



FIRST COMMITTEE
41st meeting
held on
25 November 1983
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 41ST MEETING

UN LIBRARY

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEMS 46, 50, 55, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63 AND 141 (continued)

PROGRAMME OF WORK

*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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.1/38/PV.41
22 December 1983

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46, 50, 55, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63 AND 141 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now continue with explanations of vote after the voting on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 14.

Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands): My delegation wishes to explain why it abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.59. It goes without saying that the qualities of the so-called Palme report are not now under discussion. My delegation's abstention cannot be interpreted in any way as underrating the important contribution Sweden continues to make to the cause of arms control and disarmament. However, we feel that the draft resolution could have reflected more carefully the fact that the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues was considered in the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which completed its task last spring. Furthermore, for such a study to make a really meaningful contribution to the disarmament process, a more precise outline of the parameters would have been preferable.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): The Japanese delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.59. We have always joined in appreciating the important contributions made by the Independent Commission, some of the contents of whose report we regard very highly. My delegation, however, has considerable doubts as to whether sufficient international considerations and deliberations have been carried out in order to warrant a proposed United Nations study by governmental experts. It seems to us that something as important and broad based as a comprehensive study on security would require more careful international consultations and preparations before the General Assembly could take action on that subject, as proposed in the draft resolution.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): We wish to explain our delegation's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.59. When the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues was brought before the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, we expressed our strong reservations on setting a precedent by bringing into United Nations practice the discussion of private reports, but reluctantly joined the consensus out of our great respect for its

(Mr. Sibay, Turkey)

permanent authors and their good intentions. We must also emphasize we were assured that it was the first and last time such a study would be brought before the United Nations. That is why this year we were unable to vote for draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.59. We wish to reiterate that Turkey remains firmly opposed to the discussion of reports by private persons being introduced into United Nations practice.

Mr. VAN BOHEMEN (New Zealand): I would like to explain New Zealand's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.59 approved by the Committee this morning. New Zealand abstained in the vote on that draft resolution. We fully support its paragraphs 1 and 2 and recognize the important contribution the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues has made to the international disarmament debate. Our abstention reflects our reservations about the request to the Secretary-General, in paragraph 3, to undertake a comprehensive study on concepts of security.

The report of the Independent Commission was noted by the General Assembly last year and considered by the Disarmament Commission this year. While we appreciate the work of private bodies like the Independent Commission and recognize the value they can have for the work of the United Nations, we are reluctant to lend our support to a request that the United Nations itself should undertake a further study, particularly one of such a broad and undefined nature.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): I should also like to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.59. With some regret, my delegation has been compelled to withhold an affirmative vote from this draft resolution. I speak in explanation of our vote to make clear that this does not detract from our full support for the concept of common security, which was elaborated by the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues last year. In fact, the co-operative approach to security which the Independent Commission has taken, and the shape it has given to the concept in its well-known report, have been fully endorsed by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on many occasions. I would point in particular to our co-operation in the proceedings of the United Nations Disarmament

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

Commission earlier this year. We also find that the concept is worthy of further exploration and that efforts should be undertaken in that direction. In that way, my delegation is fully in support of the majority of the preambular and operative paragraphs in draft resolution L.59. We do, however see some difficulties in the present wording of paragraph 3. Our first objection is on the level of principle.

Like other delegations have pointed out, the First Committee at present faces the danger of embarking on a proliferation of United Nations studies in the disarmament field, without first ascertaining that the projects of a study are endorsed by the greatest possible number of interested States, that the prospects of the study have been fully explored and the contributions it can make to our work carefully assessed, that the Advisory Board is given sufficient opportunity to review the study projects and to evaluate them in relation to other concurrent study plans, and that all planned study projects are arranged over time in a rational manner guaranteeing the ability of the Department of Disarmament Affairs to provide back-up services and avoiding an uneven rhythm of projects in need of substantial Secretariat support. Just as this proposed study, that proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.57/Rev.2 is another regrettable example of this practice.

In addition, my delegation has some doubts as to the particularly broad terms of reference of the study. It is questionable whether a group of governmental experts, under the auspices governing the work of such broadly representative groups, can produce more than a very general and not particularly illuminating overview on a broad range of issues. At the present juncture, it might have been more beneficial for the authors of the draft resolution to seek academic assistance for the further development and elaboration of the concept of common security and other related concepts. A broadening and deepening of the debate, such as research institutes and political scientists can accomplish, might have fertilized our further work in this important realm better than a United Nations experts study with its particular constraints.

Mr. DUBEY (India): We abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.59. I shall very briefly explain the reasons for that. We have all subscribed to the concept of collective security enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, and we are all committed to abide by it. Any study of concepts of security can at best - on the negative side - bring out the dangerous implications

(Mr. Dubey, India)

of the alternative security doctrines espoused by major military Powers and their allies and - on the positive side - reaffirm the continuing validity of the collective security doctrine.

We are not in favour of any alternative security doctrine designed to replace the doctrine of collective security as embodied in the United Nations Charter. Moreover, we do not think the elements of the study mentioned in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.59 are adequate or, in respect of some of them, even so pertinent at this juncture. The entire concept of security assumes a different dimension and character in the context of the present massive accumulation of nuclear arsenals and the threat of nuclear war. This is not even mentioned in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

Finally, as regards paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, it is well known that we have reservations about some of the recommendations of the report of the International Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. Our acceptance of paragraph 2 is, therefore, obviously qualified by those reservations.

For those reasons we abstained in the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union attaches great significance to the matter of the relationship between disarmament and development. There can be no doubt whatsoever that the ascending spiral of the arms race and the astronomic growth of military expenditures are proving to an increasing degree to be obstacles to the solution of problems facing the whole of mankind and are seriously complicating those problems.

We believe that the resources freed as a result of the implementation of disarmament measures could considerably accelerate economic development, especially that of the developing countries.

Unfortunately, the Soviet delegation was unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.15. That draft resolution is, in our view, a natural extension of last year's resolution 37/84, on which the Soviet Union was obliged to abstain. That resolution calls upon Member States to take measures in accordance with the recommendations and conclusions of the study on the relationship between disarmament and development (A/36/356). As we have frequently stated, the Soviet Union does not endorse all those recommendations and cannot therefore support the presentation of a report by the Secretary-General to the fortieth session of the General Assembly based on measures pursued by Member States and within the United Nations system in accordance with resolution 37/84.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus taken action on all the draft resolutions grouped under cluster 14, apart from draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.54/Rev.1, to which we shall return at a later stage in our work.

