

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records*



SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
43rd meeting
held on
Thursday, 1 December 1983
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 43rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RODRIGUEZ MEDINA (Colombia)

later: Mr. STARCEVIC (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 76: QUESTION OF THE MALAGASY ISLANDS OF GLORIEUSES, JUAN DE NOVA, EUROPA AND BASSAS DA INDIA

AGENDA ITEM 72: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION (continued)

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

(c) REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 70: INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE (continued)

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECOND UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE EXPLORATION AND PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

OTHER MATTERS

*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/SPC/38/SR.43
7 December 1983

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 76: QUESTION OF THE MALAGASY ISLANDS OF GLORIEUSES, JUAN DE NOVA, EUROPA AND BASSAS DA INDIA

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that, in view of the talks currently under way between the French and Malagasy authorities and the forthcoming meeting in Paris, for which Madagascar had established an interministerial commission to follow the question of the islands near Madagascar, it had been requested that the Committee should postpone consideration of agenda item 76 until the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

2. He therefore suggested that the Committee should adopt a draft decision to the effect that it decided to postpone consideration of that item and recommended that the General Assembly should include it in the provisional agenda of its thirty-ninth session. He also suggested that the Rapporteur should submit the Committee's report transmitting that decision to the General Assembly at the appropriate time.

3. It was so decided.

4. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 76.

AGENDA ITEM 72: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued) (A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 and Corr.1, A/SPC/38/L.8/Rev.2, L.10/Rev.1, and L.32)

(a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION (continued)

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

(c) REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (continued)

5. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolutions A/SPC/38/L.10/Rev.1 and A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 and to the amendment to the latter submitted by the United States in document A/SPC/38/L.32 and invited members of the Committee to comment on those documents before proceeding to a vote.

6. Mr. KAZAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that, in every international forum, the Soviet Union had consistently defended the need to establish a new world information order: his country's contribution to the International Programme for the Development of Communication was well known.

7. While, in general, his delegation supported the draft resolutions before the Committee, a number of paragraphs contained in draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 involved considerable financial implications and were directed towards activities

/...

(Mr. Kazakov, USSR)

that were not of the highest priority. His delegation could not support the request for additional financing for such activities, particularly in view of efforts to reduce the United Nations budget, to which his country made a significant contribution.

8. He regretted the fact that the detailed statements which his delegation had made in the meetings of the Working Group on Questions relating to Information had not been taken into account. He therefore supported the amendment proposed by the United States (A/SPC/38/L.32). Unless the amendment was adopted, he would request a separate vote on paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 13 of the draft resolution and would abstain in the vote on those paragraphs.

9. Mr. KRYNEN (France) reiterated his delegation's commitment to the establishment of a new world information and communication order. While he did not wish to criticize draft resolutions A/SPC/38/L.10/Rev.1 and A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 he felt, nevertheless, that, in view of the considerable means available to the Department of Public Information (DPI), it should be able to absorb the new activities proposed each year. His delegation regretted that that was not possible in connection with draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 and would therefore abstain in the vote on it.

10. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) said that, while understanding the reasons why the United States had submitted the amendment contained in document A/SPC/38/L.32, his delegation felt that the adoption of the amendment would call in question the position of the developing countries, particularly in the Fifth Committee, and also a large part of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1. His delegation would therefore vote against the amendment.

11. Mr. SCHUETZE (German Democratic Republic) said that, in his delegation's view, draft resolutions A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 and A/SPC/38/L.10/Rev.1 contained important principles and guidelines for a constructive international exchange in the field of information and for the further development and improvement of DPI activities. It was especially important for the documents adopted to reflect the need for co-operation in the establishment of a new world information and communication order, based on the desire for stronger peace and security and for effective steps in the field of disarmament. In that connection, information activities both within and outside the United Nations bore a major responsibility for educating people in a spirit of international understanding and co-operation.

12. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1, although it had some reservations about the additional financial implications which it entailed.

