory board.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French). We have thus concluded consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.32.

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.36, entitled "Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present", under agenda item 47, General and complete disarmament. This draft resolution has 16 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the Soviet Union at the 54th meeting of the Committee on 20 November 1978.

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

Mr. WONG (Singapore): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38, on "Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present".

In voting for the draft resolution, my delegation supports the general principle that the proliferation of nuclear weapons should be stopped and not encouraged. However, in our view, the reality of the situation in one region is such that the application of this principle to that region is a question that should be negotiated among the parties concerned.

Mr. FAN (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Many countries call on the nuclear States not to station nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear States. That demand is reasonable. China has consistently stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and for the dismantling of all military bases stationed abroad, including nuclear bases.

Everybody can see that the two super-Powers possess nuclear arsenals on an unprecedented scale. The Soviet Union, in particular, possesses a vast conventional superiority in Europe. Under such circumstances, the mere restriction of the stationing of nuclear weapons by nuclear States on the territories of other States cannot eliminate the danger of war.

We are of the view that pending the attainment of the lofty goal of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons the imperative task at present in safeguarding international peace and security is to call on the super-Powers to undertake unconditionally not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones and to dismantle all their military bases stationed abroad, as well as to demand that they take effective measures to reduce substantially their nuclear arsenals and conventional armaments.

In accordance with this principled position, the Chinese delegation will not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38 and requests that the Chinese position be reflected in the records.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): With regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.38, my delegation wishes to explain its negative vote as follows.

The international community, particularly in the European region, currently relies upon a regional framework for the maintenance of security. This framework is based on the principle of a balance between the totals of nuclear and conventional weapons held by the parties concerned, as well as of mutual deterrents. Such a framework constitutes an important basis for maintaining international peace.

In the circumstances, a measure imposing certain restrictions on the deployment of nuclear weapons, as is proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38 would not only be of doubtful effectiveness, but might even destabilize the international military balance, and thereby bring about results directly contrary to the strengthening of the maintenance of peace.

Hence, my delegation cannot agree to the idea of this draft resolution. My country believes it to be quite important that the nuclear-weapon States should proceed step by step to realize concrete and effective nuclear disarmament measures, and therefore would like once again to appeal to the nuclear weapon States to adopt such an approach. As a matter of national policy, however, my country has consistently upheld the three non-nuclear principles, namely, of not possessing, not manufacturing and not permitting the entry into Japan of nuclear weapons. From a global perspective my delegation is unable, for the reasons I have just stated, to support the draft resolution.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): In the view of the United States, the issue of stationing nuclear weapons in the territories of States concerns mutual security interests and cannot be properly dealt with through blanket and universal measures such as that contained in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38 before us. Therefore it is the view of the United States that the issue should be addressed in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones so that it can be decided on a case-by-case basis.

(Mr. Fisher United States)

If a non-nuclear-weapon State or group of States should decide they will not allow the stationing of nuclear weapons on their territories, the United States would, of course, respect such an action. In the context of the various alliance arrangements, particularly in the context of the alliances to which the United States is a party, the United States believes that the stationing of United States nuclear weapons is an issue which must be decided between the United States and its allies in the context of bilateral and multilateral security arrangements.

The United States would also like to point out that the verification of a global ban of the kind proposed by the draft resolution before us would require extremely elaborate measures of inspection of a kind which would be unlikely to be negotiable. In passing, it is interesting to note that the proposal now under consideration contains no provision for verification whatsoever. Because of the considerations I have just outlined, the United States proposes to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38, entitled "Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present".

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38 was adopted by 87 votes to 19, with 11 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): Sweden has contributed to efforts aimed at preventing the stationing of nuclear weapons on territories which earlier have not had such weapons as a part of its consistent work for nuclear disarmament. However, this problem cannot be solved simply by a declaration of non-stationing. It is a complex question dealing with a general military situation in the world and the doctrines and force postures of the leading military Powers. Obviously, this matter is also related to the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. A United Nations resolution on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons must not and cannot be a substitute for real disarmament.

* Subsequently, the delegations of the Ivory Coast and Mali advised the Secretariat that had they been present they would have voted in favour.

Mr. DUBEY (India): India's affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38 does not imply the acceptance or approval by my delegation of the present stationing and deployment of nuclear weapons. India stands for the total elimination of all nuclear weapons.

Mr. PEREZ HERNANDEZ (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation feels that its views concerning matters of the present kind are well known to members of the Committee. We are very grateful to the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We understand the importance of submitting such a proposal. It is true that my delegation shares in and supports efforts towards non-proliferation. We have abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38, for reasons which we will explain.

My country has suffered from military aggression of all kinds, both large and small, initiated by imperialists for 20 years, since the setting up of socialism. In an intervention in the tenth special session devoted to disarmament the Vice-President of the Federal Republic of Cuba, Mr. Rodriguez, pointed out that as long as the military Powers of the American continent adopt an attitude of aggressiveness which results in undisguised threats my country cannot renounce certain measures.