The Committee will now return to cluster 9, and consider draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.24/Rev.2, L.28 and L.36/Rev.1.

Miss ABOUL NAGA (Egypt): Members will recall that when the delegation of Egypt introduced draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36 on behalf of its sponsors, we stated that the sponsors were still prepared to engage in negotiations with the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.24 and L.28. Indeed, it was our earnest hope that draft resolution L.36 could offer the Committee the opportunity to come to a single decision on a single draft resolution on the subject, which would mean a complete action directed towards the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

It was in that spirit, and in response to your appeal, Mr. Chairman, that the sponsors of L.36 engaged in extensive negotiations with the sponsors of L.24 and L.28. At one point in the negotiating process the possibility of reaching an agreement on a single text, or even on two draft resolutions instead of the three which are before the Committee, seemed to be quite remote. Nevertheless, these difficulties never discouraged the interested parties from continuing to explore and pursue every possibility of reaching agreement. It is, indeed, due to the spirit of co-operation and understanding among those involved in the negotiations, as well to their good faith, that I am in a position today to report to the Committee the successful outcome of those negotiations, which is reflected in draft resolution L.36/Rev.1.

As a matter of fact, consultations went on even after L.36/Rev.1 was issued and circulated, and a few changes to that document have been agreed upon to make it possible for the Committee to act on one single draft resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

I wish now to explain the revisions made to L.36, as reflected in L.36/Rev.1. First of all, after the sixteenth preambular paragraph a new preambular paragraph was added, which reads as follows:

"Taking note of the draft Treaty on the Prohibition of the Use of Force in Outer Space and from Space against the Earth submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as well as views and comments expressed during the discussion of that draft at its thirty-eighth session".

(Miss Aboul Naga, Egypt)

The second revision consists of the deletion of the penultimate preambular paragraph, which had begun with the words, "Noting with alarm that certain reported programmes ...".

In the operative part of L.36, the first revision concerned its paragraphs 1 and 2; those paragraphs have been combined into a new paragraph 1, which reads as follows:

"Reaffirms that general and complete disarmament under effective international control warrants that outer space shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and that it shall not become an arena for an arms race".

A new paragraph 6 has been added. It reads as follows:

"Requests the Committee on Disarmament to intensify its consideration of the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space in all its aspects taking into account all relevant proposals including the consideration of the proposal referred to in the preambular part of the present resolution".

Those are the changes in the text of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36 which now appear in draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1.

As I first mentioned, there have been a few other changes to the text in document A/C.1/38/L.36. They are incorporated in draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1 as follows:

At the end of the eighth preambular paragraph, after "9 December 1982", add the following: "and resolution 37/99 D of 13 December 1982" - which was the resolution adopted at the previous session of the General Assembly on "Prevention of an arms race in outer space and prohibition of anti-satellite systems".

The second change is on page 3. In the penultimate preambular paragraph, after the words "to the establishment of such a working group", add "without delay", there being no other change in the paragraph.

The third change is also on page 3. The last preambular paragraph is to be deleted.

With this revision and the changes, I am particularly pleased that our efforts have been crowned with success in the interest of the subject-matter, which is becoming extremely important in the field of disarmament, namely, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". I am also pleased to announce that Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic

(Miss Aboul Naga, Egypt)

Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic have become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1, and I wish to express our thanks and appreciation to them.

On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1, I also wish to express our deep appreciation to the Secretary of the Committee and his colleagues for their help and assistance in making the revision available for circulation in a relatively short time.

Finally, with the realization of our wish to take action on one single draft resolution on the issue under consideration, we hope that the present draft resolution will commend itself to the widest acceptance of the Committee.

Mr. ERDENECHULUUN (Mongolia): As the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.24/Rev.2 on the item entitled "Conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in outer space and from space against the earth", the Mongolian delegation is pleased to announce that, after intensive consultations with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36, we are in a position to associate ourselves to its revised version.

As was noted by the previous speaker, the representative of Egypt, the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and my own delegation join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1, just introduced by the Egyptian delegation.

In so doing, we should like first to express our appreciation to the authors of this draft resolution for their spirit of co-operation and accommodation in reaching agreement on a common draft resolution. As we see it, the aim of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1 is further to intensify the work of the Committee on Disarmament on a priority basis with a view to undertaking concrete negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement or agreements preventing an arms race in outer space in all its aspects. We consider it of special importance that in the present situation, when the danger of an arms race in outer space is acquiring grave dimensions, it is incumbent upon all States to do all they can in order to create the necessary political and legal conditions so as to prevent the use of force in outer space and from space against the earth.

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

It is with that in mind that we emphasize the importance of operative paragraph 6, which

"Requests the Committee on Disarmament to intensify its consideration of the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space in all its aspects taking into account all relevant proposals including the consideration of the proposal ..."

on the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in outer space and from space against the earth.

In view of the above, my delegation will not press its draft resolution in document A/C.1/38/L.24/Rev.2 to a vote.

Mr. ALESSI (Italy) (interpretation from French): In response to the appeal of several delegations and your own appeal, Sir, to try and consolidate all draft resolutions dealing with the same item into a single draft resolution, I should like to inform the Committee that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.28, on whose behalf I am speaking, will not insist that it be put to the vote.

We have noted that a certain number of changes made to the text of draft resolution A/C.1/27/L.36 are positive and we are grateful to the sponsors of this draft resolution for their efforts at conciliation.

This decision in no way means that the sponsors of document A/C.1/38/L.28 have given up the approach which has up to now characterized their activities in the field of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. It merely testifies further to their desire to pursue their objective in a constructive manner and to promote any possible convergence of views likely to facilitate the future task of the Committee on Disarmament on such an important subject.

The CHAIRMAN: At this stage, I should like to express my deep appreciation and thanks to the delegations of Egypt and Sri Lanka for their tireless efforts and spirit of co-operation and accommodation which made it possible to reach agreement and for the Committee to take action on one draft resolution on this subject. I should also like to convey my appreciation and thanks to the sponsors of the other two draft resolutions who have indicated that they will not request that they be put to the vote or that they will be withdrawn - as expressed by the representative of Mongolia for A/C.1/38/L.24 and by the representative of Italy for A/C.1/38/L.28 - and I am sure that I speak on behalf of all the members of the Committee in doing so.

