



COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
L-201 (WVVR)

FIRST COMMITTEE
44th meeting
held on
Friday, 26 November 1982
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 44TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/37/PV.44
9 December 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue its consideration of action to be taken upon draft resolutions under disarmament items.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/37/L.26/Rev.1, Liberia; L.40/Rev.1, Fiji; L.41, Sweden and the United Kingdom, L.50; Bangladesh; L.64/Rev.1, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The CHAIRMAN: The First Committee will begin consideration of the remaining three items relating to the strengthening of international security on Monday, 29 November. Therefore may I take this opportunity to invite representatives kindly to add their names to the list of speakers on these items to enable us fully to utilize the time available on Monday.

The Committee will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67 and Corr.1.

Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): I should like to make a brief statement to clarify the terms of operative paragraph 1 in Part V of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67. It goes without saying that the provisions of Article 101 of the United Nations Charter are relevant and will be observed in the usual manner.

Mr. HOWSE (Canada): My delegation wishes to make a brief statement in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67, of which Canada is a sponsor.

My intervention is of course not an explanation of vote. Canada sponsored this draft resolution because it is in full sympathy with the institutional arrangements contained in the text, itself a compendium of several organizational proposals in earlier separate draft resolutions.

(Mr. Howse, Canada)

I wish however to place on record that our endorsement of the omnibus resolution A/C.1/37/L.67 should not be interpreted as signifying any change in the traditional Canadian policy regarding the appointment of Secretariat staff, in conformity with the criteria outlined in Article 101 of the United Nations Charter.

Operative paragraph 1 of section V of the draft resolution refers to the "principle of equitable geographical distribution" regarding the organization of the Department of Disarmament Affairs. My delegation considers that - as stated in Article 101 of the Charter - this is only one principle among several other important principles, such as integrity, competence and efficiency, which must be taken into account when dealing with the Department of Disarmament Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to draw to the attention of the representatives of the Committee the fact that the financial implication of the draft resolution under consideration is contained in document A/C.1/37/L.68.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67 and Corr.1. The sponsors have expressed a wish that the draft resolution will be adopted without a vote. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain the position of their countries.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The whole system of disarmament negotiations came into being in recent years. Because of the growing significance of the problem of disarmament and the corresponding expansion of a system of bodies, the appropriate technical services and staff are naturally required to deal with consideration and negotiations on the subject. The General Assembly adopted a decision leading to the organizational improvement of the structure and functioning of the United Nations apparatus in connection with the question of disarmament.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Even given the major importance of organization questions in disarmament, we should not lose sight of the fact that the real reasons for the lack of progress in the sphere of disarmament lie not in the organization of the work of various United Nations bodies, but in the unwillingness of certain major States to stop the arms race and their desire to instigate a build-up of armaments.

However, we view with understanding the interest shown by many States in the question of the organization of the work of the United Nations in this field with a view to more efficient use being made of staff resources.

Now we are called upon to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67 and Corr.1. Being guided by our general approach to the solution of questions of an organizational nature, we do not object to the adoption of this draft resolution without a vote on the basis of consensus. We give our consent to this on the understanding that, after the formation of the Centre for Disarmament into a Department, referred to in Part V of the draft resolution, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries will be accorded leading posts in the new Department for Disarmament Affairs.

We wish to refer to another aspect of this draft resolution in which it says that the new Department for Disarmament Affairs would be so organized as to reflect fully the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

Mr. SHARMA (Nepal): My delegation will be happy to join in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67 and Corr.1. However, we wish to place on record our view on some aspects of the institutional arrangement leading to the process of disarmament. First of these concerns the provisions in Part I of the draft resolution. The general debate in this Committee has revealed that most of the delegations are not very satisfied with the outcome during the last four years of the work of the Committee on Disarmament which is the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. There is clearly an urgent need for the Committee on Disarmament to take steps to carry out and improve its functions. My delegation urges the Committee on Disarmament to review the question of its membership within the overall context of rationalizing its work. My delegation would also like the Committee on Disarmament to develop a standing mechanism to deal with the

(Mr. Sharma, Nepal)

question of review of its membership instead of taking periodic ad hoc decisions. The review, we trust, would neither overlook the sound provisions of paragraph 113 of the Final Document adopted at the first special session on disarmament nor fail to examine thoroughly paragraph 120 (d) and (h) of the same Document.

Secondly, my delegation has repeatedly expressed its great appreciation of the important role played by the Centre for Disarmament in promoting a well-informed public opinion in favour of disarmament. My delegation reaffirms its support for the gradual expansion of the Centre in proportion to the progress achieved in multilateral deliberative and negotiating forums and in keeping with the expanding role of the United Nations in the disarmament process.

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objections, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67 and Corr.1 without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67 and Corr.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those representatives wishing to speak to the draft resolution.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): We have joined the consensus concerning draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67 and Corr.1. Those delegations which have been truly committed to the realization of what apparently is aspired to by Part I of this draft resolution, that is, a limited and functionally effective expansion of the Committee on Disarmament, based their arguments in previous years on complete elements of logic and strict necessity to observe the vital interests of all peoples of the world in the success of disarmament negotiations and the duty and right of all States to contribute to and take part in those negotiations. These elements have constituted the embryo of the logic behind General Assembly resolutions 33/91 G, 35/156 I and 36/97 J adopted in 1978, 1980 and 1981 respectively. The explicit reiteration of these principles of substance during the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly would, to our mind, have been indispensable in attaining conceptual integrity.

(Mr. Sibay, Turkey)

We have now left behind four full years following the recommendations adopted by consensus in 1978. With regard to the issue of expansion by virtue of the draft resolution just adopted, we have noted that it has not been possible to complete the first review of the membership so far and we are requesting the Committee on Disarmament to report back to us next year.

Not only are we able to entertain the contention that merely noting the inability to complete the review is a precise and adequate reflection of the situation before us, but we would also have liked to see a firm request by this body for the finalization of the consideration of the modality for the review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament so that this important issue would finally be concluded during the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly. But my delegation would also have liked to see incorporated into the draft resolution a reaffirmation of the procedure of inviting States not members of the Committee on Disarmament to participate in all the work of the Committee upon their request without undue restrictions.