(Mr. Perez Hernandez, Cuba)

That has been confirmed recently. The United States press has indicated that 20,000 soldiers belonging to the United States and the United Kingdom have carried out military manoeuvres in front of the Cuban coastline. My people are fully aware of the purpose of those manoeuvres and will not be intimidated by such methods.

The United States press has further indicated that United States spy aircraft have resumed their flights over Cuban territory in flagrant violation of our sovereignty.

The information media of the United States have also referred to this and have made a great fuss about the presence of MIG-23 aircraft on our soil, although we all know that the aircraft are there for purely defensive purposes. As Premier Castro said, they have been there for over a year, and it is common knowledge that they have been flying for the past eight months.

While we are in favour of non-proliferation we must insist that the United States put an end to its policy of aggression and hostility towards our country at all levels.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The Finnish delegation voted for draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38, on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.

In explanation of vote I wish to make the following points. First, we support the objective of achieving a world-wide zone of countries which are permanently free from nuclear weapons. It is, however, an objective which requires a carefully considered and balanced arrangement of obligations and responsibilities, including appropriate security guarantees.

Secondly, in our view it follows from the concept of State sovereignty that only the Government of the country concerned, be it small or big, aligned or non-aligned, can be qualified to interpret its own security needs.

Thirdly, Finland has for its part forgone nuclear weapons and has consistently worked for the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons.

Consistent with its international position as a small neutral country, Finland will not receive on its territory nuclear weapons on behalf of other countries. My Government has endeavoured to strengthen the non-proliferation régime and has supported the concept and practice of nuclear-weapon-free zones as well as other measures aimed at lessening the danger posed by nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, my Government has made proposals which aim at entirely excluding the countries of Northern Europe from all nuclear speculations.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): The Albanian delegation did not take part in the vote, but it wishes to emphasize the following.

The text of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38, and especially its two operative paragraphs, expresses more or less the same ideas as those contained in the draft convention proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6. The Albanian delegation expressed its point of view on the same subject in the course of the debate in the Committee on agenda item 128, and we do not wish to repeat our position in detail.

We would add that it is not possible to put on the same footing nuclear Powers and countries that do not have nuclear weapons when speaking of the danger of nuclear weapons, the threat of a nuclear war and efforts to stop the arms race.

Mr. MESHARRAFA (Egypt): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38. However, we have two reservations on that resolution and I should like to state them.

First, we believe that the concept of not stationing nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would freeze the military situation and acknowledge the doctrine of nuclear strategic superiority.

Secondly, we would have preferred to see operative paragraph 2 reflect a universal concept of the non-stationing and total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I asked to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38.

My delegation was, of course, present during the voting, and it voted in favour of the draft resolution. We did so because we believe that the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present is a desirable step. We would, of course, like to see that step reflected in the broader perspective of the non-use of nuclear weapons and the dismantling of nuclear arsenals.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Bearing that in mind, my delegation would have liked to see the operative part of the draft resolution reflect the idea expressed in the fifth preambular paragraph. By this we mean that it should have contained a provision requiring the nuclear-weapon States that have stationed nuclear weapons on the territories of other States to consider steps for the withdrawal of such weapons.

We should also have liked to see in the draft resolution a provision requiring the non-nuclear-weapon States on whose territories nuclear weapons are stationed to take steps to ensure that such weapons are not used against other non-nuclear-weapon States.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.38.

The next draft resolution to be considered under agenda item 47, "General and complete disarmament", would have been that contained in document A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.1, concerning the "Committee on Disarmament", but the representative of Mexico has submitted a number of amendments and I propose to postpone consideration of it until the afternoon meeting.

We shall therefore now take up, under the same agenda item, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.43, "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". This draft resolution has 12 sponsors and it was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 55th meeting of the First Committee on 29 November 1978.

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

Mr. DUBLY (India): India will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.43 for the following reasons.

It has been our consistent position that a cut-off in the production of fissionable material must be linked to the immediate cessation of the production of nuclear weapons. This link is clearly and correctly established in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament. If the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.43 were to be implemented, the nuclear-weapon States would still be able to continue further production of nuclear weapons from present stocks of fissionable material.

It is also my delegation's view that "full scope safeguards", to which reference is made in the third preambular paragraph, would be meaningful only if the cut-off in the production of fissionable material were linked to the prohibition of further production of nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, in the third preambular paragraph there is reference to the concept of the limitation of further production of nuclear weapons, which is unacceptable to my delegation, since it would in fact legitimize the production of nuclear weapons.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the vote to be taken on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.43, we should like to emphasize that the Soviet Union is in favour of the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and of the gradual reduction of nuclear stockpiles until their complete elimination.

The Soviet Union proposes that all nuclear Powers, as well as a certain number of non-nuclear Powers, enter into negotiations on this question. We have more than once proposed that such negotiations be started without delay.