(The Chairman)

The one remaining draft resolution in cluster 9, draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1, was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, held on 17 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Bangladesh, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, the Maldives, Mongolia, Poland, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Sweden and Viet Nam.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, 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, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev. 1, as orally amended, was adopted by 121 votes to 1, with one abstention.*

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

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

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1, not so much because we disagreed with its overall objective but because it appeared to us to prejudge a number of important issues and to ignore or dismiss several problems which have already been discussed at length in international forums but which still await resolution. It appears to us self-evident that in the exploration of outer space mankind stands at the very edge of technological developments and that many highly complex and technical matters need to be discussed before radical initiatives will be justified.

Our abstention on this draft resolution should not, however, be held to cast doubt on the great importance which my Government attaches to existing agreements covering aspects of arms control in outer space or our readiness to look carefully and sympathetically on the prospects of future agreements.

I would remind the Committee that Mr. Luce, Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, addressed this subject in his statement before this Committee on 27 October, stating the willingness of the British Government to seek an agreement which would truly enhance security and inviting others to join us. He warned, however, against the quick fix and the easy option, which would complicate rather than resolve the issue. We believe this problem can be tackled only by a realistic and balanced approach to the problems of arms control in outer space. We believe such an approach was contained in draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.28. I wish to place on record that the United Kingdom would have voted in favour of that draft resolution had it remained on the table.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The vote of the Soviet delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1, was guided by the policy of principle of the Soviet Union for the taking of effective measures to avert the genuine and real danger of the proliferation of the arms race and its extension into outer space, and the militarization of outer space, so that outer space will always remain free of weapons of any kind. It was precisely to that end that we proposed the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting the use of force in outer space and from outer space against the earth at this session of the General Assembly.

Draft resolution L.36/Rev.1 was prepared as a result of the active and constructive work of delegations of all groups. We welcome its adoption,

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

since it gives the Committee on Disarmament concrete indications with regard to the need for stepping up its work on the problem of preventing the arms race in outer space, within the framework of the special working group, and gives that group powers to undertake businesslike negotiations in order to achieve the necessary understandings, including on the proposal of the Soviet Union for preparing a treaty prohibiting the use of force in outer space or from outer space against the earth.

We view the adoption of this draft resolution and the result of the voting on it as an important step forward towards the realization of the will of all States to see to it that outer space does not become an arena of the arms race but is used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Mr. FINDLAY (Australia): Australia voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1 because of its interest in international agreements to prevent an arms race in outer space. We should like to thank its original sponsors, Egypt and Sri Lanka, for the flexibility they have shown in accommodating our concerns and enabling us to vote in favour.

We do, however, have a continuing reservation about the use of the expression "exclusively for peaceful purposes". This, in our view, should not be interpreted as contrary to our interest in stable deterrence and the contribution which various State systems make to such stability.

Mr. DUBEY (India): India is deeply concerned about the extension of the arms race into outer space. We should therefore like the Committee on Disarmament to take up this question for serious negotiations, with a view to concluding an agreement, or agreements, for the prevention of an arms race in outer space. My country has an outer-space programme of its own and we have already achieved modest success in the utilization of outer space for the benefit of our people. We have, therefore, the greatest stake in ensuring that the global arms race is not extended to outer space and does not come in the way of our endeavours to make peaceful use of outer space.

The Indian delegation is therefore very happy that this Committee has been able to adopt a consensus resolution. We very much hope that this will be reflected in the deliberations of the Committee on Disarmament when it starts discussion on this subject at the beginning of next year.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): The Japanese delegation voted for draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1 because of my Government's deep interest in the subject of the

(Mr. Imai, Japan)

prevention of an arms race in outer space. However, I should like to state our concern about certain points in the draft resolution. For one thing, my delegation believes that it is of overriding importance to formulate precise definitions of various terms used in the draft. Operative paragraph 7 pre-empts the work of the Committee on Disarmament. Further, we are concerned that in the preambular part there is reference to only one of the draft concepts so far proposed regarding outer space. While supporting the draft resolution, I should like to put on record the above-mentioned concerns of the Japanese delegation.

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): We voted for the draft resolution that has just been adopted. This vote indicates that despite our divergences we very much hope that the Committee on Disarmament will be able to tackle this task as soon as it resumes its work in 1984, and that it will do so on the basis of the compromise that was drawn up in Geneva at the end of the summer session.

None the less, Belgium cannot subscribe to concepts linked to the demilitarization of outer space in so far as this affects security - in particular, the verification systems for arms control and disarmament agreements.

Moreover, we again express our regret at the trend towards the General Assembly taking the place of the Committee on Disarmament in drawing up mandates for working groups.

Mr. ALESSI (Italy) (interpretation from French): The Italian delegation voted for draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1, just as it voted for a similar resolution at the thirty-seventh session. Our vote is consistent with the interest we have always taken in the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

We appreciate the improvements that have been made in the text, but in supporting the draft resolution we stress that we still have certain reservations about a number of points in it. In particular, my delegation believes that operative paragraph 7, on the mandate of a future working group of the Committee on Disarmament, goes beyond what we think is respect for that Committee's autonomy on the organization of its work, and this at the very time when negotiations on a text for the mandate seem to be about to yield a positive result.

(Mr. Alessi, Italy)

Moreover, with reference to the penultimate preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 6, the Italian delegation does not believe it appropriate that there should be special mention of one particular proposal among all the various existing oral and written proposals on the subject.

However, we endorse the draft resolution's general objective, and that is why we supported it.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like first of all to pay a tribute to the two main sponsors of the draft resolution, both from the Group of Non-Aligned Countries, who have worked tirelessly towards the unified text now before us. They have thus fulfilled an ambition which we all had last year, but in which we were less successful. Their excellent work makes it possible for another group of countries to withdraw their draft resolution, and I, as one of its sponsors, happily concurred in that decision.

We were able to vote for draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1, in the expectation that our agreement would facilitate the further negotiations on a mandate for a working group in the Committee on Disarmament in 1984. However, some problems remain, and I should like to point them out.