We have weighed carefully the diverse implications of bringing to the decisive wisdom of this Committee the consideration of a different approach towards the review issue by virtue of a parallel draft resolution. However, we have refrained from doing so in order to avoid duplication and from a sincere desire not to waste this Committee's valuable time. We now observe that an additional period of 10 months will have to be appropriately utilized for an equitable conclusion of the review. We also observe that as a matter of fact all the elements relevant to appropriate follow-up action would be much more decisive and indicative at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

Mr. KOMIVES (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67, entitled institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament, since it considers this draft resolution to be a basis for dealing appropriately with some of the various aspects of the relevant issues. In explanation of our position I should just like to touch upon two parts of the draft resolution just adopted.

First, on Part I of the draft resolution, which concerns the review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament, my delegation takes note with satisfaction that the draft resolution handles this question in the right manner, based on the relevant parts of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament and of the Concluding Document of the second special session on disarmament, both of which were adopted unanimously.

Secondly, I should like to comment briefly on Part V of the draft resolution which, in its paragraph 1, requests the Secretary-General to transform the Centre for Disarmament, appropriately strengthened with the existing overall resources of the United Nations, into a Department for Disarmament Affairs, headed by an Under-Secretary-General. In connection with the transformation of the Centre for Disarmament into a new department, my delegation considers it necessary to stress two points. First, the Hungarian delegation attaches great importance to the maintenance of a close relationship between the units of the Secretariat dealing with matters concerning international security and disarmament, as these are interrelated questions; I note with satisfaction that these necessities are clearly reflected in the fifth preambular paragraph. Secondly, I share the views of those who recognized with satisfaction the way in which the Centre for Disarmament performed its responsibilities, both in New York and in Geneva. My delegation is looking forward, with the same expectation, to the unit being organized. It considers that the performance of the Department for Disarmament Affairs will largely be determined and subsequently evaluated by its ability to take realistically and adequately into account the role Member States, among them the socialist countries, play in the field of disarmament. In the opinion of my delegation, this should be reflected in the composition of the new unit as well.

Mr. ALESSI (Italy) (interpretation from French): The Italian delegation fully endorsed the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67, because it feels that this draft resolution will help provide a satisfactory solution to a number of questions connected with the institutional arrangements that the second special session on disarmament failed to deal with.

We are particularly pleased to note that the draft resolution requests the transformation of the present United Nations Centre for Disarmament into a Department for Disarmament Affairs. This is a timely and even a necessary decision, because of the importance that disarmament matters have now assumed at the United Nations and also because of the constantly growing burden of responsibilities and duties of the Centre.

However, I should like to stress that my delegation is in some doubt with respect to the wording of paragraph 1 of Part V concerning the organization of the future Department for Disarmament Affairs. Paragraph 3 of Article 101 of the United Nations Charter provides the full indications needed in this respect.

Mr. THORNE (United Kingdom): In the view of my delegation, the language in paragraph 1 of Part V of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67, and specifically the formulation "which will be so organized as to reflect fully the principle of equitable geographical distribution" does not reflect accurately the provisions of the Charter. The overall concept of equitable geographical distribution for staffing purposes is contained in Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter, which also specifies that the paramount consideration in the employment of staff in the United Nations shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. The concept of equitable geographical distribution is applicable to the United Nations Secretariat as a whole. To apply it rigidly to individual sections and departments would be to impose an inflexibility that would work against the considerations of efficiency and good management. We regret that our efforts to bring the language of paragraph 1 of Part V of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67 into line with the provisions of Article 101, paragraph 3, have not been successful.

We would not therefore have been able to support that language on its own. But the representative of Norway, in introducing the draft resolution, helpfully explained that the provisions of Article 101 of the Charter will continue to be observed.

(Mr. Thorne, United Kingdom)

In these circumstances and on that understanding, we felt able to acquiesce in consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67 as a whole.

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): In supporting the consensus that enabled us to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67, we should like to express our appreciation of the efforts by Sweden and Norway to streamline matters by combining draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.9, L.23, L.36 and L.60 on various institutional arrangements. This practice should be encouraged as it improves the Committee's work, which has become almost uncontrollable due to the plethora of draft resolutions.

However, this solution is not without disadvantages, especially when such an initiative is taken late in the day. In the case of the draft resolution just adopted, Belgium does not believe it can give equal support to all the parts of the text. That is why, although we were a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.23 on the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, we did not wish to be associated so closely with draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67 as a whole.

Indeed we have serious doubts, on the one hand, concerning the need to encourage a change in the name of the Committee on Disarmament and, on the other, concerning the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, we understand that the part of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67 devoted to it is solely aimed at redefining and not expanding the tasks that some States would like to entrust to it.

Finally, the wording of paragraph 1 of Part V of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67, on the Centre for Disarmament, is not at all satisfactory to us. To ask that the principle of equitable geographical distribution should be applied in each department and not in the Secretariat as a whole would create an undesirable precedent if Article 101 of the Charter were not implemented as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus completed its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.67 and its Corrigendum 1.

(The Chairman)

I call on the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean to introduce the Committee's report, in document A/37/29 of 24 November 1982.

Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka), Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean: It is my privilege to introduce in the Committee today the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, which appears in document A/37/29.

By General Assembly resolution 36/90 of 9 December 1981, the Ad Hoc Committee was requested to continue its efforts for the necessary harmonization of views on the remaining issues related to the convening of the conference on the Indian Ocean and, in consideration of the political and security climate in the Indian Ocean area, to make every effort to accomplish the necessary preparatory work for the conference, including consideration of its convening not later than the first half of 1983.

Accordingly, the Ad Hoc Committee held two sessions, from 1 to 12 March and from 20 to 28 May, in New York, one session from 3 to 20 August in Geneva and one additional formal meeting last Tuesday, 23 November, when the Committee adopted its report which is now before this Committee. As indicated in the introduction to the report, the Committee held a total of 30 formal meetings this year, as well as several informal meetings.