The solution of the question of the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes cannot, in our view, be divorced from the question of the prohibition of such weapons, since if it were that would not contribute to the goal of nuclear disarmament.

The problem of nuclear disarmament must be resolved in its entirety, whereas in this draft resolution the question of the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes is dealt with separately from the cessation of production of nuclear weapons themselves and from

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

other nuclear disarmament measures. Such an approach is contrary to the provisions of the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, as has just rightly been pointed out by the representative of India. As we know, paragraph 50 of the Final Document deals with these questions as a whole.

For those reasons, the Soviet delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.43.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): Pakistan's position on the question of the cessation of the production of fissionable material is basically positive. However, the provisions of the present draft resolution, as formulated, are such that my delegation would find it very difficult to support it. I would therefore suggest to the co-sponsors certain changes in some of the paragraphs of the draft resolution which, we hope, they will find it possible to accept.

First, in the second paragraph of the preamble we believe that the question of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the nuclear arms race has been reflected in an obverted manner. We believe that it is not that proliferation of nuclear weapons is linked to the nuclear arms race, but the other way around, namely that the nuclear arms race leads to or facilitates or makes possible the proliferation of nuclear weapons. I therefore think that the statement in the second paragraph of the preamble has to be turned around. And if the co-sponsors so wish, we would suggest precise language for this such as:

"Convinced that progress in halting and reversing the nuclear arms race is indispensable for the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons."

Secondly, our other difficulties are with the third paragraph of the preamble. Here our difficulties are twofold. First of all, the paragraph states that:

"... the acceptance by all States of binding and verifiable controls in the form of full scope safeguards, on a non-discriminatory basis ..."

would ensure the absence of nuclear proliferation and the nuclear arms race.

We believe that this concept of "full scope safeguards" and its qualification as the only binding and verifiable controls which should be accepted by States is something that my delegation is not prepared to endorse, at least at the present moment. The question of "full scope safeguards" and other types of safeguards is still under consideration in the International

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and other relevant forums; and we do not think that this should be prejudged in this manner. We would therefore suggest that this should be amended to read:

"Considering that the acceptance by all States of IAEA safeguards on a non-discriminatory basis ..."

We would leave open the question of what type of IAEA safeguards should or should not be accepted.

The second difficulty with regard to this paragraph refers to the question of whether the safeguards would apply only to the production or further production of fissionable materials. We believe that if safeguards are applied only to further production of fissionable materials, this would not be sufficient to prevent further proliferation of nuclear weapons because enormous stocks of fissionable material have already been accumulated over the years by some of these Powers and other countries, which can be used for the proliferation of nuclear weapons, even if further production is stopped.

Therefore, we would suggest the insertion here of the phrase:

"all production of fissionable material and accounting for fissionable material produced so far."

With these changes, the Pakistan delegation would find it possible to vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.43.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Pakistan made a number of suggestions, I understand, intended for the co-sponsors of that draft resolution. I wonder whether there is any reaction to his suggestions at this time. I emphasize, if I understood the representative of Pakistan correctly, that he was not raising a formal proposal or a formal amendment.

Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): My delegation supports the views expressed by the representatives of India and of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in explanation of vote before the vote. For the reasons expressed by these two delegations, my delegation will abstain on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.43 when it is put to a vote. I regret to say that the statement of Pakistan does not change our position.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegations have asked to speak, the Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.43.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.43 was adopted by 94 votes to 10, with 19 abstentions.

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

Mr. KERROUM (Algeria) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Algeria fully supports the principle of the prohibition of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, in particular as presented in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the tenth special session. However, the Algerian delegation has had to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.43 because, on the one hand, the second and third paragraphs as worded could be construed as implying a special responsibility of the non-nuclear-weapon States in the field of disarmament, which obviously is unacceptable to the Algerian delegation, and because, on the other hand, no provision is included for the control of existing stocks of fissionable materials, which could thus continue to be used quite legitimately for the production of new nuclear weapons.

Mr. LENNUYEUX-COMNENE (France) (interpretation from French): It is obvious - and the French delegation is well aware of it - that nuclear disarmament will one day have to pass by way of the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for military purposes, or at least a limitation of that production, accompanied by appropriate verification systems.

The French delegation, however, could not but indicate its reservations concerning draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.43 to the extent that that text does not bring out sufficiently the fact that the appropriate stage for an international negotiation on the cessation of production of fissionable materials for military purposes could only be the period subsequent to the conclusion and implementation by the two principal nuclear Powers of agreements leading to substantial reduction of their nuclear arsenals, as well as to the cessation of qualitative progress of those arsenals.

In view of these reservations the French delegation abstained on the draft resolution submitted to us.