My first observation relates to operative paragraph 7, asking the Committee on Disarmament to take specific organizational action. In my delegation's view, the Committee, an autonomous international body, must be left to determine its working modes by sovereign decision. As is well known, its own rules of procedure provide for the consensus rule to govern such decisions.

In the operative part we find the formula "exclusively for peaceful purposes", which thus adds the word "exclusively" to a term which has already proved to be particularly laden with ambiguity in the course of previous attempts by the international community to regulate outer space. My delegation maintains its reservations on the use of that term. However, the operative paragraphs in question are acceptable to the extent that they express the international community's resolve to promote rapid and effective steps towards further disarmament measures relating to outer space.

My delegation also believes that since the multilateral process in this field is now well launched it should be left to the parties to former bilateral discussion to weigh the merits and the opportunity - in time - of embarking on further bilateral endeavours supplementary to multilateral efforts.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal
Republic of Germany)

A further stumbling-block to my delegation's unconditionally supporting draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1 is the totally unjustified highlighting of the Soviet draft treaty on space matters. As my delegation has frequently pointed out in the Committee on Disarmament, its wording raises more questions than it answers. My delegation has grave doubts about whether the Soviet draft could be anywhere near a suitable basis for the beginning of later negotiations.

In space matters my delegation adheres to a step-by-step approach, and from the early days we have always stressed that the international community should deal with the issue of anti-satellite systems and their consideration in arms control terms. That would certainly also apply to the outer space legal issues relating to the protection of satellites.

I again express the hope that we can successfully and swiftly move in the Conference on Disarmament - as the body will be called next year - to determine a mandate for a suitable working group. I am certain that these negotiations can be conducted on the basis of the draft text of a mandate for which there was such broad support at the conclusion of the last session of the Committee on Disarmament, both from the Group of 21 and the Group of Western Countries.

Mr. SAETHER (Norway): The prevention of an arms race in outer space is becoming an increasingly important task in multilateral disarmament negotiations, to which the Norwegian Government attaches considerable importance. Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1, as amended today, reflects the necessity of promoting the multilateral deliberations on this question. Against this background, Norway voted for the draft resolution.

However, it contains several paragraphs Norway does not entirely support. In particular, Norway believes that all existing proposals should have been given equal treatment in the draft resolution. We also stress that operative paragraph 7 requests the Committee on Disarmament to establish a working group with a broader mandate than at present seems acceptable to all the members of that Committee. However, the Norwegian Government hopes that at the beginning of its 1984 session the Committee on Disarmament can establish a working group to deal with the question of preventing an arms race in outer space.

Finally, I pay a tribute to the delegations of Egypt and Sri Lanka for their instrumental role in the consultations on this draft resolution.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1, because of our great interest in its subject matter. We must, however, put on record our reservations concerning the concept of "exclusively for peaceful purposes", whose proper context is ambiguous.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation joins the many speakers here who have today expressed gratitude to those who so skilfully conducted the negotiations that led to the happy result we witnessed a few moments ago.

I would only add, by way of explanation of our affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1, that in our view paragraph 7 is one of the fundamental paragraphs of this text. In that paragraph the Committee on Disarmament is requested to establish an ad hoc working group on the subject at the beginning of its session in 1984. We believe that that ad hoc working group should have as its mandate the conducting of the necessary negotiations for, as stated in paragraph 7, the conclusion of an agreement or agreements to prevent an arms race in all its aspects in outer space.

The only negative vote on this draft resolution was cast by a member of the Committee on Disarmament. Since that Committee, under its rules of procedure, works on the basis of consensus, my delegation does hope that the result of the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1 - that is, 121 in favour and only 1 vote against and 1 abstention - may have some influence so that next year in the Committee on Disarmament the position of the delegation which cast the negative vote will be brought into line with the clearly expressed will of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil): I think that the First Committee has taken one of the most important, if not the most important, votes ever taken during the deliberations of the General Assembly on disarmament questions. We have voted on the question of preventing or not preventing an arms race in outer space. We have not been able to prevent an arms race on earth, and now we are trying to prevent an arms race in outer space. The international community has voted overwhelmingly in favour of preventing an arms race in outer space.

I pay a tribute to the delegations of Egypt and Sri Lanka for bringing about this compromise draft resolution that has had the support not only of the non-aligned countries but also of the two military alliances. There has been only one single negative vote on this draft resolution designed to prevent an arms race

(Mr. Souza e Silva, Brazil)

in outer space, and it was cast by one of the countries that can help to prevent an arms race in outer space. I express the hope, on behalf of my delegation, that that country will take into consideration the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the international community represented here and will not prevent negotiations in the appropriate negotiating body aimed at avoiding an arms race in outer space, negotiations that should lead to the conclusion of an agreement or agreements to that end.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded our action on the remaining draft resolution in cluster 9.

We shall now revert to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.8/Rev.1. In that connection I wish to make the following statement.

I have been informed that the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions has made a number of observations on the draft statute which forms the subject of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.8/Rev.1 and which was initially submitted to the General Assembly as an annex to the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/38/467. That draft statute had been previously considered by the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies in its function as Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, pursuant to resolution 37/99 K, part IV, paragraph 6.

In the light of the observations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.8/Rev.1 have, after consultations with me, decided at a meeting today not to seek action on that draft at the present session.

In the circumstances I believe it would be appropriate for the General Assembly to decide that the draft statute of the United Nations Institute Disarmament Research should be returned to the Board of Trustees with a request that the Board spell out the meaning of the provisions of the draft statute, so that the General Assembly can take a decision on that draft statute at its next regular session.

If I hear no objections, I shall take it that this statement is acceptable to the First Committee and that a recommendation for a decision to that effect could be included in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, my delegation has no objection to the decision you are proposing, which is indeed necessary. We merely wish to express our regret.

The Governing Council of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) held its last session from 6 to 13 September. On that occasion it approved this statute.

We would simply like to say that, in our view, it probably would have been possible for the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to examine this document at a proper time. We learned with some surprise that it had only been communicated very recently. We regret that the Advisory Committee was then unable to undertake an examination of the statute of UNIDIR, which it would have done had it been informed earlier. This would have enabled us to adopt the statute at this session of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: Since there is no objection, may I take it then that the Committee agrees with my suggestion?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now return to the consideration of draft resolution L.31/Rev.1.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): As members will recall, draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.31, reproduced in the document dated 11 November 1983, was introduced to the Committee. I had the honour of doing this myself on behalf of the sponsors, the delegations of Algeria, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and my own delegation.