Five months ago the Ad Hoc Committee submitted to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament a special report on its work, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 36/90. The report was introduced on 1 July 1982. If the Ad Hoc Committee's report did not merit any special attention at the special session, it was only because of the inconclusive character of the special session as a whole.

The annual report which I introduce covers the Ad Hoc Committee's activities of the current year. As regards the substantive work, attention in the Committee was focused mainly on item 4 (a) of its agenda, that is, the substantive and organizational issues related to the conference

(Mr. Fonseca, Chairman, Ad Hoc
Committee on the Indian Ocean)

on the Indian Ocean in accordance with paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of resolution 36/90, including consideration of 1983 conference dates. Without going into details on the discussions concerning that matter, I wish merely to refer to the Committee's evaluation of the status of work regarding a key issue before it, namely, the preparation for the conference on the Indian Ocean. Paragraph 6 of the report states:

"On the one hand, the discussions revealed a strong feeling that the Committee should proceed without delay to practical preparations for the Conference and make every effort to complete the necessary preparations for holding the Conference not later than the first half of 1983, as a necessary step for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, adopted in 1971. On the other hand, it was emphasized by some delegations that the lack of real progress on the harmonization of views and the prevailing political and security climate in the region were not conducive, at this stage, to the convening of the Conference." (A/37/29, para. 6)

Due to this divergence of views, which continued to prevail, the Committee was unable to reach a consensus on finalizing the dates for convening the conference in 1983.

Concerning the question of participation by States not members of the Ad Hoc Committee, the report notes that during the course of the year the Committee received several requests, and these are listed in subsection D of the present report. However, the Committee was unable, in the time available, to reach consensus on their applications.

Part III of the report contains the draft resolution which the Committee would recommend to the General Assembly. In the preambular part, the General Assembly would, inter alia, reaffirm its conviction that concrete action for the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace would be a substantial contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security. While it would express deep concern at the dangers posed by the grave and ominous developments in the area and the resulting sharp

(Mr. Fonseca, Chairman, Ad Hoc
Committee on the Indian Ocean)

deterioration of peace, security and stability, which particularly seriously affect the littoral and hinterland States, as well as international peace and security, the General Assembly would call for renewing genuinely constructive efforts through the exercise of political will necessary for the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

In operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution the General Assembly would express its regret that the Ad Hoc Committee had failed to reach consensus on the finalization of dates for the convening of the conference during 1983, and would take note of the views expressed relating to the need for the convening of the conference during the first half of 1984.

By operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution the General Assembly would therefore request the Ad Hoc Committee to continue its efforts for the necessary harmonization of views on the remaining issues related to the convening of the conference and to make every effort to accomplish the necessary preparatory work for the conference, including consideration of its convening not later than the first half of 1984.

The General Assembly in operative paragraph 8 would request the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee to continue his consultations on the participation of non-Member States in the work of the Committee, with the aim of resolving this matter at the earliest possible date. The Ad Hoc Committee would be requested to hold three further sessions in 1983, of a duration of two weeks each, with the possibility of holding a fourth session to be considered as required. Finally, the resolution would also renew the mandate of the Committee, as defined in the relevant resolutions.

This seems to be all that a Chairman of a Committee should say in introducing the report of a Committee which, together with the Committee's recommendation or draft resolution, has been reached by consensus. He is expected to maintain a clinical detachment in regard to views which he may have. I spoke earlier in this introduction about the divergence of views between those who wanted to see practical preparations for the conference in 1983 and others who saw a lack of real progress on the harmonization of views and the unsatisfactory political and security climate in the region.

(Mr. Fonseca, Chairman, Ad Hoc
Committee on the Indian Ocean)

This divergence of views is the essential reason for the text of the Ad Hoc Committee's resolution being practically identical with resolution 36/90, which came before this First Committee last year. Members of the Ad Hoc Committee know this, but I believe it is my duty to draw attention to it in this Committee. That sameness - I shall not say "stalemate" - is more than symbolic of the reality which prevailed not only in the Ad Hoc Committee but, as members of this First Committee know, in the whole spectrum of disarmament. We saw that in the Concluding Document of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Resolutions adopted by vote show the sense of majorities which we can hardly afford wholly to discount. But if the search is for a consensus, as we have reached, we run into an impasse or at best a modicum of advance.

As Chairman of a Committee coming with a consensus resolution, one is precluded from attributing reasons for this condition. The delegations intervening in the debate that follows will each offer their own reasons and perhaps attribute blame. Members of the Ad Hoc Committee will be familiar with that and may even concede that such exchanges have been less than helpful. Members of this Committee can make their own appraisal. The Chairman can only hope that the debate and the reasoning will also reflect the other reality, namely, that all members of the Ad Hoc Committee also decided for a consensus resolution. The reasons for so deciding may of necessity be subdued, but, as the Committee's Chairman, I can only take some satisfaction that after any rhetoric in the debate those muted reasons are also valid, that this approach is still accepted, and that all members of the Committee continue their membership of the Committee because they subscribe to the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

I should like to conclude my statement by thanking delegations for their spirit of compromise and accommodation, which enabled the Committee to adopt its report, including the draft resolution, by consensus. To

(Mr. Fonseca, Chairman, Ad Hoc
Committee on the Indian Ocean)

the "Friends of the Chairman" I owe a debt of gratitude for their unstinting co-operation throughout the strenuous process of negotiations. I should like also to thank the Secretary of the Committee and his colleagues for their valuable assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to introduce the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. May I recommend the draft resolution contained in part III of the report for this Committee's acceptance also by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now turn its attention to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.26/Rev.1, under agenda item 50 (h), "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session", entitled "Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session". It has 31 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 36th meeting of the Committee on 18 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of Committee, who will read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.26/Rev.1 are: Algeria, Argentina, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, the Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Liberia, Madagascar, Mongolia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.26/Rev.1. Since no delegation wishes to explain its vote before the vote, the voting procedure on this draft resolution will now begin.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco,

Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republic, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.26/Rev.1.