13. Mr. CRAANEN (Netherlands) said that, although his delegation was firmly convinced of the need for DPI to exercise budgetary restraint, it understood that exceptions were sometimes inevitable. Accordingly, his delegation was willing to support some of the operative paragraphs of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 that had financial implications but not those which had been introduced at the last minute or those which had not been previously submitted to the Committee on Information. His delegation felt that that situation reflected the fact that the negotiating process had not been conducted satisfactorily.

/...

(Mr. Craanen, Netherlands)

14. His delegation also objected to the fact that the draft resolution made no reference to the need for an evaluation and a system of priorities for DPI activities, elements which were extremely important. Moreover, the text contained paragraphs of a political nature, which were of questionable relevance in a text on information. In that connection, he drew attention to the twenty-first preambular paragraph, which referred to the highly controversial General Assembly resolution concerning direct television broadcasting (resolution 37/92), and which thus transferred the question of the peaceful uses of outer space to the area of information.

15. For all those reasons, and despite the importance which it attached to the United Nations information activities, his delegation intended to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.10/Rev.1 without a vote.

17. It was so decided.

18. A recorded vote was taken on the amendment contained in document A/SPC/38/L.32.

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Abstaining: Austria, Brazil, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Nepal, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

19. The amendment contained in document A/SPC/38/L.32 was rejected by 70 votes to 22, with 15 abstentions.

20. At the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, a separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Ireland, 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, United States of America.

21. Paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

22. At the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, a separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya,

Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Portugal, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

23. Paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted by 92 votes to 3, with 16 abstentions.

24. At the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, a separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, United States of America.

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

25. Paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted by 87 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions.

26. At the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, a separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, United States of America.

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

27. Paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted by 88 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions.

28. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand.

29. Draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 102 votes to 4, with 9 abstentions.

30. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, expressed regret that the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 has not heeded his delegation's previous warning about the selective targeting of only one or two of the major issues that might constitute threats to international peace and security. For example, certain preambular and operative paragraphs of the draft resolution referred only to the question of Namibia and the legitimate needs of the Palestinian people and made no mention of other questions of urgent international concern. While reiterating that those two questions were important, he stressed that an omnibus resolution on the question of information should deal with generally shared principles regarding the free flow of information world-wide and with the efficient, cost-effective operation of DPI.

31. Moreover, the draft resolution did not address the need for a thorough evaluation of DPI and for the establishment of reasonable priorities for its overall programme, tasks which constituted the core responsibility of both the Special Political Committee and the Committee on Information with a view to guiding United Nations information activities. Although part of his delegation's concern about the need for a comprehensive evaluation was reflected in paragraph 7 of the

(Mr. Lichenstein, United States)

draft resolution, that reference was not sufficient, and the sponsors had been unwilling to consider ways of establishing priorities. That difficult problem must be tackled, for the General Assembly must provide DPI with some indication of the priority which it attached to the multitude of information activities it so irresponsibly assigned to it.

32. His delegation believed that sufficient funds were available within the existing programme budget to finance high priority information activities, particularly if DPI adopted more cost-effective procedures through offsetting programmatic or administrative adjustments, as suggested in the United States amendment (A/SPC/38/L.32) which had just been rejected.

33. In view of the unwillingness in the Special Political Committee and in the Committee on Information to give serious consideration to either evaluation or the setting of priorities, the United States must firmly oppose the needless budgetary increases that would result from the implementation of the draft resolution and, accordingly, had voted against it.

34. Mr. DE GEER (Sweden) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.10/Rev.1 and had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 but wished to clarify its position on some aspects of the latter.

35. Sweden maintained a reservation with regard to article 20, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which was mentioned in the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1, and therefore wished to reiterate that reservation.

36. With regard to the twenty-first preambular paragraph, he reminded members of the Committee that Sweden had abstained in the vote on General Assembly resolution 37/92, which contained elements that it could not support, for example, principles that could be interpreted as authorizing Government control over the television programmes broadcast by satellite. Such control was contrary to Swedish laws, which provided for the independence and freedom of the mass media.

37. As to paragraph 15, while his delegation supported its main thrust, the formulation of the final part of the paragraph did not logically fit in with the rest. However, his Government considered the fourth Geneva Convention to be fully applicable to all the territories occupied by Israel since 1967.

