

*United Nations*  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION  
*Official Records\**



FIRST COMMITTEE  
49th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 27 November 1984  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-NINTH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil)

later: Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia) (Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS  
(continued)

---

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room IX.2-750, 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.1/39/PV.49  
30 November 1984

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 53, 54, 59, 62, 64 AND 142 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the draft resolutions that have not yet been acted upon, in the order in which they appear in the clusters, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.30, L.22, L.40/Rev.1, L.69/Rev.1, L.45, L.46/Rev.1, L.1, L.3, L.37/Rev.2, L.61 and the draft resolution on agenda item 62.

We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30 and I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out a document concerning that draft resolution.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Mr. Chairman, as you have requested me to read out the communication addressed to you by the Chairman of the Fifth Committee on this subject, I shall now read out the text, which is dated 27 November 1984 and is addressed to the Chairman of the First Committee:

(Mr. Kheradi)

"I have the honour to refer to your letter of 15 November 1984, by which you requested that the revised draft statute of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) be brought to the attention of the Fifth Committee, for necessary action, before the First Committee takes any decision on it.

"In accordance with established practice, the text of the revised draft statute, as well as the Secretary-General's statement on its administrative and financial implications (A/C.5/39/33), were considered by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, whose report appears in document A/39/7/Add.8.

"The Fifth Committee considered this question at its 34th meeting, on 27 November 1984, and took the following decisions:

"(a) By a recorded vote of 75 to 17, with 5 abstentions, the Committee decided to endorse the recommendations of the Advisory Committee with regard to the suggested revision of article VII of the draft statute (see A/39/7/Add.8, para. 10). The result of the vote is attached;

"(b) By 79 votes to 10, with 8 abstentions, the Committee authorized me to inform you that the Committee endorses the comments and recommendations of the Advisory Committee as contained in its report (A/39/7/Add.8), in particular the suggested revisions to articles III, IV, VII and VIII of the draft statute of UNIDIR, as contained in paragraphs 10 to 13 of the ACABQ report. The Committee also decided to revert to the consideration of the programme budget implications of any resolution that the First Committee may adopt in this respect, after its adoption. In this regard the First Committee will no doubt wish to take into account the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/39/33) and the relevant portions of the ACABQ report (A/39/7/Add.8, paras. 14-19)."

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): In connection with the letter just read out by the Secretary of the Committee, I should like to bring to the attention of the Committee the fact that it has become necessary to introduce certain amendments to both draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30 and, of course, to the draft statute which was adopted and recommended to the General Assembly by the Advisory Board in its capacity as the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR).

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) has made some very useful and constructive comments on the draft statute, as agreed upon by the Board of Trustees of UNIDIR. Following those comments and the approval of the recommendation of ACABQ by the Fifth Committee, it would appear that the amendments to both draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30 and the draft statute are of no more than a technical nature and are intended merely to clarify the draft statute.

First, draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30, in its revised text, will be amended in a manner that would indicate that the draft statute that will be approved by the General Assembly will, of course, be the draft statute amended in accordance with the views of ACABQ, as approved by the Fifth Committee. Accordingly, the revision would merely apply to operative paragraph 2, which will now read:

"Approves the draft statute of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, as annexed hereto."

This would be the only amendment to the draft resolution itself. Of course, the draft statute will be amended in articles III, IV and VII. These amendments will be circulated to representatives so that they can compare them with the original draft as recommended by the Board of Trustees. As I said before, these amendments are of a technical nature and should, therefore, not create any problems for those who were willing to go along with the original text, as recommended by the Board of Trustees.

Of course, I am fully aware of the views that some delegations have expressed, which were fully reflected in the discussion of the issue this morning in the Fifth Committee. I would hope that with the approval of the draft statute, as commented upon by ACABQ, it will be possible to adopt the revised text of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30 with the annex containing the draft statute, as revised, by consensus within the First Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Members of the Committee have heard the introduction to revised draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30 and the revised draft statute. I understand that members of the Committee would like to have the texts of those documents before action is taken upon them. In that case we shall defer a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30 and on the draft statute. This deferment will also apply to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45, which is linked to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30.

(The Chairman)

Since it is the representative of Nigeria who has introduced these revisions, I should like to ask him when he thinks the First Committee could take up this draft resolution and act upon it.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I think that you, Mr. Chairman, as the Committee's presiding officer, may be in a better position to determine when it would be best to take this draft resolution up. Of course, that would depend on when the revised texts of the draft resolution and the draft statute could be distributed. If they could be distributed this afternoon, the Committee might be able, since the changes are very minimal, to take a decision before this meeting is adjourned. Perhaps, however, members would want to have more time to study the revisions. I am in the hands of the Committee and you, Mr. Chairman, as to when it would be best to take up the draft resolution for action.

The CHAIRMAN: In the light of the statement just made by the representative of Nigeria, and bearing in mind that these revised texts may be circulated tomorrow, I suggest that we take up this draft resolution for action at a meeting next Monday.