The Committee will now turn its attention to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37, under agenda item 44, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". It has one sponsor, Kenya, on behalf of the African Group, and was introduced by the delegation of Kenya at the 37th meeting of the Committee on 19 November 1982.

Since no delegation wishes to explain its vote before the voting, the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37 will now begin. A separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37 has been requested.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba,

Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37 was adopted by 99 votes to 8, with 15 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37, as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic,

Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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 Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37, as a whole, was adopted by 110 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.*

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

* Subsequently the delegation of Japan advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour, and the delegation of Canada advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union consistently supports the efforts of the States of Africa to make that continent a nuclear-weapon-free zone. We resolutely condemn any attempts by South Africa to acquire nuclear weapons and we share the indignation aroused by the activities of certain Western countries and Israel in encouraging South Africa's nuclear ambitions.

The Soviet Union has no relations with South Africa and advocates the adoption of comprehensive sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter, against the racists in order to close any channels for co-operation in the military or nuclear spheres.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Guided by these considerations, we have supported draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37. In connection with the formulation of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the Soviet delegation wishes to state that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa must not affect the generally recognized norms of international law, including the right of freedom of navigation on the high seas.

Ms. BOYD (Australia): Australia voted in favour of the draft resolution on the denuclearization of Africa despite serious misgivings about some of its wording. In voting for the draft resolution it is our understanding that the expressions used therein should be understood in the context of the draft resolution itself. We have been able to cast a positive vote because of the overriding importance which Australia places on the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and our growing concern about the negative attitude of some States on this question. It has been Australia's long-standing view that South Africa should adhere to the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty, or at least accept full-scope safeguards on its nuclear industry.

Mr. TANAKA (Japan): I should like to explain our vote in favour of this draft resolution.

My delegation wishes to state for the record that our vote in favour of the draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37 should not be construed as meaning that we are in agreement with the assertions in some of the paragraphs of the draft resolution, which lack conclusive evidence.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): In connection with draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38, the French delegation would like to remind the Committee that our Government supported efforts to create nuclear-free zones in Africa. France voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 32/81 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. My Government also shares the view that all States should refrain from actions which promote the proliferation

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

of nuclear weapons. That is why we believe that South Africa must submit all its nuclear installations to control by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). On this point the French Government is in full agreement with the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38. However, the French delegation notes that those two texts do not draw a distinction between the peaceful and military uses of nuclear energy. In other words, the sponsors of both draft resolutions assume that co-operation in any form between industrialized countries and countries importing technology in the civilian nuclear field, even under IAEA control, must inevitably lead to military uses.

In this connection, I note that draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38 are in contradiction with the report of the Group of Experts created by General Assembly resolution 34/76 B, adopted by consensus in 1979. That report, prepared by highly qualified specialists representing the various regions of the world, draws a very clear distinction between the peaceful uses of nuclear energy under IAEA safeguards and uses which do not come under any control. To these objections could be added others of major importance relating to texts being in conformity with the United Nations Charter.

The texts before us say that the General Assembly should "request the Security Council", whereas the Security Council already has various aspects of the situation in South Africa before it. We do not believe that this is in keeping with the Charter provisions which deal with the division of responsibilities and powers between the main organs of the Organization. In addition, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.38, in its final preambular paragraph, challenges the vote of certain permanent members of the Security Council on resolutions proposed for consideration in that body. That is a serious breach of the United Nations Charter and of the principle of respect for the sovereignty of Members of the United Nations. France therefore abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37 and will have to vote against draft resolution L.38.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the vote of the United Kingdom on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37, which has just been adopted by the Committee. It is the right of all States to apply and develop their programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. That right is internationally recognized and set out in a number of international instruments. In our view it would be wrong to seek to limit those rights in individual cases for political reasons.

The United Kingdom believes that South Africa should become a party to the non-proliferation Treaty in order to reassure its neighbours and the world about its nuclear programme.

In the context of this draft resolution, the United Kingdom's own contacts with South Africa in the nuclear field are of a very limited nature and are mainly restricted to the fields of safety, medicine and agriculture. We do not collaborate in any way with South Africa in the development of a nuclear-weapon capability or supply nuclear material, nuclear facilities and equipment or related economic assistance devoted towards this objective.

In the light of those points, the United Kingdom voted against paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37, while abstaining on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): Ireland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37 and will vote in favour of draft resolution L.38, on the nuclear capability of South Africa and on the denuclearization of Africa, because we wish to give expression to our traditional and long-term support for the fundamental principle of the denuclearization of Africa. At the same time, in casting its positive vote on both draft resolutions, Ireland has reservations on a number of elements in the draft resolutions which we do not feel to be either justified or necessary. Ireland is thinking in particular of the contentious singling out of certain Western States in the preambular paragraphs of both draft resolutions and the failure to distinguish in the operative sections of both draft resolutions between co-operation for peaceful purposes and co-operation for weapons purposes.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37 and will do likewise on draft resolution L.38, on which we are about to vote.

We wish to place on record our full support for the aims of both drafts. None the less, we find ourselves obliged to make the following clarification: the Republic of Argentina has a position of principle applying in all cases with respect to the application of total safeguards by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to nuclear installations. As both draft resolutions contain provisions supporting such action my delegation wishes to express its reservations on that specific point in each of them.

Although the drafting of some of the paragraphs left something to be desired, that did not prevent my delegation from supporting both draft resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.38, under agenda item 44, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". The draft resolution has two sponsors; it was introduced by the representative of Kenya on behalf of the African Group at the 37th meeting of the First Committee on 19 November 1982, and the other sponsor is Qatar.

The Committee will now proceed to take action upon draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.38.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco,

Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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 Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Belgium, France, Israel, Suriname, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.38 was adopted by 107 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.*

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

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The delegation of Finland voted in favour of both draft resolutions, A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38, under agenda item 44, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". I wish to explain the votes of my delegation on both drafts.