38. His delegation also believed that, in view of the current budgetary situation, the resources already allocated for public information activities should be sufficient to cover additional activities. It therefore favoured limiting the growth of the DPI budget. However, his delegation could not support restrictions which it considered to be categorical or arbitrary and which were thus incompatible with its support for the substance of the draft resolution.

39. Referring to the sixteenth preambular paragraph, he reiterated that, in his Government's opinion the principle of equitable geographical distribution applied to the staff of the Secretariat as a whole, and not just to any one particular department.

/...

40. Mr. Starčević (Yugoslavia) took the Chair.

41. Ms. MAYER-SCHALBURG (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, if draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.10/Rev.1 had been put to the vote, her delegation would have voted against paragraph 9, which concerned the implementation of UNESCO resolution 4/22. By supporting efforts to facilitate the free flow of information throughout the world and by introducing very attractive rates for press agencies and newspapers, her country had acted in accordance with the spirit of resolution 4/22, even before it had been introduced. However, her Government could not adopt special rates for particular countries, a position shared by several other countries which had not responded positively to the UNESCO resolution.

42. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1, she regretted that no consensus had been reached and that her delegation had been obliged to vote against it. Although her delegation's main concern that priorities should be set and that the resolution should not be politicized had been respected in many cases, paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 had financial implications over and above the regular budget. While the Federal Republic of Germany was not in any way opposed to the opening of the information centres in question or to the improvement of existing facilities, the manner in which that would be done under the draft resolution was inconsistent with the principle of zero growth, a principle her delegation had respected by requesting better staffing arrangements for the German-language information service in Vienna within existing resources.

43. Moreover, paragraph 15 singled out one particular political item to be covered by DPI and contained wording which her delegation could not accept. Although her Government supported the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, it viewed any interpretation of that right as an anticipation of results which were to be achieved in the framework of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace settlement.

44. Her delegation also regretted the fact that the draft resolution mentioned General Assembly resolution 37/92, which her delegation had voted against because it failed to respect the principle of the free flow of information. For all those reasons, her delegation had felt compelled to vote against draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

45. Mr. EVETTS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had been disappointed by the failure to reach consensus on such an important draft resolution, particularly in view of the hard work carried out by the Working Group and the significant improvements achieved. The draft resolution reflected the Committee's continuing failure to deal effectively with the questions of the limited resources available to DPI, the cost-effectiveness of its activities and the need to set responsible priorities among the various recommendations made both in the Committee on Information and in the Special Political Committee.

46. In that context, his delegation regretted the inclusion of paragraphs which had financial implications. Although his delegation was prepared to accept the additional appropriation required for paragraph 1, it regretted the inclusion of

(Mr. Evetts, United Kingdom)

paragraphs which had not been considered by the Committee on Information and on which no agreement could be reached. Moreover, his delegation had voted against General Assembly resolution 37/92, mentioned in the twenty-first preambular paragraph, and had reservations about paragraph 15, which, in its opinion, was not the type of paragraph that should appear in a resolution dealing with generally agreed information policy. His delegation also regretted the tendency to politicize the Committee's work on questions relating to information. For all those reasons, his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

47. Mr. ALMOSLECHNER (Austria) said that although his delegation agreed in general with the text of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1, it had abstained in the vote for a number of reasons. With regard to the twenty-first preambular paragraph of that draft resolution, he pointed out that Austria had abstained in the vote on General Assembly resolution 37/92. His delegation felt that consideration might also be given to the question of financing the staffing requirements of the United Nations information service in Vienna so as to ensure adequate service in the German language. Nevertheless, according to recommendation 39 of the Committee on Information, such steps were to be taken within existing resources. His delegation also felt that paragraphs 12 and 13 of the draft resolution constituted interference in questions which fell within the competence of the Secretary-General.

48. Although his delegation supported efforts to implement the activities proposed in the draft resolution through the termination of low priority programmes, it had abstained in the vote on the amendment contained in document A/SPC/38/L.32 because the implications of that amendment seemed too restrictive.