Mr. VUKOVIC (Yugoslavia): Yugoslavia is on record as constantly supporting the idea of the cut-off of production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. On the initiative of the non-aligned countries, this idea has been reflected in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the tenth special session. We still support this general concept. However, the present draft resolution, as has already been pointed out by the representative of Algeria, can be construed as putting the responsibility for the further proliferation of nuclear weapons on the non-nuclear-weapon Powers, which is contrary to the views of my delegation. We therefore could not support that idea.

Mr. MESHARRAFA (Egypt): The Egyptian Government has supported any step to promote the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the cut-off of production of fissionable material. However, our delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.43 for the same reasons as the representatives of Algeria and Pakistan.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now completed our consideration of all the draft resolutions under item 47 of the agenda, "General and complete disarmament" save two.

First, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.35 submitted by the delegation of Belgium is not ready to be voted upon because of its financial implications, the statement of which is not yet ready, although I understand that it will be available by tomorrow morning.

Second, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42/Rev.1, concerning the Committee on Disarmament, which could not be voted on because of the amendments presented this morning by the representative of Mexico, although I understand that there will be no difficulty in taking it up this afternoon when the draft amendments have been circulated in written form.

It had been my intention to take up next item 48, concerning a world disarmament conference, and the relevant draft resolution, A/C.1/33/L.34. However, I have been informed that that also has financial implications, the statement of which is not expected to be ready until tomorrow.

We shall therefore move on to item 49, which concerns a United Nations conference on prohibition of restriction or use of certain conventional weapons, and draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.26, which is submitted under that item.

(The Chairman)

The draft resolution has 18 sponsors. I would draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the draft resolution has financial implications, which are detailed in document A/C.1/33/L.53.

The draft resolution has not yet been officially introduced in the First Committee. The delegation of Sweden has asked to speak in order to introduce it and I call upon him for that purpose.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): I should like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.26 on behalf of the sponsors: Austria, Bangladesh, Denmark, Egypt, Honduras, India, Ireland, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sweden, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

The preambular part of the draft resolution recalls the decision of the General Assembly to convene in 1979 a United Nations Conference on this subject. It recalls also the decision to convene a Preparatory Conference for the 1979 Conference with the task of establishing the best possible substantive basis for that conference and of considering organizational matters relating to the holding of the United Nations Conference.

The operative part outlines the continued work for the preparation and holding of the United Nations Conference. It is suggested that, for that purpose, the General Assembly should take note of the report of the first session of the Preparatory Conference and the proposals introduced during that session.

In operative paragraph 3, the General Assembly reaffirms its belief that the United Nations Conference should strive to reach agreement on specific weapons.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 endorse the decision to hold the next session of the Preparatory Conference in March-April 1979 and to hold the Conference itself from 10 to 28 September 1979.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

The final operative paragraph proposes the inclusion of this matter in the provisional agenda of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. The draft resolution is of a procedural nature, reaffirming decisions already taken for the preparation and carrying out of a United Nations Conference on the prohibition or restriction of use of certain conventional weapons.

From our consultations on the draft resolution we have concluded that it could be adopted by consensus. On behalf of the sponsors I therefore express the hope that such will be the case.

Just as I concluded my statement I was informed of two corrections to be made in the draft resolution. New Zealand should be added to the list of sponsors and in the third line of operative paragraph 6, the word "presented" should read "represented" in the English text.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon the representative of Zambia who wishes to speak in explanation of his vote before the vote.

Mr. MUTUKWA (Zambia): My delegation has no problem in going along with the consensus proposed. However, we have some difficulty with the financial implications of this draft resolution. In particular, we would ask for some clarification regarding the dates proposed for the Conference. I note that 10 to 28 September are the dates mentioned. There are two main problems arising from those dates. The first is that, as we note from the text, the report of the Conference would be made to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. It seems to be a contradiction that a report to the thirty-fourth session should be made by a Conference meeting in the midst of that session. My second problem is probably a selfish one. Some of us who have small delegations will certainly be stretched if we have to have some people representing us in Geneva at that Conference and at the same time to have representatives here. My delegation would therefore seek clarification and request, a review of the dates proposed, if possible.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Cyprus wishes to become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.26.

The CHAIRMAN: There has been a wish expressed by the co-sponsors that the Committee act by consensus on this draft resolution. Since I hear no objection I declare the draft resolution adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.26 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I will now call on those representatives who wish to make statements after the consensus.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): Although my delegation has joined in the consensus on this draft resolution, I would like to make two pertinent observations about the position of the United States regarding the proposed Conference on specific conventional weapons.

The United States abstained on a substantially similar resolution at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly because we had not received any reasonable assurances concerning how decisions would be taken at this United Nations Conference. A year later we still find ourselves in the same uncertain position with regard to decision-making. My Government, I wish to emphasize, is not committed to participation at the Conference unless and until an adequate basis is laid both on substance and procedure.

Mr. MUTUKWA (Zambia): I must apologize for asking to speak again, but I thought I had sought some clarification regarding the date for this meeting but I do not think I received that clarification.

The CHAIRMAN: For the purpose of the clarification sought by the representative of Zambia, I call on the Assistant Secretary-General of the Centre for Disarmament.