Finland has consistently supported all efforts to strengthen security of States on a regional basis - and, in particular, to promote the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Moreover, our record in the field of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons is well known. We continue to believe that the emergence of any additional nuclear-weapon State would threaten the security of the region and international

* Subsequently the delegation of Suriname advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

security as a whole. Particularly alarming is the possibility of proliferation in regions where international peace and security are already in jeopardy.

While concurring with the main thrust of draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38, my delegation has serious misgivings about several paragraphs contained in them.

That is particularly true concerning draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.38. In our view, the language contained in the last preambular paragraph and in operative paragraphs 4 and 5 is not in keeping with the provisions of the Charter on the respective powers of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Moreover, we regret that the draft resolution contains no reference to adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which we consider to be the fundamental pillar of any peaceful activity in the field of international nuclear co-operation.

Mr. GLEISSNER (Austria): The Austrian delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38. In this we were motivated by our long-standing support for the denuclearization of Africa and by our concern about the threat of a further proliferation of nuclear weapons posed by the unsafeguarded nuclear programme of South Africa.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38 do, however, contain some provisions with regard to which we have reservations. In particular, we should have preferred a clearer distinction being drawn between the responsibilities of the Security Council and the General Assembly in this matter.

Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand): This explanation of vote relates to the two draft resolutions under agenda item 44 on which we have just voted.

New Zealand regrets that it could not vote in favour of the two draft resolutions - A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38. Our abstentions should not be taken as implying any reservation about the concept of the denuclearization of Africa or the broad objectives of the texts. New Zealand has voted in favour of corresponding draft resolutions in the past, just as we have supported the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the South Pacific, South Asia and the Middle East, and welcomed the establishment of the Latin American zone under the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

(Mr. Payton, New Zealand)

It was our wish to support the two draft resolutions this year, and to that end we hoped that there might be early consultations on the texts. We are disappointed that our request to that effect was not taken up.

New Zealand supports the principle and objective of denuclearization of Africa. That there is a potential danger of nuclear proliferation on the continent is beyond question, and we agree that South Africa should be called upon to submit its nuclear installation to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). However, the two texts contain paragraphs the intention of which is not clear, and several elements with which, for reasons we have explained in earlier years, we have difficulty.

Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): My delegation voted in favour of the two draft resolutions on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. We did so because of the importance that we attribute to the Declaration as such. Also, our vote was dictated by the urgent need to ensure the prevention of further proliferation of nuclear weapons in general and the introduction of such weapons into southern Africa in particular. Nevertheless, we should like to express our misgivings about some aspects of the two draft resolutions just adopted.

In general terms, the Norwegian delegation deplores the introduction into the texts of critical references to a group of countries. In our opinion, that has led to a weakening of support for the draft resolutions and, indirectly, also for the cause of the denuclearization of Africa.

More specifically, the Norwegian delegation has reservations on both the wording and content of the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37. Similarly, we have misgivings about the fifth and ninth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.38. Had separate votes been taken on those paragraphs, my delegation would have abstained, as we did in the separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37.

Mr. LACLAUSTRA (Spain)(interpretation from Spanish): As in past years, the Spanish delegation voted in favour of the two draft resolutions on the subject of the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa contained in documents A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38. We did so because we continue to be in full accord with the basic objective of the two drafts. However, the Spanish delegation wishes to place on record that draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.38 uses language that we find excessively polemical and somewhat careless, in particular in the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 1 and 4. The latter paragraph, like operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37, refers to actions that are within the competence of the Security Council.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): My delegation has asked to be allowed to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37 on the denuclearization of Africa and draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.38 on the nuclear capability of South Africa.

The United States supports in principle the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa consistent with our well-known position on the principles for establishing such a zone. The United States remains firm in its belief that an Africa free of nuclear weapons is a goal worth our collective energies and co-operation, and the Organization of African Unity deserves great credit for its early recognition of the importance of the denuclearization of the African continent.

However, it is our view that these draft resolutions do not serve the purpose of non-proliferation and in fact discourage South Africa from implementing a non-proliferation policy.

With reference to some of the language in both draft resolutions, we have reaffirmed our commitment to the effective implementation of the Security Council arms embargo against South Africa, as is fitting, since in 1963 we became the first major Power to impose a unilateral arms embargo. That was a decade and a half before we joined with other members of the Security Council in imposing a mandatory arms embargo. United States restrictions on sales to South African military and police go well beyond the requirements of the Security Council arms embargo. They are at least as rigorous, and as rigorously enforced, as those of other nations.

Our strictly enforced restrictions, dating from 1975, on the sale of nuclear materials and other items that could be used in developing South Africa's capacity to produce nuclear weapons are consistent with our overall policy of discouraging as vigorously as we can the proliferation of nuclear weapons anywhere in the world. We have not, and will not, permit the sale of fuel or sensitive nuclear materials except to nations which sign the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and accept full-scope safeguards on all their nuclear facilities.

In general, we want to stress that the United States adheres fully to all Security Council decisions but cannot support language that prejudices a situation and attempts to commit the United States to a position prior to consideration by the Council.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

We feel that it is unfortunate that these two draft resolutions contain intemperate language which is unhelpful and unnecessary. The United States therefore found it necessary to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37 and to vote against L.38.

Mr. MICHAELSEN (Denmark): The Danish delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38 as a whole because we agree with their objective of preventing the proliferation of nuclear arms to Africa and share the concern about all forms of nuclear co-operation with South Africa. However, we have reservations with regard to certain paragraphs - inter alia the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4 of both draft resolutions.

Mr. C. LIDGARD (Sweden): Sweden voted in favour of both draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38. In respect of those two votes, I wish to make the following statement on behalf of my delegation.

The Swedish Government warmly supports the general purpose of the two draft resolutions, that is, to keep the African continent free of nuclear weapons. My Government also shares the concern that South Africa might acquire nuclear weapons. Such a development would constitute a major setback for the international effort to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons; it would also, no doubt, contribute to a further aggravation of the present situation in that region.