49. Mr. BONDIOLI-OSIO (Italy) expressed regret that it had been impossible to achieve a consensus on draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1. He stressed his country's support for the efforts of the international community to establish a new world information and communication order. Accordingly, it has voted in favour of the budget of DPI in the Fifth Committee. In that regard, he emphasized that the Department's programme budget should be sufficient if proper priority was given to the activities to be undertaken.

50. MR. GAYAMA (Congo) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1. His delegation attached particular importance to the recommendations of the Committee on Information set forth in paragraphs 23, 24 and 26 of the annex to the draft resolution.

51. It was regrettable that a consensus had been unattainable owing to the position of certain delegations that the adoption of the draft resolution would have financial implications which exceeded the regular budget. Such a position was discriminatory with regard to the Committee on Information. Other resolutions concerning less important items were adopted by the General Assembly, and no objection was raised when their financial implications exceeded the regular budget. He, therefore, appealed to those delegations which had not supported the draft resolution to reconsider their positions and try to understand that the requests made in the draft resolution were fully in keeping with the objectives of the United Nations.

/...

52. Mr. BAALI (Algeria) said that his delegation was disappointed that draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1 had not been adopted by consensus. It was particularly disappointing that, in spite of the high degree of flexibility on the part of the Group of 77, the delegations which opposed the draft resolution had not acted in a similar spirit of co-operation. The draft resolution which had been adopted would be of little use if the financial resources necessary for its implementation were not made available. The establishment of a new world information and communication order required considerable financial support. It was time to take decisive measures in that regard. Although his delegation considered that the measures provided for in the draft resolution were not strong enough, his delegation had voted in favour of it.

53. Mr. DENIGER (Canada) commended the Group of 77 for the flexibility which it had shown during the negotiations on the draft resolution under consideration. Although his delegation had no serious reservations with regard to the substance of the draft resolution, it had abstained in the vote because of the financial implications of a number of paragraphs in the text. His delegation felt that DPI should respond to requests such as the ones contained in the draft resolution by redeploying existing resources. He had voted in favour of the amendment contained in document A/SPC/38/L.32 and would have voted in favour of the draft resolution if that amendment had been adopted by the Committee.

54. Mr. SALONEN (Finland) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1, in spite of certain reservations with regard to the text. It was regrettable that the Committee had been unable to reach a consensus. His delegation did not support the twenty-fifth preambular paragraph as it applied to the Principles Governing the Use by States of Artificial Earth Satellites for International Direct Television Broadcasting. Some of the provisions of the draft resolution were contrary to the principles of freedom of information laid down in Finnish law. For that reason, his delegation had abstained in the vote on General Assembly resolution 37/92.

55. Paragraph 15 of the draft resolution had political elements which were extraneous to questions relating to information and were incompatible with the efforts to find a comprehensive settlement to the problem of the Middle East through negotiations. Although his delegation shared the concern of certain delegations concerning the financial implications of the draft resolution, it was unable to support the arbitrary measures set forth in document A/SPC/38/L.32. Lastly, with regard to paragraph 17 of the draft resolution, his delegation considered that the principle of equitable geographical distribution applied to the staff of the United Nations as a whole, not to the composition of any single unit of the Secretariat.

56. Mr. NOWAK (Poland) said that his delegation fully shared the desire to apply austerity measures, which was the basis for the amendment in document A/SPC/38/L.32. Nevertheless, in certain cases such as the one described in paragraph 11 of the draft resolution, exceptions had to be made. His delegation, therefore, had abstained in the vote on the amendment in document A/SPC/38/L.32 and had voted in favour of paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

(Mr. Nowak, Poland)

57. The question of financial implications was of great concern to his delegation and it would proceed accordingly in the Fifth Committee. His country maintained its strong reservations on the amount of funds to be allocated for the implementation of paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 13 of the draft resolution.

58. Mr. PALUDAN (Denmark) said that his delegation associated itself with the explanation of vote of the delegation of Sweden concerning the twenty-first preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 15 of the draft resolution. He would have abstained in the vote if both paragraphs had been put to the vote. His delegation also supported the remarks of the Swedish delegation with regard to the budget and activities of DPI.