Mr. BJORNERSTEDT (Assistant Secretary-General, Centre for Disarmament): I am not certain that I can give much clarification on the actual possibilities of changing the date because this is a conference servicing matter and would have to be dealt with, I think, by the Committee on Conferences.

(Mr. Björnerstedt, Assistant
Secretary-General, Centre for
Disarmament)

However, it would seem that next year's calendar is very crowded and that we are severely limited in the choice of dates for the various meetings and sessions which are planned for next year. I would think that the best action that can be taken at this time in response to the request of the representative of Zambia is that the Secretariat bring his concern to the attention of the Committee on Conferences for discussion in the total context of the conferences scheduled for next year.

Mr. MUTUKWA (Zambia): I thank the Assistant Secretary-General for his clarification. My delegation would merely recommend that this Conference be held before the thirty-fourth session. Whatever date that may be, we will be in a position to go along with that.

Mr. MORENO (Italy): My delegation, by joining in the consensus on the draft resolution just adopted, has intended to reaffirm its sincere and full commitment to the adequate preparation of the United Nations Conference on Prohibition or Restriction of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects.

As the Preparatory Conference held in Geneva in September 1978 clearly indicated, a broad range of issues, both organizational and substantive, remain to be solved, in order to assure for the future Conference a reasonable prospect for genuine achievements.

In particular, we believe that, in line with a practice generally established and recently reaffirmed by the Final Document of the special session in relation to the adoption of arms limitation and disarmament measures, the rule of consensus should be observed in reaching any decision on substantive matters. This is indeed an essential condition for the achievement of results acceptable to all interested States.

(Mr. Moreno, Italy)

We believe equally that every future concrete measure to be adopted by the Conference should be based on a realistic and balanced evaluation of both humanitarian and military considerations.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): The representative of Zambia raised some pertinent points when he directed some questions which the Assistant Secretary-General kindly answered. He then suggested that this conference should be held, as far as possible, before the beginning of the next session of the General Assembly, and the Chairman indicated that that observation would also be passed to the Committee on Conferences.

I thought that as a participant in the Preparatory Conference in Geneva it might be of use to the representative of Zambia if one were to indicate that the preoccupations which he had voiced were actually considered in detail while the Preparatory Conference was considering the dates not only for the conference itself but also for the next session of the Preparatory Conference. I think one of the problems that we had encountered, of course, was the difficulty of finding available time both in New York and in Geneva. Now, it was the unanimous decision, as it were, of the participants at the Preparatory Conference that the conference be held in Geneva and the period from 10-28 September seemed to be the most appropriate period in Geneva.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

It was also a period which, in the view of the participants in the Preparatory Conference, would not clash unduly with the session of the General Assembly. This is an item which is pertinent to the work of the First Committee and, as we all know, the First Committee does not begin its work until the general debate in the plenary is completed. The general debate usually continues until the end of September or the beginning of October. Therefore, from this point of view, I should like to assure the representative of Zambia that the holding of that Conference at that time, namely, 10 to 28 September - which, as I said, was the most suitable period - would not clash with the work of the First Committee during the next session of the General Assembly.

I therefore hope that the representative of Zambia would not insist on his suggestion that the Conference be held before the next session of the General Assembly, because that would be virtually impossible.

I should also like to add for the benefit of the representative of Zambia that many of the participants at the Conference would also be involved in the meetings of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. That Committee's meetings will continue almost until the beginning of September, and members will need a slight break between the end of those meetings and the beginning of the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.26 and has also concluded its consideration of agenda item 49.

The Committee has, for the time being at least, considered all the draft resolutions that were available for consideration. I would suggest that we now consider some of the draft resolutions which were earlier deferred because their financial implications were not ready.

The Committee will consider first draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1. This draft resolution has 22 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of New Zealand at the 40th meeting of the Committee on 16 November 1978.

(The Chairman)

I call on the Secretary of the Committee in order to clarify the financial implications of the draft resolution.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee): Under the terms of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1, the General Assembly would consider, at a resumed thirty-third session, a draft treaty submitted to it by the multilateral negotiating body should the three negotiating nuclear-weapon States have brought their negotiations to a positive conclusion and transmitted the results to the multilateral negotiating body prior to its 1979 session.

The resumed session of the thirty-third General Assembly would be convened only in the event that the circumstances just described come to pass during 1979. Consequently the details concerning its organization cannot be determined at this stage.

However, the Secretary-General wishes to provide the First Committee with some indication of the financial implications which might be involved in conference servicing should the thirty-third session be resumed.

The full cost per week of conference servicing of plenary meetings of the General Assembly would be of the order of \$335,000 and for each Main Committee, of the order of \$275,000, assuming that verbatim records would be provided for both plenary meetings and committee meetings, and that there would be some 50 pages of intersession documentation provided in six languages.