However, while we are strongly in favour of the general aim of the two draft resolutions, my delegation has reservations in particular against formulations contained in the fifth preambular paragraph of both texts about the attitude of some countries.

Mr. TAVARES NUNES (Portugal)(interpretation from French): My delegation wishes to explain the reason for its abstention in the vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38, which are designed to secure the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. Those votes express the support that my Government intends to give to the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We feel that the establishment of such zones should make a positive contribution to the realization of the ultimate objectives of disarmament, particularly by preventing nuclear proliferation provided that certain conditions are met. In this regard, my country supports all the efforts of the international community for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa and to keep such weapons outside that continent, pending the attainment of agreements on a definitive nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa.

In this connection, my delegation attaches the greatest importance to the accession of all States to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and, consequently, the application of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards to all African countries, including South Africa.

(Mr. Tavares Nunes, Portugal)

The vote of my delegation is also an expression of the condemnation of the apartheid régime by the Government and people of Portugal. However, my delegation finds some of the language used in the operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37 ill-advised, particularly the comprehensive condemnation of any co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear sphere. In our view co-operation for peaceful purposes should not come within this condemnation; only military collaboration should be included. A sweeping condemnation applying even to co-operation in the medical sphere could be harmful to the interests of the African population.

Mr. OCAK (Turkey): We have been happy to support the two draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38, consistent with our long-standing policy on the denuclearization of the African continent.

However, although we agree with the main thrust of these two draft resolutions, we wish to place on record our hesitation about those paragraphs which may be considered to place certain interpretations on the functioning and methods of some United Nations bodies.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus completed its action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.37 and L.38.

We shall now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space and prohibition of anti-satellite systems", under agenda item 55 (b), entitled "General and Complete Disarmament". This draft resolution has 17 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Italy at the thirty-sixth meeting of the First Committee on 18 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors are: Australia, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. SARAN (India): Before draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 is put to the vote, my delegation would like to put on record India's consistent position with respect to the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. India is of the view that measures to prevent an arms race in outer space should cover both the deployment and the testing of weapons of any kind in outer space. We are also of the view that outer space should be used for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of mankind as a whole. The consistent position taken by my country and by other non-aligned countries is fully reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1, which India has sponsored, together with a number of other non-aligned countries and now also socialist countries.

The positive vote which we intend to cast on draft resolution L.41 reflects our desire to explore and encourage every possible means of preventing outer space from becoming a new arena for a potentially disastrous arms race. We would have preferred it, however, if this Committee had been able to adopt a consensus draft resolution based on the draft resolution submitted to the Committee on behalf of the non-aligned and socialist countries.

Mr. KAHN (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic abstained in the voting on General Assembly resolution 36/97 C at the thirty-sixth session. It will also abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41.

This draft resolution is not directed against the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. The sixth preambular paragraph and, more clearly, operative paragraph 3 (b), focus on a single weapons system to which the Committee on Disarmament is to give priority.

It has always been the position of my delegation that the halting of the arms race and disarmament should be achieved through a unity of complex measures and partial steps taken simultaneously. Therefore, we oppose the singling out of one weapons system unless at the same time efforts are made to achieve a comprehensive solution of the problem, that is, the prevention of the stationing of any kind of weapons in outer space. Conversely, we certainly support the prohibition of anti-satellite systems as part of a comprehensive ban covering all weapons.

While it is quite insufficient to deal with one weapons system only without seeking a prohibition of all weapons in outer space, the draft resolution is also inadequate in so far as operative paragraph 4 merely speaks of the hope of the possible establishment of a working group in the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Kahn, German Democratic Republic)

In contrast, operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1 requests the Committee on Disarmament to establish an ad hoc working group at the beginning of its 1983 session with a view to undertaking negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement or agreements to prevent an arms race in outer space in all its aspects. We therefore regret that draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 meets the requirements of this subject-matter in terms neither of content nor of procedure.

Last but not least, the reservations of my delegation with regard to this draft resolution are not dispelled for yet another reason. According to The New York Times of 17, 18 and 19 October this year, United States spending on military operations in space will exceed that of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as from 1982 and also in the years thereafter. I quote from the same source - the five-year defence guidelines

"Space operations add a new dimension to our military capabilities. We must ensure that treaties and agreements do not foreclose opportunities to develop these capabilities."

We can only hope that no such motivation underlies draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to make certain comments on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 and I should like to take this opportunity to mention also draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1, which is devoted to the same subject.

As a space Power, the Soviet Union attaches great importance to the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. At the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, we took an important initiative to resolve this problem. We proposed the conclusion of an international treaty prohibiting the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Notwithstanding the decisions of the General Assembly, negotiations on this problem met with resistance in the Committee on Disarmament. As could be seen by the whole of the work of the First Committee, the overwhelming majority of States advocate the initiation of new negotiations and the formation of a working group in the Committee on Disarmament to draft an agreement or agreements designed to be a real barrier to the spread of the arms race to outer space. This is clearly and precisely expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1. We note this with satisfaction and thank the co-sponsors for their constructive and business-like co-operation in this regard.

However, unfortunately draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 has been put forward in a different spirit. In the first place, it singles out a particular question, that is, the prohibition of anti-satellite systems, and this is presented as providing the solution of the whole question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space - which is the main task at the present time. As a matter of principle, the Soviet Union does not object to consideration of proposals for the prohibition of anti-satellite systems. As is well known, the Soviet draft treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space, presented a year ago, deals with that problem, but to reduce the whole question to anti-satellite systems would be to narrow the task artificially. The substance of the problem is the prevention of the arms race in space generally, and the question of anti-satellite systems can be considered in the context of effective measures designed to solve that problem, which is truly a matter for mankind as a whole.

It is essential to approach this goal from all directions. The Soviet Union has again confirmed its readiness to enter into negotiations with the United States on anti-satellite systems. The favourable effect that such negotiations would have is reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1. However, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 takes a backward step in this regard, even when compared with last year's resolution, adopted on the initiative of a group of Western countries.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

In light of these considerations, the Soviet delegation will abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 and will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1, which is in accordance with the task of keeping the arms race out of outer space.