59. Mr. Rodríguez Medina (Colombia) resumed the Chair.

60. Mr. FRANCIS (Jamaica) said that, if his delegation had been present for the vote, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

61. Mr. EDEY (Barbados) expressed regret that it had been impossible to reach a consensus on the draft resolution. If his delegation had been present for the vote, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

62. Mr. OMARDIN (Malaysia) said that, if his delegation had been present for the vote, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

63. Mr. MIZERE (Malawi) said that, if his delegation had been present for the vote, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

64. Miss EMARA (Egypt) said that, if her delegation had been present for the vote, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

65. Mrs. LEGWAILA (Botswana) said that, if her delegation had been present for the vote it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.5/Rev.1.

66. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 72.

AGENDA ITEM 70: INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE
(continued) (A/SPC/38/L.28, L.33, L.29, L.30, L.31 and L.34)

(a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE (continued)

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECOND UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE EXPLORATION AND PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

67. Mr. SCHUETZE (German Democratic Republic) withdrew his delegation's amendment (A/SPC/38/L.31) to the draft resolution in document A/SPC/38/L.28. His delegation did not want its amendment used as a pretext for rejection of the amendments

/...

(Mr. Schuetze, German Democratic Republic)

contained in documents A/SPC/38/L.29 and L.30. His delegation fully subscribed to the statement made by the Chairman of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space as reflected in paragraph 24 of the summary record of the 18th meeting of the Special Political Committee (A/SPC/38/SR.18).

68. Mr. LEHNE (Austria) said that his delegation had held discussions with the sponsors of the amendments proposed to draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28 but had been unable to reach agreement with them. The Committee would therefore have to vote on the draft resolution and on the amendments proposed thereto. That was a regrettable departure from the Committee's practice of adopting resolutions on outer space by consensus.

69. Mr. DE GEER (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, expressed regret that it had not been possible to achieve a consensus on draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28. That departure from the long tradition of the General Assembly of working on a consensus basis with regard to outer space matters might have a negative effect on the work of COPUOS and its ability to influence outer space activities. Smaller countries like his own would be less able to promote such activities in the direction which they considered desirable.

70. His delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28 if it could be adopted without amendments. Although he would vote in favour of the amendment contained in document A/SPC/38/L.29, he had certain reservations. The proposed amendment failed to state clearly that negotiations on an agreement or agreements to prevent an arms race in outer space should be conducted in the Committee on Disarmament. Furthermore, the adoption of such an amendment to draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28 might undermine draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1 on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

71. His delegation would vote against the amendment contained in paragraph 1 of document A/SPC/38/L.30 because the proposed mandate for the work on the geostationary orbit did not recognize that the authority for the technical planning and regulation of the use of that orbit for radio communication was vested in the International Telecommunication Union. Furthermore, that proposal did not accord the necessary priority to the item relating to the use of nuclear power sources in outer space. His delegation would also vote against the amendment contained in paragraph 2 of document A/SPC/38/L.30 because it would have a negative effect on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1, which recognized the primary role of the Committee on Disarmament in the negotiations of agreement or agreements on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Moreover, that proposed amendment was at variance with paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, under which the Committee on Disarmament was the "single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum". His delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28 if the amendments contained in document A/SPC/38/L.30 were adopted.

72. Mr. DENIGER (Canada) said that his delegation would have been able to accept the text proposed in document A/SPC/38/L.28. It would vote against the amendment contained in document A/SPC/38/L.29 which would adversely affect the resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space adopted by the First Committee (A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1). It was clearly indicated in paragraph 7 of that resolution that the Committee on Disarmament was the appropriate forum for negotiations on the conclusion of an agreement or agreements to prevent an arms race in outer space.

73. His delegation would vote against the amendments contained in document A/SPC/38/L.30 because it considered that the establishment of a working group within the Legal Sub-Committee to deal with the utilization of the geostationary orbit would interfere with the mandate given to ITU on that matter. Furthermore, the establishment of such a working group, on a priority basis, would seriously affect the work being done by the Legal Sub-Committee on supplementing the norms of international law relevant to the use of nuclear power sources in outer space. Should the amendments proposed be accepted the use of nuclear power sources in outer space would be the only item on the agenda of the Legal Sub-Committee that would not be considered on a priority basis.