It should be also pointed out that depending on the timing of the resumed session if it were to be held, it might become necessary to relocate other meetings to Geneva or Vienna, thus incurring additional expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of New Zealand, one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, who wishes to make a statement on the draft resolution before we proceed to the stage of explanations of vote.

Mr. FREEMAN-GREENE (New Zealand): I should like to inform the Committee that all the sponsors of this draft resolution have agreed to two small changes to operative paragraphs 5 and 6.

In operative paragraph 5, the change involves the deletion of the last line and its replacement by these words: "Committee on Disarmament at the beginning of its 1979 session". In operative paragraph 6 the change again concerns the words "multilateral negotiating body", which will be replaced by "Committee on Disarmament".

I apologize to you, Sir, and to the Committee for these late amendments. The reason for them is simply to bring the wording and the timing of this draft resolution into line with that of resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1, which we adopted on Monday. If the amendments I have proposed are accepted, the two draft resolutions would enjoin the negotiating nuclear-weapon States to do the same thing, that is, to bring their work before the Committee on Disarmament at the beginning of its 1979 session. It is my hope that, with these amendments, the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of New Zealand for that clarification. Since, according to the strict application of the rules of procedure, sponsors of a draft resolution cannot amend their own draft resolution, I hope that he will have no objection if we consider these as revisions to the text rather than amendments.

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

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1 - which, in accordance with what you have just said, Mr. Chairman, will now be Revision 2 - submitted under agenda item 38, with the changes introduced a moment ago by the representative of New Zealand.

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

My country firmly believes in the need to prohibit totally nuclear-weapons testing, so much so that we have co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.11/Rev.1, adopted by this Committee only three days ago by 100 votes to none, with 10 abstentions. That document urges the three nuclear-weapon States which participate in the negotiations on a treaty on the prohibition of all nuclear-weapons testing to submit a draft to the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva at the beginning of its 1979 session. That body is also requested to take up as a matter of priority negotiations on the same question, beginning in January 1979. In this way, the 34 non-aligned developing countries, co-sponsors of the draft resolution, thought the three essential elements of this question were emphasized; namely, the imperative need for prohibition the urgency with which the treaty should be concluded and the principal role which should be played in these negotiations by the Committee on Disarmament.

This last element is the one which is flagrantly absent from draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2. States participating in trilateral negotiations have spent years in coming close to a draft agreement on a treaty which would satisfy the interests of three countries alone. Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2, operative paragraphs 5 and 6, attempts to have the Committee on Disarmament consider, negotiate and agree on such an important treaty in a period of time which could in no way exceed the eight months from the opening of its session to the latest possible date for the supposed submission to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

My country shares the sense of urgency which has inspired the sponsors of this draft resolution, but can in no way accept that the Committee on Disarmament, a body which will now include new and important members, should become a mere intermediary between the major Powers and the General Assembly.

For the Geneva Committee on Disarmament to be able to comply fully with its negotiating functions in the interests of the entire international community, the process of consideration must be respected - the consideration which must be given to this and all other draft treaties - so that the General Assembly may receive a truly negotiated document which would include all the interests at play, and which consequently would have the largest possible number of adherents. Any other procedure would be tantamount to lowering the level of the Committee on Disarmament to that of a mere body which endorses documents approved by the major Powers, a situation which would discredit its functions and bring us back to a position once experienced by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2 now does not adequately envisage or provide for these requirements which we believe are essential. For these reasons, my delegation will abstain in the vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2, concerning nuclear weapon testing in all environments, submitted under item 38, "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/78". Before proceeding to the vote, and for the benefit of those delegates who may not have been in the room when the representative of New Zealand proposed two minor revisions to the text, I will repeat those revisions.

(The Chairman)

The last line of operative paragraph 5 should be deleted and replaced by:
"Committee on Disarmament at the beginning of its 1979 session".

The words "the multilateral negotiating body", in the first line of operative paragraph 6, also should be replaced by the words "the Committee on Disarmament".

I shall now put draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2 to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: China

Abstaining: Argentina, Cuba, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2 was adopted by 122 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

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

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I would like to explain the support of the United States for draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2.

As the United States representative to the First Committee, Senator Pearson, said in his statement to the First Committee of 22 November 1978, we are conscious of the impatience of other nations to see the results of the trilateral negotiations for a comprehensive test ban. At the same time we are mindful that these negotiations are breaking new ground in nuclear arms control and that the importance of constructing a fair, balanced and verifiable agreement must take precedence over attempting to meet some arbitrary completion date. Thus we are in fact using our utmost endeavours to conclude the trilateral negotiations as soon as possible, as called for in the resolution, and we will continue to do so. I am sorry to say that it does not appear to be realistic to anticipate that we will be able to do so by the date specified in the resolution, notwithstanding these best utmost efforts.