Subsequently, on 18 November, the delegation of Brazil presented an amendment in document A/C.1/38/L.71. The representative of Brazil, heeding the suggestion of our Chairman - and the sponsors of the draft resolution associated themselves with this - had an interchange of views with these sponsors, as a result of which it proved possible to come up with a revised text of the draft resolution satisfactory to all. Consequently, this revised draft resolution in document L.31/Rev.1, dated 21 November, is sponsored by all the sponsors of the original draft resolution, with the addition of Brazil.

When I introduced the original draft resolution on behalf of all the sponsors, I expressed our hope that it could be approved by consensus or without a vote, which is what it is normally called.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The sponsors still entertain this hope and I shall give the reasons for this. If members compare the revised draft with the original draft - which I would request them to do - they will note the following changes. In what was formerly the sole operative paragraph, which is now operative paragraph 1, we have added to the third line the following words, "to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session a progress report on the matter ...", the remainder of the text of the paragraph remaining unchanged.

If members bear in mind that the original text, which is completely retained except for the addition I have mentioned, called on

"... the Conference on Disarmament, as soon as it considers that the circumstances are propitious for that purpose, to renew its work on the elaboration of the comprehensive programme of disarmament previously requested and to submit to the General Assembly, not later than at its forty-first session, a complete draft of such a programme",

I believe, it will be easily understood, that implicit in this paragraph was the idea that it would remain for the Conference on Disarmament to decide whether it believed it appropriate to present or not to present one or more progress reports at one of the sessions before the forty-first session.

In our view, the only thing that has been done as a result of the addition now to be found in paragraph 1 is to make explicit what was previously implicit. It would appear that some delegations believed that, as the French say: "If it goes without saying, it will go better if it is said". So, this addition has been made, but in the opinion of the sponsors, it in no way changes the essential substance of the original paragraph.

The additional operative paragraph reads as follows:

"Decides to consider at its thirty-ninth session, in the light of the above-mentioned progress report, the advisability of requesting the Disarmament Commission to examine further the question and to make appropriate recommendations to the General Assembly".

This second paragraph adds nothing to the powers which obviously belong to the General Assembly. If it received a progress report, then it would be up to the General Assembly to decide what it deems fit: what is explicitly stated here or any other procedure.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

As I said at the beginning, that is why the sponsors still hope that this draft resolution will be one more approved by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation has expressed the wish to speak on the draft resolution or to explain its position before the vote, we shall now proceed to take a decision on it.

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.31/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee on 15 November. It is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Mexico, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. As members have just heard, its sponsors have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, may I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.31/Rev.1 without a vote?

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.31/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: If no delegation wishes to explain its vote after the voting, that completes action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/38/L.31/Rev.1.

I suggest we now take up the remaining two draft resolutions in cluster 8 - draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2, with the financial implications, in document A/C.1/38/L.79, and draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.68/Rev.2.

Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): I take it we are considering both draft resolutions together. I have an amendment to submit to the Committee on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.68/Rev.2. After due consultations with the sponsors, it was agreed to amend paragraph 8 of L.68/Rev.2 to read as follows:

"Condemns in particular recent decisions by some Member States to grant licences to several corporations in their territory to provide equipment, technical and maintenance services for nuclear installations in South Africa."

We propose that the paragraph which I have just read out replace paragraph 8 in L.68/Rev.2.

The CHAIRMAN: If no delegation wishes to speak on either of those two draft resolutions, I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. MICHAELSEN (Denmark): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries - Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark. Our countries continue to support the general purpose of draft resolution L.68/Rev.2,

(Mr. Michaelsen, Denmark)

that is, to keep the African continent free of nuclear weapons. We share the concern that South Africa might acquire nuclear weapons. Such a development would constitute a major setback for international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. It would no doubt also contribute to a further aggravation of the situation in that region. Therefore, we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/38/L.68/Rev.2, as orally amended.

Our five delegations, however, have reservations about certain paragraphs. The Nordic countries deplore the inappropriate and arbitrary singling out of individual countries and groups of countries. We also have reservations of principle with regard to the paragraphs in the draft resolution which fail to take into account the Charter provisions concerning the division of powers between the General Assembly and the Security Council.

Mr. VANIER (Canada) (interpretation from French): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2, on "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". The sponsors of that draft resolution are to be congratulated for having omitted from the text of resolution 37/74 A, which served as the basis for the present draft resolution, certain tendentious wording which named States which collaborate with South Africa in its presumed nuclear programmes. With those modifications, the present wording of draft resolution L.67/Rev.2 reflects two fundamental principles supported by Canada: that South Africa should not develop nuclear weapons, and that it should submit its nuclear installations to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Accordingly, my delegation is able to give its support to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2.

We should like, however, to express a preference for the original wording of paragraph 8. We are of the view that the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research should finance its studies with its own resources. We therefore express our reservations about paragraph 8 and point out that the study which is called for should be carried out using existing resources.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation is pleased to announce that it will vote affirmatively on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2. This is the first time that my delegation will be able to do so in the case of a draft resolution of this type. Our positive vote is designed to express our high degree of identification with the objectives of the draft resolution, both as

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

regards the establishment of Africa as a whole as a nuclear-weapon-free zone, and as regards the particular admonition to the Republic of South Africa to refrain from any nuclear-weapons-related activities. We have noted with gratification that the text of draft resolution L.67/Rev.2 is now of a nature enabling us to mark our support for those objectives more clearly.

Yet a certain number of doubts pertaining to the specific language of the draft resolution remain. In the second preambular paragraph, and again in operative paragraph 1, the confines of the future nuclear-weapon-free zone are taken to comprise both the continent of Africa and "its surrounding areas". This term continues to give us difficulties, since it is ambiguous. It is unclear whether the surrounding areas would comprise additional territories or only sea areas, and what the extent of such areas would be. My delegation, in any event, will continue to give the strictest possible interpretation to this clause.