74. His delegation was of the view that the proposal in paragraph 2 of document A/SPC/38/L.30 amounted to giving a clear but unacceptable mandate to COPUOS to get involved in a subject matter that had already been dealt with in the First Committee of the General Assembly.

75. In conclusion, he said that his delegation was of the opinion that the Committee on Disarmament was the proper forum for discussion of the question of preventing an arms race in outer space.

76. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) said that his delegation too regretted the fact that it had been impossible to produce a text which could be adopted by consensus. The Group of 77 could not, however, be held responsible for the lack of consensus.

77. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28 and on the amendments contained in documents A/SPC/38/L.29 and L.30. A separate vote had been requested on paragraphs 1 and 2 respectively of document A/SPC/38/L.30.

78. A recorded vote was taken on the amendment contained in document A/SPC/38/L.29.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya,

/...

Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey.

79. The amendment contained in document A/SPC/38/L.29 was adopted by 97 votes to 11, with 8 abstentions.

80. A recorded vote was taken on the amendment contained in paragraph 1 of document A/SPC/38/L.30.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Ivory Coast, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Turkey.

81. The amendment contained in paragraph 1 of document A/SPC/38/L.30 was adopted by 92 votes to 16, with 9 abstentions.

82. A recorded vote was taken on the amendment contained in paragraph 2 of document A/SPC/38/L.30.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Portugal, Spain, Turkey.

83. The amendment contained in paragraph 2 of document A/SPC/38/L.30 was adopted by 91 votes to 17, with 8 abstentions.

84. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28, as amended. A recorded vote had been requested.

85. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28, as amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica,

/...

Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

86. The draft resolution contained in document A/SPC/38/L.28, as amended, was adopted by 98 votes to 12, with 8 abstentions.

87. Mr. KINGSMILL (Australia) speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28, as amended, for three reasons. First, his delegation was strongly opposed to the inclusion in the text of a request to COPUOS to consider, as a matter of priority, questions relating to the militarization of outer space. The Committee on Disarmament was the only body competent to discuss such questions. Secondly, his delegation objected to the inclusion of new paragraph 5 (c) (A/SPC/38/L.30, para. 1) in the text. It had the fullest confidence in ITU and the manner in which it handled the use of the geostationary orbit. Thirdly, his delegation objected to the provisions of paragraph 18 of the resolution. It was a matter of concern that the Organization was being requested to pay for the costs of Government experts.

88. In conclusion, he expressed regret at the fact that it had proved impossible to produce a text on which a consensus could be reached.

89. Mr. GODSON (United Kingdom) said that it was a matter for regret that the practice of consensus by which the Committee had operated in the past had been broken. His delegation was especially concerned about the long-term effects that might have for the Committee's future work. His delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28 because it overlooked problems which were currently under discussion in other international forums and attempted to duplicate the work of those bodies. His delegation was of the opinion that there was no scientific

(Mr. Godson, United Kingdom)

basis, or practical need, for the definition or delimitation of outer space at the current time. The question of the geostationary orbit was being discussed in ITU, the appropriate international forum for dealing with that matter. The Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space had already proposed that a study on the geostationary orbit should be carried out by a group of experts to be appointed by the Secretary-General. It would seem sensible to await the results of that study before deciding what further action might be necessary.

90. The United Kingdom recognized that the question of arms control in outer space was one of extreme concern to many delegations; the question could not, however, be treated in isolation. Arms control in outer space was inseparable from the question of general arms control on earth. Existing international agreements, including the 1967 Outer Space Treaty already limited military activities in space, for example, by banning the stationing of nuclear weapons and other kinds of weapons of mass destruction in outer space. The next step was for the Committee on Disarmament, which was acknowledged as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating body, to consider whether it was desirable to supplement those agreements and, if so, in what form. Until the Committee on Disarmament had completed that work it would be inappropriate for any other international body to become involved in the specialized and complex subject of arms control in outer space.