Mr. S. O. BOLD (Mongolia): The Mongolian delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space and prohibition of anti-satellite systems". This position taken by my delegation is based on the following consideration.

Unless further measures are taken, outer space may be in danger of becoming an arena for the arms race. These measures, in our view, should be comprehensive and effective enough to prevent this. However, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 suggests an artificially one-sided, selective approach, singling out from the whole range of problems the prohibition of anti-satellite systems only. While advocating the notion of prohibiting anti-satellite systems, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 offers no provision for the resumption of the bilateral talks between the USSR and the United States which are designed precisely to centre on the anti-satellite systems. Therefore, we consider this approach inconsistent and illogical.

In view of this consideration and because of the fact that Mongolia, with a number of other delegations, sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1, which fairly and squarely reflects the position of Mongolia, we shall abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina)(interpretation from Spanish): On the subject now under discussion - draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41, relating to the prevention of an arms race in outer space, my delegation wishes to point out that it is a co-sponsor of a draft resolution on the same topic, namely, A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1, on which we shall be voting later.

My delegation sees a need for consistency, and we therefore cannot support simultaneously two draft resolutions on the same topic when they take a different

approach, in particular when one of those draft resolutions - A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1 - correctly conveys the thinking of the Argentine delegation of the subject - for which reason we became one of its sponsors. My delegation will therefore abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41.

Moreover, there are other reasons for our position. In the case of other draft resolutions which have already been voted on, my delegation has pointed out that it is a general position of principle for us not to single out particular types of weapons from broader categories in order to give them special treatment in negotiations. In draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41, this is the case with anti-satellite systems. For example, operative paragraph 3 specifically refers to them.

Apart from this position of principle, my delegation would like to point out, with reference to the particular case of anti-satellite systems, that there can be no doubt that satellites are being used for military and warlike purposes. My country, Argentina, suffered directly in the recent South Atlantic conflict from the consequences of the military use of satellites; consequently it makes no sense to seek the elimination of anti-satellite systems unless at the same time we regulate, in an integrated way, the use of satellites for purely peaceful purposes.

For these reasons, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico)(interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Mexico will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41. We shall do so because our position is already faithfully reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1, of which Mexico is a sponsor.

As an example of the differences between the two draft resolutions, which make draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 completely unsatisfactory to us, I shall confine myself to a single instance. Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 reads:

"Expresses the hope that the Committee on Disarmament will take the appropriate steps, such as the possible establishment of a working group ...". The relevant provisions in the other draft resolution, A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1, are, and indeed should be, categorical. It says,

"Further requests the Committee on Disarmament to establish an ad hoc working group on the subject at the beginning of its 1983 session ...".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

That is what needs to be done. In fact, I would go further and say that that is what should already have been done at the session of the Committee on Disarmament this year and it could not be done solely due to the obstruction of two delegations which prevented the wishes of the other 38 countries, my own included, that sit on the Committee, from being met.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41, on the understanding, first, that Brazil expects the negotiations on a convention on the prevention of an arms race in outer space to cover all kinds of weapons and not a particular system of those weapons, and secondly, that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 will mean that there will be no objection to the establishment of a working group in the Committee on Disarmament to negotiate a convention on the prevention of an arms race in outer space as soon as the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space convenes early next year in Geneva.

For those reasons the position of my delegation is fully reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.44 of which my delegation is a sponsor.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago,

Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Panama, Peru, Poland, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 was adopted by 92 votes to none, with 29 abstentions.

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

Mr. STARCEVIC (Yugoslavia): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 since we support all efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space and to proceed urgently to negotiations towards that end. Our positive vote should not, however, be interpreted as our agreement concerning all the concrete recommendations contained in this draft resolution, since we believe that they are somewhat prejudicial regarding the approach to negotiations and their scope. We are convinced that negotiations on the prevention of an arms race in outer space should not be selective regarding the subjects of consideration, but should include all issues related to this problem.

Mr. JAYAKODDY (Sri Lanka): The delegation of Sri Lanka wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41. My delegation abstained on this draft resolution because we are of the view that the draft resolution does not adequately provide for early, effective and concrete action to be taken by the international community for negotiating an agreement or agreements, as appropriate,

(Mr. Jayakoddy, Sri Lanka)

to prevent an arms race in all its aspects in outer space. This urgent requirement is most adequately provided for in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1, which will come before this Committee later today and which will be supported by my delegation.

Mrs. ABOUL NAGA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Our delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 because we believe that draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1 fully reflects the position of Egypt on this subject, a position which is consistent with that of the Group of 21 on the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41, in our view, does not contain a request for the international community to take specific and effective measures in order to reach an agreement or agreements, as appropriate, in order to prevent an arms race in outer space. In contrast, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1 directly requests the Committee on Disarmament to establish an ad hoc working group with a view to undertaking negotiations for the conclusion of such an objective.

Finally, the consistent position of my country is based on the non-use of outer space for the introduction of any weapons. On the contrary, our space should be exclusively used for peaceful purposes.

Mr. MAKKI (Oman): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.37/L.41. Our positive vote, however, must be understood in the context of our consistent belief that outer space should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and should not be an arena for the deployment of any sort of weapons system, not just one.

Mr. MOUSSAOUI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): The Algerian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41 but we should like to state for the record that our affirmative vote does not prejudice our substantive position as set forth in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.64/Rev.1, of which we are a sponsor.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.41.

(The Chairman)

The Committee will now begin consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.10/Rev.1, under agenda item 133 (c), review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament. I should like to remind representatives that the financial implications of this draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/37/L.69.

This draft resolution has 33 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November 1982. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.10/Rev.1 are: Algeria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, the Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.10/Rev.1. There are no requests to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, 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, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: None

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted by 124 votes to none.*

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of France for an explanation of vote after the vote.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation of course voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.10/Rev.1. We particularly appreciate the usefulness of the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament, and we are happy to assist whenever possible. The work of the programme, which has now been going on for a number of years, is very useful in the training of diplomats and of specialists in disarmament affairs.