As regards paragraphs 3 and 4, my delegation, of course, agrees with the general thrust of the language, with the objective of keeping Africa free from nuclear weapons. The Federal Republic of Germany will certainly do its utmost, within the limits of its legal possibilities, to contribute towards that end, but it should be noted that the language is very broad and would need careful interpretation. The reservations which my Government has expressed hitherto with regard to possible broader interpretations will remain valid.

Paragraph 8 provides for support by the United Nations Secretariat for the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) in the exercise of tasks entrusted to it under the draft resolution. We would have liked to think that this signified, in the first place, intellectual support. Unfortunately, as document A/C.1/38/L.79 shows, a financial meaning is also implied. We have some budgetary and constitutional difficulties with this. The relatively limited task assigned to UNIDIR should, in our view, be carried out within existing resources to the extent possible.

In that vein, paragraph 8 too should benefit from a strict interpretation. Unfortunately, the calculations contained in document A/C.1/38/L.79 do not heed that principle. The amounts requested appear to be very much exaggerated. My delegation wishes to make it clear that its support of draft resolution L.67/Rev.2

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

will in no way curtail its freedom of action when the extent of the financial involvement of the United Nations is considered in the competent financial bodies.

I should like to recall a working paper on the question of the nuclear capability of South Africa which my delegation submitted to the United Nations Disarmament Commission earlier this year. In that working paper we suggested wording of our own on many of the issues considered in draft resolution L.67/Rev.2. Happily, our wording is not too far removed from what we now find in that draft resolution. That confirms our hope that the United Nations Disarmament Commission will do fruitful work next year on the subject, with a view to completing concrete recommendations, on a consensus basis, thereby dealing with the relevant item on the agenda of the Disarmament Commission in a definite fashion.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2, with financial implications outlined in document A/C.1/38/L.79. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sierra Leone at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, held on 17 November, on behalf of the group of African States.

A separate recorded vote on operative paragraph 8 has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, 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, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/67/Rev.2 was adopted by 103 votes to 1, with 22 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2 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, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, 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, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Israel, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2, as a whole, was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.68/Rev.2. It was introduced on behalf of the African Group by the representative of Sierra Leone at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 17 November. 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, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, 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, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.68/Rev.2, as orally amended, was adopted by 112 votes to 4, with 11 abstentions.

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

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): It is with regret that we are not at this stage in a position to support draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2. We were not able to do so mainly because its text does not clearly indicate that the forms of nuclear collaboration mentioned are limited to the acquisition a nuclear-weapon capability.

Our vote in no way diminishes our firm support for the objective of denuclearization of Africa.

Ms. BOYD (Australia): I wish to explain Australia's vote on both draft resolutions - A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2 and L.68/Rev.2 - which the Committee has just adopted under agenda item 46.

Australia voted for draft resolution L.67/Rev.2 but abstained in the vote on L.68/Rev.2. The latter contained some elements which, regretfully, my delegation cannot fully support and which have caused us to abstain in the vote. However, Australia fully supports the intention underlying the drafting of both draft resolutions and firmly shares the concerns of those disturbed about the situation in South Africa and the possibility of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Australia endorses all calls on South Africa to become a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and for it to place all its nuclear installations under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

Therefore, we fully support those paragraphs in draft resolution L.68/Rev.2 which focus on South Africa's potential to increase the danger of nuclear proliferation.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2 and L.68/Rev.2, which have just been adopted by the Committee.

The Government of the United Kingdom fully supports the Governments of independent States in southern Africa in their efforts to guarantee and safeguard their territorial integrity and national sovereignty. It also believes that South Africa should become a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons so as to reassure its neighbours and the world about its nuclear programme.

None the less, all States have the right to apply and develop programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. This right is internationally recognized and set out in a number of international instruments. It continues to be our view that it would be wrong to seek to limit this right in individual cases for political reasons.

The United Kingdom's own contacts with South Africa in the nuclear field are minimal and mainly restricted to applications of safety, medicine and agriculture. We do not collaborate in any way with South Africa in the development of a nuclear-weapons capability nor in the development of its civil nuclear-power programme.

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

My Government has also noted with concern the financial implications of draft resolution L.67/Rev.2, as set out in document L.79, which has just been distributed. It is the United Kingdom's firm view that any expenditure required to carry out the requests set out in operative paragraphs 7 and 8 of draft resolution L.67/Rev.2 should be found from within the overall level of resources proposed for the 1984-1985 biennium and not from additions to the regular budget.

Mr. GLEISSNER (Austria): The Austrian delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2 and L.68/Rev.2. In doing so, we were motivated by our longstanding support for the denuclearization of Africa and by our concern about the danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons which the unsafeguarded nuclear programme of South Africa potentially constitutes.

However, both draft resolutions contain some provisions with regard to which we have reservations. In particular, we would have preferred making a clearer distinction between the responsibilities of the Security Council and the General Assembly in this matter. With regard to operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution L.68/Rev.2, I wish to state that Austria strictly observes the arms embargo imposed by the Security Council.

Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation wishes to place on record on what grounds it voted in favour - unlike its vote on a similar resolution last year - of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2, concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, and abstained once again on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.68/Rev.2, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa".

In voting in favour of draft resolution L.67/Rev.2, the Netherlands in no way wishes to give the impression that it shares all the considerations and opinions in the draft resolution, let alone that it is particularly happy about them. Nevertheless, we feel that in some parts this draft resolution, unlike its predecessors, has moved in the direction we consider to be the right one. My delegation notes, for example, that paragraphs 3 and 4 of draft resolution L.67/Rev.2 address the question of forms of collaboration only in so far as they "enable it to frustrate the objective of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa which seeks to keep Africa free from nuclear weapons".

Considering these paragraphs in conjunction with paragraph 6, draft resolution L.67/Rev.2 makes an implicit distinction between nuclear collaboration liable to contribute to South Africa's capability to manufacture nuclear weapons on the one hand and nuclear co-operation for peaceful purposes under International Atomic

(Mr. Ramaker, Netherlands)

Energy Agency safeguards on the other hand, a distinction which my delegation appreciates. We would, however, have preferred the word "co-operation" to "collaboration".

My delegation, furthermore, considers the deletion from draft resolution L.67/Rev.2 of any reference to the collaboration of certain Western countries and Israel a step in the right direction.

As to the financial implications of draft resolution L.67/Rev.2, my delegation will have to reserve its position.