91. With regard to paragraph 18 of resolution A/SPC/38/L.28, the usual practice was for the expenses of experts to be borne by those States which nominated them. In the opinion of his delegation, that rule should apply in the case of the studies called for in paragraph 16 of the resolution.

92. Mr. BRAUN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution as amended because his Government considered the Committee on Disarmament was the only body responsible for considering questions on the military uses of outer space. Despite the Committee's failure to reach a consensus on the text of the resolution, his delegation was convinced that decisions taken by COPUOS in the future would again be based on consensus.

93. Mr. BONDIOLI-OSIO (Italy) said that it was a matter for regret that the Committee had been unable to reach a consensus on a question as important as that under discussion. His delegation would have been able to support the text in document A/SPC/38/L.28. It was unfortunate that the amendments contained in documents A/SPC/38/L.29 and L.30 had been adopted, altering the mandate of COPUOS in such a way as to include in it the question of the militarization of outer space. That would have a detrimental effect on the future work of COPUOS. His delegation wished to stress the role played by ITU in the question of the use of the geostationary orbit. As a result of the adoption of the amendment proposed in document A/SPC/38/L.30, the most important item on the agenda of the Legal Sub-Committee of COPUOS would be the only item not considered as a matter of priority.

/...

94. Mr. CRAANEN (Netherlands) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28 as amended. It had been unable to support the proposal for the establishment of a working group because, as worded, it did not recognize the primary responsibility of ITU in that field. His delegation had also been unable to accept the amendment concerning the militarization of outer space, because it considered that sole responsibility for that question lay with the Committee on Disarmament. In conclusion, he expressed regret at the fact that it had not been possible to produce a consensus resolution on the subject.

95. Mr. SALONEN (Finland) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28 because the tradition of consensus had been broken and because the text contained elements which might have harmful effects on the work of COPUOS. His delegation regarded the Committee on Disarmament as the only body competent to discuss questions on disarmament and had therefore been unable to accept the amendment contained in document A/SPC/38/L.29 and the amendment contained in paragraph 2 of document A/SPC/38/L.30. It had abstained in the vote on the amendment contained in paragraph 1 of document A/SPC/38/L.30, because it interfered with the work being done in the matter by ITU.

96. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America) said that for nearly 25 years COPUOS had been an unparalleled model of co-operation and effectiveness within the United Nations system. The objective, business-like manner in which it had conducted its work over the years had yielded a number of useful instruments for promoting order and equity in the exploration of outer space for peace and the betterment of mankind. It was unfortunate that the decision taken by the Committee at that meeting would usher in a period of confrontation. The programme of work for COPUOS showed an absence of any commitment to the principle of consensus and would not, therefore, lead to any significant progress.

97. The same delegation which had so brazenly attempted to manipulate the debate on the issues discussed in COPUOS for the sole purpose of spreading propaganda must bear the responsibility for that turn of events. The United States had based its decision to join COPUOS to a large degree on the firm commitment of that body to the principle of consensus. Most of the achievements of COPUOS could be attributed to that commitment. Unfortunately, his delegation was not optimistic about the future work of that Committee.

98. His country was wholly committed to finding affective ways to resolve the extremely difficult issues of arms control and disarmament. That commitment, of course, extended to disarmament issues as they related to outer space. His Government firmly supported the fundamental proposition that outer space should be used only for useful purposes. His delegation rejected the notion that COPUOS had any competence to hold substantive discussions on arms controls issues. The Committee on Disarmament was the sole appropriate forum for such discussions.

99. The United States had been a major contributor to the development and understanding of outer space for peaceful uses and, more than any other country in the world, had shared its knowledge and experience with less developed countries. It participated in countless co-operative efforts with regional groups,

(Mr. Lichenstein, United States)

sub-regional groups and individual countries in that regard. It was unfortunate that the full cost of the decision just taken by the Committee would not be paid by the delegation which was most responsible for that error. It would also have to be paid by those members of COPUOS which did not have any major space capability. They would find that the effectiveness of the one forum in which they traditionally had been able to bring their points of view to bear on outer space activities was needlessly jeopardized.