Mr. GUERREIRO (Brazil): Last year, the Brazilian delegation voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 32/78, which noted with satisfaction the beginning of negotiations among three of the nuclear-weapon States on a comprehensive test ban and expressed the hope that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament would consider the results of those negotiations in time for the treaty to be ready before the tenth special session.

The results of the special session were disappointing as far as concerned the solution of priority problems relating to nuclear weapons. Whatever the alleged technical difficulties involved in the negotiation of a comprehensive test ban treaty, the lack of any concrete results cannot but frustrate the high expectations the international community nourished when adopting resolution 32/78.

Nevertheless the Brazilian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2. We did so because we hope that constructive and well intentioned efforts can still be made without delay in this area, thus enabling the Committee on Disarmament to examine, review and revise concrete proposals and to ensure that the treaty is both effective and non-discriminatory, establishing a balanced scheme of rights and obligations for all States.

(Mr. Guerreiro, Brazil)

The conclusion of a comprehensive test ban is a vital and decisive first step of any real process of nuclear disarmament. As the Minister for External Relations of Brazil stressed in his statement in the General Assembly opening the general debate at the present session:

"The situation today demands decisive action on the part of the international community which has complacently and for many years contemplated the uncontrolled accumulation, by a few States, of arms of mass destruction and the terrifying and permanent refinement, by those same States, of instruments capable of annihilating human life on earth." (A/33/PV.6, p. 7)

Mr. DORJI (Bhutan): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2, just adopted by the Committee. However, my delegation would like to reserve its position on the second preambular paragraph, which refers to some of the Treaties to which my Government has not acceded.

Mr. NAIR (Fiji): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.1, and we wish to explain our vote as follows.

We believe that negotiations on the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban must be conducted in good faith and in an atmosphere of trust and confidence not only among the negotiators but also among those awaiting progress and the results of these negotiations. Furthermore, the conduct of negotiations on an agreement of such importance to all mankind must not in any way be prejudiced by the actions of those outside the negotiations. Commitment to confidence-building measures is very important and could significantly contribute to progress in any negotiation.

This calls for the immediate cessation of all nuclear testing. Accordingly my delegation has always maintained the position that any resolution calling for the early conclusion of a comprehensive test ban should also include a call for the immediate cessation of all nuclear testing.

(Mr. Nair, Fiji)

The two issues are interlinked and, in our view, cannot be separated, particularly at this stage of negotiations for a comprehensive test ban.

In light of this position, my delegation sought appropriate modifications in the draft resolution now contained in document A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2. It was our hope that they would find accommodation in the initiative of some members from our own region - one which continues to be used for nuclear testing. Further, since there were already two separate initiatives similar to those contained in A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2, and in view of the contents of the modifications sought by us, we felt that there was an urgent need for the two matters to be reflected in one comprehensive draft resolution under agenda item 38, so that the necessary interrelationship could be stressed under this item. We thought that that could be best achieved through appropriate modifications in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2.

However, that effort on our part was not entertained by some of the sponsors of that draft resolution. We were told that a consensus was emerging and, in order not to disturb the emerging consensus, we decided not to submit a formal amendment.

Since there has not been a consensus, we felt obliged to abstain, because we felt that for a draft resolution under agenda item 38 draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2 was incomplete.

Mr. LENNUYEUX-COMNENE (France) (interpretation from French): To explain its abstention on the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2, the French delegation wishes to make two comments.

First of all, we note that since 1 January 1978 there have been at least 30 nuclear tests. I cannot believe that the Powers which carried out these tests - at the same time as they were trying to negotiate a treaty on their prohibition - did so without regard to the health of present and future generations, as might be understood from the first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution before us. I therefore think that in that preambular paragraph there is at least a contradiction.

(Mr. Lennuyeux-Commène, France)

Secondly, the French delegation wishes to recall, in connexion with a possible treaty on the cessation of nuclear tests by all States in all environments, the statement made at the tenth special session by the Vice-Chairman of our delegation, Mr. Taittinger when he said:

"France considers that the cessation of nuclear tests should be seen in the context of a genuine disarmament process ...

But we consider that it would be erroneous to believe that a halt to testing would in fact produce a qualitative freeze in nuclear weapons. The two most heavily armed Powers have, by means of numerous tests which they have carried out, accumulated data adequate to allow them to make any qualitative improvements they may desire without carrying out new tests.

"The cessation of tests, therefore, in itself would make no decisive contribution to preventing the production of new types of weapons or to non-proliferation." (A/S/10/PV.27, p. 69)

That statement, which my delegation has already quoted in connexion with draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.3/Rev.1, remains the most explicit expression of France's position on this subject. The French delegation considers that it should be reiterated when the new multilateral negotiating body the Committee on Disarmament begins its work

The CHAIRMAN: In view of the lateness of the hour, I would ask the remaining delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting kindly to agree to do so as the first order of business at this afternoon's meeting, particularly since the Committee still has two matters with which to deal at this meeting. The first is that this morning I was asked to call upon the representative of Liberia at this time, and I now do so.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): The Liberian delegation wishes to announce that it has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.6/Rev 1 submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and a group of other countries. In the Liberian delegation's opinion, this draft resolution aims at the formulation of an international convention guaranteeing non-nuclear-weapon States against attack by nuclear-weapon States.