Turning now to draft resolution L.68/Rev.2, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa", my delegation has a much less favourable opinion. This draft resolution has not changed in the same positive way as has draft resolution L.67/Rev.2. Moreover, my delegation considers the singling out of certain countries unwarranted. I hope I made clear earlier in my statement that the Netherlands does not share the view expressed in draft resolution L.67/Rev.2 to the effect that all forms of co-operation and collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear field should be prohibited. Our abstention does not, however, imply that we do not wholeheartedly support the request to the United Nations Security Council contained in the first part of paragraph 6 to look into the matter of existing loopholes in the arms embargo against South Africa.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union has consistently supported the efforts of the States of Africa to create on that continent a zone free of nuclear weapons. We categorically condemn any attempts on the part of South Africa to acquire nuclear weapons and we share the indignation at the actions of certain Western countries and Israel in encouraging the nuclear ambitions of the racist régime. The Soviet Union is in favour of imposing comprehensive and binding sanctions, under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter against the racists in order to close off any channels which promote their military and nuclear activities.

We supported draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2, as a whole, and in doing so we supported the proposal that the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, in co-operation with the Department for Disarmament Affairs and in consultation with the Organization of African Unity, should provide data on the continuing development of South Africa's nuclear capability. The Soviet delegation has serious doubts about the formulation used in the operative part of the

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

draft resolution, which presupposes departure from the established system of financing the activities of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research by means of voluntary contributions. The Soviet delegation therefore abstained in the voting on that paragraph.

In connection with the formulation of operative paragraph 1 of this draft resolution, the Soviet delegation would like to state that the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa should not be allowed to affect the universally acknowledged norms of international law, including the principle of freedom of navigation on the high seas.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): My delegation would like to speak in explanation of its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2, on the denuclearization of Africa, and L.68/Rev.2 on South Africa's nuclear capability.

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 zones. The United States firmly believes that an Africa free of nuclear weapons is a goal worthy of our collective energies and co-operation.

The Organization of African Unity deserves great credit for its early recognition of the importance of the denuclearization of the African continent. We believe, however, that these draft resolutions do not serve the purpose of non-proliferation and in fact could discourage South Africa from implementing a non-proliferation policy. We are able to reaffirm our commitment to undertakings relevant to both draft resolutions. We are committed to the effective implementation of the Security Council arms embargo against South Africa. Our restrictions on sales to South African military and police go well beyond the requirements of the Security Council's arms embargo. Since 1975 the United States has had in place strictly enforced restrictions on the sale of nuclear materials and other items that could be used in developing South Africa's capability to produce nuclear weapons. These restrictions have been applied in a manner consistent with our overall policy of discouraging the proliferation of nuclear weapons anywhere in the world. The United States remains committed to banning the sale of fuel or sensitive nuclear materials except to nations which sign the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty and accept full-scope safeguards on their nuclear facilities.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

The two draft resolutions before the Committee contain intemperate language, which is unnecessary and potentially harmful to the underlying objectives of these draft resolutions.

Draft resolution L.67/Rev.2 also has financial implications which my Government has pointed out time and time again should be kept within the budgetary limits of the United Nations, and that also influenced our vote, particularly our vote against operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution L.67/Rev.2. Therefore the United States found it necessary, for the reasons I have explained, to abstain in the vote on draft resolution L.67/Rev. 2 and to vote against draft resolution L.68/Rev.2.

Mr. NUNES (Portugal) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to explain why we abstained on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2 and L.68/Rev.2, whose purpose is the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

My delegation has on several occasions stated our country's support for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones as an instrument of the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, so long as certain conditions which we believe to be essential are met. This position of principle of course applies to the African continent, and in this sense my country supports the efforts made by the international community to create a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, including those efforts aimed at keeping any such weapon out of that continent, pending the achievement of relevant agreements. In this context my delegation attaches paramount importance to the adherence of all States to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to the application of the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards to all States, including South Africa.

My delegation once again reaffirms the condemnation of the policy of apartheid by the Government and the people of my country. Furthermore, my country is firmly committed to the principle of settling international disputes by peaceful means, as set out in Article 2 of the United Nations Charter, and it therefore condemns any form of aggression perpetrated by South Africa against sovereign States - in particular, Mozambique, Lesotho and Angola. None the less, my delegation believes that the language used in certain paragraphs is excessive, particularly that which refers to nuclear collaboration, thereby creating an imbalance in the draft resolutions we have just adopted. Therefore, we abstained on those draft resolutions.

Mr. LACLAUSTRA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted for draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2, in keeping with our support for the goal of the denuclearization of Africa. However, we should like to express our reservations about paragraph 4.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.68/Rev.1, for which we also voted, we should like to place on record our reservations about the last preambular paragraph, as well as operative paragraphs 5, 7 and 8 which we consider contain vague language.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): It was with great regret that the French delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2 and voted against draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.68/Rev.2 - all the more so since the French Government fully agrees with the fundamental aims of the two resolutions on the denuclearization of Africa and on preventing South Africa from acquiring a military nuclear capability. Furthermore, the French Government shares the concern felt by the African States about acts of force and attempts at destabilization carried out by South Africa against the countries in the area.

Finally, the French Government supports the principle that all States should refrain from any action which would promote the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We believe it is essential for South Africa to submit all its nuclear installations to the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

The French Government fully agrees with the sponsors of draft resolutions L.67/Rev.2 and L.68/Rev.2 on all those aspects. However, the French delegation once again notes that the two texts do not make the necessary distinction between the peaceful use of nuclear energy and its use for military purposes. In other words, the sponsors of the two draft resolutions presuppose that any co-operation between countries which export civil nuclear technology and countries which import it, even under the control of the IAEA, would inevitably lead to military uses.

In this respect, I note that draft resolutions L.67/Rev.2 and L.68/Rev.2 do not take into consideration the report of the group of experts created under General Assembly resolution 34/76 B, adopted by consensus in 1979. That report, drawn up by highly qualified experts from various parts of the world, clearly establishes the distinction between the peaceful use of nuclear energy under IAEA guarantees and uses which escape any form of control. Therefore, the French delegation cannot associate itself with the condemnation of all forms of collaboration, as set out in paragraph 3 of draft resolution L.67/Rev.2 and paragraphs 7 and 8 of draft resolution L.68/Rev.2.