100. For almost 25 years the United States had freely shared its resources and knowledge with the countries represented by the Group of 77. In spite of that mutually productive record, there was little enthusiasm within the Group for seriously considering the concerns of the United States. That situation was regrettable because a spirit of goodwill depended on mutual understanding and a commitment to co-operate. In view of the foregoing, his Government would have to re-examine its decision to participate in the work of COPUOS. It would do so with the keenest regret.

101. Mr. CABILLERO RODRIGUEZ (Cuba) said that his delegation regretted that it had not been possible to adopt a resolution by consensus on a question as important as that under discussion.

102. Although his delegation understood why some delegations had insisted on the inclusion of paragraph 19 in the text of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28, it could not accept that priority should always have to be given to satellite systems already registered with ITU, not to newly established systems. That was a question which his delegation would take up with ITU.

103. Mr. HAYES (Ireland) said that it was a matter for regret that the principle of consensus on which the Committee usually worked had not been upheld. His delegation had abstained in the votes on the amendments contained in document A/SPC/38/L.30 because it considered that they would render the work of COPUOS more difficult. It had voted in favour of resolution A/SPC/38/L.28, as amended, in the belief that in practice COPUOS would continue to work in a constructive manner.

104. Mr. LOGOGLU (Turkey) said that, like other delegations, his delegation would have preferred a resolution adopted by consensus.

105. Although Turkey had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28, as amended, it had abstained on the amendments contained in documents A/SPC/38/L.29 and L.30. It had abstained in the vote on document A/SPC/38/L.29 because the meaning of the term "exclusively for peaceful purposes" was not sufficiently clear. It had abstained in the vote on paragraph 1 of document A/SPC/38/L.30 because it considered that there was no need for haste to define and delimit outer space. It had abstained in the vote on the amendment in paragraph 2 of that document because the language was ambiguous and because the work called for was already being performed by other United Nations bodies.

/...

106. Mr. SHEHATA (Egypt) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the amendments contained in documents A/SPC/38/L.29 and L.30 and in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.28, as amended. He thanked the representative of Austria for taking account in his text of proposals made by the delegations of Egypt and Nigeria concerning the expenses of experts appointed to carry out the studies referred to in the resolution. Although his delegation had voted in favour of the amendments contained in documents A/SPC/38/L.29 and L.30 it would have preferred a reaffirmation of the mandate of the Committee on Disarmament as the sole forum for the discussion of questions relating to the militarization of outer space.

107. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) said that consensus meant an absence of a negative attitude on the part of one or more delegations. On that basis, the Group of 77 had engaged in consultations with the delegation of Austria with a view to trying to reach a consensus text. In those consultations, the Group of 77 had realized that there was a lack of political will on the part of one delegation. The Mexican delegation regretted the result of that negative attitude.

108. Mr. MAJORSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the amendments contained in documents A/SPC/38/L.29 and L.30 because they reflected the interests of a large number of delegations. Like other delegations, his delegation regretted the fact that the Committee had been unable to adopt the resolution by consensus. That in no way weakened his delegation's resolve to ensure that, in future, decisions of the Committee were adopted by consensus. The situation at the current session would have been different had it not been for the attitude of one delegation.

109. The CHAIRMAN said that, for five years, a large group of countries had been endeavouring to ensure that their concerns and interests were taken into account in the decisions of the Committee. It was deplorable that the tradition of consensus had been broken, but it would be even more deplorable if efforts were not made to reintroduce it. Thirty-eight years previously, the founders of the Organization had been motivated by the need to co-operate with and give assistance to weak and needy countries. The needs of those countries in outer space had reached a critical stage. He appealed to all delegations to try to understand the feelings which had motivated the developing countries in the vote.

110. He announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 70.

OTHER MATTERS

111. The CHAIRMAN replying to a question put by the representative of Egypt, said that negotiations were still continuing on the Liberian request that the statements made by the representative of Israel at the 41st and 42nd meetings of the Committee should be reproduced in extenso.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.