We wish to make just a brief statement to elucidate our thinking on the basic goals underlying this draft resolution, before action on it is taken at a later date.

Firstly, we believe that the non-nuclear States are entitled, by reason of logic and simple justice, to such security by international law. This does not exclude other forms of guarantees, but we feel that our security would be more secure under a régime of law.

Secondly, such a legal guarantee would discourage States from the temptation of becoming nuclear-weapon Powers, thus creating an additional roadblock to the proliferation of nuclear-weapon States.

Thirdly, a law convention should speed up the efforts to consummate regional zones free from nuclear weapons by additional assurances to States which may waver or hesitate in such an effort.

Fourthly - and this is an African reason - Africa is an excellent example of the superior guarantee by law, for African States are prepared to make their continent a nuclear-weapon free area, but there is a tiger in the jungle. South Africa may say that it has not yet tested an atomic bomb, but South Africa is hungry for one and it has all the prerequisites for satisfying its morbid appetite. It has the technology, the know-how and other possibilities; and it has the enemies against which to use it. Also, it has shown by outright aggression that it has no scruples about using other weapons - and with a paranoid back-to-the-wall fear it would use the maximum weapons at its command in a showdown. Overnight, the apartheid State could show its nuclear teeth.

So, for us in Africa, the threat is Pan-African, and our fear can best be appeased not only with bilateral and multilateral assurances - much as these are appreciated - but better by the stern deterrent of international law, so that, if our racist enemy strikes, it would be striking at the full force of the global shield of international law.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

In the light of those reasons and considerations, the Liberian delegation is grateful to the Soviet Union for its initiative to certify the relevant guarantees by the force of a world legal order, and we are pleased to inscribe our country as a co-sponsor. We respectfully call on this Committee to give this draft resolution its fullest support when it is put to the vote.

On the other hand, we are equally grateful to the Pakistan delegation for its similar draft resolution. I am sure that for us and others this has constituted somewhat of a dilemma. But we note that the Soviet Union has wisely held consultations with the Pakistan delegation, and Pakistan's own draft resolution can be considered on an equal basis by the Committee on Disarmament. For us, this resolves our dilemma.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

Having thus subordinated the pride of authorship to the higher issue of world peace, we assume that the draft international convention attached as an annex to the Soviet draft resolution is equally subject to whatever modifications, alterations and changes delegations in the Committee on Disarmament may choose to propose.

While I have the floor, I wish to thank this Committee for the unanimous support it has given to the Liberian resolution on the need for a new philosophy on disarmament, and especially to our esteemed and efficient Chairman who has made the consensus vote possible. We shall thank him on another occasion for the skill and patience that has piloted this difficult session to its present stage.

And one more remark. Representatives will recall that in my first statement, on 27 October, I took note with some degree of hope and optimism of the trend of the two super-Powers to move to co-operation in this momentous effort for halting the arms race made by this Committee. Such hopes in the past have flowered, unhappily only to wither in the autumn season of their difficulties.

However, we have seen one unique example in this Committee where the flowers of accord, which only too easily become the fall leaves of discord, have shown that that man can prevail over nature. I refer to the fact that both the United States and the Soviet Union have given their support to the resolution linking disarmament with development. I believe this is the first time that both major Powers have found the will to establish this independence in which the liabilities of arms expenditures can become the asset of a healthier world economy. Liberia, therefore, Africa's first free nation, extends to both the United States and the Soviet Union its thanks and congratulations, and hopes that this will be a happy augury for similar accords in the future on the vast agenda to implement the decisions of the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: The next item on our agenda is the work programme for this afternoon. As I said a moment ago, we shall first continue with the explanations of votes on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.7/Rev.2 on nuclear-weapon testing. After that, as agreed yesterday afternoon, we shall take up the question of the production of the film depicting the horrors of war. As members will recall there was a question of legal advice on the competence of the Secretary-General's advisory board of eminent persons. I have been assured that the Legal Counsel to the Secretary-General will be present here during the afternoon. Therefore, I repeat the hope that we may be able to dispose of that matter officially, efficiently and in an orderly fashion so that we can go on to the consideration of still outstanding draft resolutions which I suggest taking up in the following order.

We would start with agenda item 37, concerning chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. There are two draft resolutions submitted under that item, but only A/C.1/33/L.39, which concerns negotiations and a ban on chemical weapons is ready for consideration. The other, on the review of the biological weapons treaty will have to be further deferred because of the lack of a statement of the financial implications.

Next we can take up draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.42, on the question of the Committee on Disarmament, and then, since the statement on the financial implications is now ready, item 46 on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. As the Committee will recall, the draft resolution on that item is included in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee itself.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.