We would only express the wish that as the programme moves forward more account be taken of the rules on the use of languages at the United Nations. Not all fellowship students are English-speaking, and the Director of the Programme and the United Nations services should make the necessary arrangements to provide the desired facilities to fellowship students who would find it easier to follow the programme's work in other languages.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other delegations wish to speak, consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.10/Rev.1 is concluded.

The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.42, under agenda item 50, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". The draft resolution, which has 13 sponsors, was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 36th meeting of the Committee on 18 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee, who will read out the list of sponsors.

* Subsequently the delegations of Ghana and Malta advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The 13 sponsors are: Ecuador, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Federal Republic of Germany, Liberia, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Sweden, Yugoslavia, Bahamas and Morocco.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no representatives wishing to explain their vote before the vote, the Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.42. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, 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, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam,
Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: None

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.42 was adopted by 125 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN: As no representative has asked to speak in explanation of vote after the vote, consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.42 is concluded.

The Committee will now deal with draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.44. The amendment to the draft resolution is in document A/C.1/37/L.66.

The draft resolution, which comes under agenda item 54, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons", has 17 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 38th meeting of the Committee on 19 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The 17 sponsors are: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Ecuador, Federal Republic of Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Mongolia, Norway, Poland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Belgium and Netherlands.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Poland, who wishes to introduce an oral amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.44.

Mr. STRULAK (Poland): After consultations with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.44, and with a view to achieving consensus on this draft resolution, its original sponsors wish to propose a revised operative paragraph 3, which reads as follows:

"3. Urges the Committee on Disarmament, as a matter of high priority, to intensify, during its session in 1983, elaboration of such a convention, taking into account all existing proposals and future initiatives, with a view to enabling the Committee to achieve agreement at the earliest date and to re-establish its Working Group on Chemical Weapons for this purpose;"

The sponsors hope that with this new operative paragraph 3 the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. STARCEVIC (Yugoslavia): My delegation participated in the consultations that led to the reformulation of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.44 and, although we did not have time - because agreement was reached at the last moment - to consult anew with all the sponsors of our amendment in document A/C.1/37/L.66, we now believe that the reformulated version of operative paragraph 3 contains all the necessary elements of our amendment in document A/C.1/37/L.66 and, therefore, in order to reach consensus on the draft resolution, and if we do not hear anything to the contrary, we are ready to withdraw our amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: As I hear no objections, I take it that the amendment in document A/C.1/37/L.66 is therefore withdrawn.

We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.44, as orally amended by the representative of Poland. The sponsors have requested that draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.44, as orally amended, should be adopted without a vote. Since no delegation wishes to explain its position, and if I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee now adopts it without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.44, as orally amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.44.

The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1 under agenda item 47, "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons", entitled "Renunciation of the use of new discoveries and scientific and technical achievements for military purposes".

I call on the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic to introduce the revised version.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): On behalf of the sponsors, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR introduced draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46 on "Renunciation of the use of new discoveries and scientific and technical achievements for military purposes". We now have the honour to introduce the revised version, contained in document A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1.

Consultations held among delegations interested in this draft resolution led to the following operative part:

"Calls upon all States to undertake efforts to ensure that ultimately scientific and technological achievements may be used solely for peaceful purposes."

The sponsors of the revised draft resolution, which is based on paragraph 39 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, hope that the amendment I have just read out will result in the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1 without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1 has 13 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the Byelorussian SSR at the 36th meeting of the Committee on 18 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee, who will read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1 are: Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1.

I call upon the representative of the Netherlands, who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): The Netherlands will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1, on the renunciation of the use of new discoveries and scientific and technical achievements for military purposes, because the draft resolution asks States to renounce the use of scientific and technical achievements even in the exercise of the sovereign right of self-defence. The formulation used to describe the objectives of the draft resolution is so vague that such a recommendation of the General Assembly would be neither sensible nor workable. We fail to see why we should not be allowed, for instance, to use glass fibre applications for military communications purposes. The scope of the draft resolution seems too sweeping. Moreover, it is confusing that the draft resolution should have been introduced under agenda item 47, which deals with the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. Not only does the thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1 far exceed the parameters of agenda item 47 but also we are already confronted with a controversial draft resolution (A/C.1/37/L.43) on the same agenda item, introduced by the same delegation.

For the Netherlands delegation there cannot be the slightest doubt that paragraph 77 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament provides the sole correct basis for contemplating and constructing by consensus significant agreements in this field. Paragraph 77, of course, aims at specific agreements to be concluded on particular types of new weapons of mass destruction which may be identified.

In our view, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1 is just a redundant and propagandistic draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia, Spain.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1 was adopted by 89 votes to 10, with 18 abstentions.

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

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): The sentiment of this draft resolution, that scientific and technological developments should be used for peaceful and not military purposes, might appear at first glance to be unexceptionable but we share the views of the representative of the Netherlands and my delegation does not believe that vague Utopian declarations of the type contained in the present draft resolution serve to promote the achievement of serious, practical measures of disarmament, which should be our primary aim. My delegation therefore voted against this draft resolution.

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Belgium voted against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1, for we do not see any point in that initiative. The representatives of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom have presented interesting arguments in this connection. Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.62, on the other hand, asks that progress for military purposes and research should be studied. We feel that this is more appropriate, although it is truly credit-worthy only if we have information on research and development for military purposes from all countries which are likely to carry out these activities.

Mr. DARMOSUTANTO (Indonesia): It has always been my delegation's hope that the results of the deliberations of this Committee would constitute an impetus for the ongoing negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament and elsewhere. One of the essential tasks in our continuous effort to streamline the proceedings of our work is through multifaceted draft resolutions on identical or similar issues.

My delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1, as Indonesia has given its sponsorship to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.62, relating to military research and development, which in its opinion is of a similar nature.

The CHAIRMAN: Consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.46/Rev.1 is now completed.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.