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

We have even more serious objections to draft resolution L.68/Rev.2. In this respect I shall confine myself to citing operative paragraph 5, which requests the Security Council to take enforcement measures. The Security Council already has before it the various aspects of the situation in South Africa, and has taken measures as a result. We believe that the request to the Security Council in this context is not in conformity with the provisions of the Charter regarding the distribution of responsibilities and powers among the principal bodies of the United Nations.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): Ireland voted for draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2 and A/C.1/38/L.68/Rev.2 on the denuclearization of Africa and on South Africa's nuclear capability, because we wished to give expression to our traditional, long-term support for the fundamental principle of the denuclearization of Africa. At the same time, in casting a positive vote on both draft resolutions, Ireland has reservations about a number of elements in them. Ireland is thinking in particular of the singling out of certain Western States and the failure to distinguish between co-operation for peaceful purposes and co-operation for weapons purposes.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): The Japanese delegation has already stated in connection with cluster 8 Japan's basic position concerning nuclear-weapon-free zones in general.

My delegation wishes to put on record that our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2, as a whole, should not be construed as meaning that we agree with the assertions contained in some of the paragraphs, including the amended paragraph 8, which lack conclusive evidence to support them.

Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania): The Albanian delegation voted for draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2 and A/C.1/38/L.68/Rev.2, in keeping with our position of full support for the just cause of the African peoples against the racist régime of South Africa. However, our positive vote does not change our well-known position as regards the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Mr. HALACHEV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from Russian): I should like briefly to explain a few of the reasons for our affirmative votes on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa", and draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.68/Rev.2, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa". These two draft resolutions concern the problem of the limitation of the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Halachev, Bulgaria)

The position of the People's Republic of Bulgaria with regard to nuclear-free zones is well known. It is based on the relevant provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We have consistently supported the establishment of such zones because we regard them as an important measure in the whole complex of nuclear disarmament questions. We are convinced that the adoption of new steps in that direction will make an effective contribution to the removal of the threat of a nuclear war, which would lead to catastrophe for mankind. The establishment of nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world will contribute, also, to the strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation régime, of the security of the regions in question, and thus of peace and security in the world. We therefore support the idea of the creation of such zones in Africa, in the Middle East, in Northern Europe, in the Balkans, in other areas of Europe and throughout the world. Everyone is familiar with the proposal made by the People's Republic of Bulgaria concerning the renewal of efforts to establish a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans.

Moreover, we fully share the deep concern voiced by a number of delegations of Member States about the threat posed by the acquisition of nuclear weapons by the aggressive racist régime of South Africa. In the past few years we have witnessed a constant intensification of that régime's aggressive policy and a multiplication of its acts of aggression that undermine the independence of African States in southern Africa, particularly Mozambique, Lesotho and Angola. In these circumstances, the acquisition of the nuclear weapon by that régime will pose the gravest danger to African States and international peace and security.

In our view, an essential prerequisite for the prevention of such a situation is the immediate cessation of the support given to the South African régime by certain Western countries, in particular in the military and nuclear field. That support is the main obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. In my delegation's view, there can be no possible justification for such support. The States granting assistance to the South African racist régime must finally heed the voice of the overwhelming majority of Member countries and put an end to that assistance.

Mr. MIKAYA (Malawi): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2 because it believes that it is in the interest of both the Republic of South Africa and the African States to the north of the Republic of South Africa to have a nuclear-free zone in the continent of Africa. The introduction of nuclear weapons in Africa will have serious implications for the peoples of Africa.

While my delegation feels that the Republic of South Africa should be requested to freeze or abandon its pursuit of a nuclear programme, it does not subscribe to any views of the kind conveyed in operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution, which condemn and, by implication, call for sanctions against any State Member of the United Nations. Had a separate vote been taken on operative paragraphs 3 and 4, my delegation would have abstained in the voting.

The CHAIRMAN: That completes the Committee's action on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.67/Rev.2 and A/C.1/38/L.68/Rev.2.

The First Committee has now taken action on all the clusters of draft resolutions, except for one in cluster 12 - that is, draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.61/Rev.1, with the amendments in document A/C.1/38/L.73 and the sub-amendments in document A/C.1/38/L.78; and one in cluster 14 - that is, draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.54/Rev.I. In addition, we have one pending matter, a draft resolution relating to the work in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

I am getting some slightly conflicting reports with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.61/Rev.1, with the amendments in document A/C.1/38/L.73 and the sub-amendments in document A/C.1/38/L.78. Some delegations appear to favour deferring action on that draft resolution and the amendments and sub-amendments until next week, to give some time for further consultations. Other delegations seem to think that we should take a decision now. Since the Committee will be considering some disarmament items on Wednesday of next week, I would suggest that we take this draft resolution up then, in order to give delegations sufficient time to work out the problems in regard to it - I do not know what they are, but there appear to be some. We could also take up on Wednesday draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.54/Rev.1 and, I would hope, a draft resolution relating to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. If that suggestion is acceptable to the Committee, we shall proceed accordingly.

It was so decided.

Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): I would like to place on record, on behalf of the African group, that since 1964 our Heads of State have declared their intention to make Africa a nuclear-weapon-free zone, and since that period, we have striven to achieve that objective.

However, most unfortunately, South Africa has refused to comply with the said declaration. In order to protect its criminal policy of apartheid, it has today acquired a nuclear-weapon capability with the collaboration of certain countries.

The language contained in the two draft resolutions which have just been adopted is nothing compared to the threat South Africa poses to all African countries today because of its apartheid policy. We have noted the declarations and assurances given here by all delegations to the effect that they would like to keep Africa nuclear free. We hope that those declarations and assurances will be translated into action.

We wish to thank all those delegations that have supported the two draft resolutions which have just been adopted.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning this meeting, I would like to remind the members of this Committee that we will start with the item on Antarctica on Monday afternoon. Those representatives who wish to speak in the debate on that item should inscribe their names on the list, which is now open. We have, so far, scheduled two meetings, one for Monday afternoon and one for Tuesday. We shall then see whether we need further meetings for the debate on this item.

The deadline for inscribing names on the list of speakers for the item will be 6 o'clock p.m. on Monday, 28 November.

I should like to thank all delegations for their co-operation during this week, which has been a strenuous one for all of us. I congratulate all of you for a job well done.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.