Since I hear no objection, we shall take up draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45 and draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30 - since the two draft resolutions are to be acted upon together - at a meeting next Monday.

We shall now proceed to draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1, A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 and A/C.1/39/L.69/Rev.1, in cluster 7. Since draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 and A/C.1/39/L.69/Rev.1 refer to the same question and are therefore linked, we shall take them up together, after we have dealt with draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany at the Committee's 40th meeting, on 15 November, and is co-sponsored by Australia, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Norway, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to inform you, Mr. Chairman, and through you the Committee, that the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 have decided not to press for a vote on their text during the current session.

On 15 November I had the honour of introducing the original draft resolution, document A/C.1/39/L.40. In its current version, document A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1, the

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

text incorporates a number of amendments designed to meet concerns from various delegations, including delegations from the group of non-aligned countries; its thrust has remained the same.

The co-sponsors are aware that the draft resolution has given rise to a particularly lively debate among all groups of delegations, particularly among the members of the group of non-aligned countries. Many from among these groups have contacted us in order to comment or to ask for additional clarifications. This has afforded us a welcome opportunity to elaborate on the broader context of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40 and to demonstrate from its language that its authors - and the members of the Western group at large - in putting forward this particular language, fully subscribe to the goals of the prevention of nuclear war, the cessation of the nuclear arms race and the achievement of nuclear disarmament, ultimately leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. We have also been able to convince those delegations that have sought a frank dialogue with us that it is a clear distortion on the part of a minority of interested representatives to picture draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40 as a document solely designed to advocate or legitimize the use of nuclear weapons.

We were gratified to find that many non-aligned delegations recognized in our text the sincere wish to make a comprehensive and meaningful contribution to the prevention of nuclear war, but also to the prevention of those armed conflicts that spell disaster and misery in their troubled regions. We share with these delegations the lack of comprehension of the negative reaction which our draft resolution has evoked in other quarters. Indeed, it is difficult to see how any delegation acting seriously and responsibly could take a negative view of a draft resolution that so visibly and meaningfully sets out to address the perils of the nuclear age - and all the more since the draft resolution is largely drawn from Charter language.

We have been able to demonstrate to many who have sought a dialogue with us that the basic premises of Western security policy threaten no one and that the frequent and distorted accusations against them only mask the fact that these premises are perceived as inconvenient by a potential aggressor. Indeed, many of the criticisms voiced in this Committee of the basic tenets of Western security philosophy are based on the premise of a conventional attack - as if such attacks were a legitimate part of international life and should be exempt from defensive action.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

Confusion, however, should not prevail and we should make it clear that in such cases the aggressor is at fault, not the victim. Western security philosophy, by discouraging attack, with all appropriate means, helps to remove the menace of war in all its forms. That should be of particular importance to all countries of the third world.

In the course of these contacts, it has become apparent to the sponsoring delegations that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40 has aroused not only a great amount of interest but also internal controversy, within the group of non-aligned countries. The controversy is still apparent, and had there been a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40, it would have shaped voting behaviour. Many delegations from among the non-aligned group have informed us informally - and some have already informed the Committee on the record - that they would have voted for the draft resolution; others would have abstained; a minority of countries would have voted against it. We have been told about attempts within the group to dissuade certain delegations from their positive view of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40. However, members of the group of non-aligned countries have also told us about their concern over seeing the group split in this manner; this concern is, indeed, shared by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40. There is no intention on their part to split the non-aligned group. All of us have been on record stressing the merits of - indeed the need for - non-alignment and the value of a united and forceful non-aligned movement that functions on the basis of fairness, objectivity and true insight into the current needs of non-aligned countries themselves. There is no intention on our part to drive a wedge into the non-aligned group. Indeed, it is not voting behaviour that counts - there are too many United Nations resolutions already - but the wealth of argument.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

When I had the privilege of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40 on 15 November, I called for an earnest, sober and analytical effort in the consideration of the draft resolution. I appealed to the non-aligned countries to be careful to assess their own security needs in real terms but also to understand the security position of such countries as my own. I asked them to assess the value of military stability in all parts of the world and the contribution such stability makes to their own development process in political and economic terms. This is still the true purpose of the text before us. It is important to have not merely an ephemeral vote during this current session on a text that has been only recently introduced and as yet insufficiently discussed but an ongoing debate on one of the crucial problems of our time, taking into account the fact that the current text has been elaborated and proposed by some of the key members of the Western group and supported by a much larger group of its members.

In this sense, not only does the draft resolution remain on the record, but its purpose stands undiminished. The problems and the considered views in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 will remain on the agenda. They are going to be discussed in the Conference on Disarmament next year, and they will again be before us in the General Assembly next year. While renouncing a vote on the draft resolution, my delegation and the other sponsors ask for a redoubled effort by all Member States, particularly from among the group of non-aligned countries, in the serious consideration of this item. Many ambiguities have to be removed, and, what is more, the non-aligned countries have to take a clearer stand on the current contradictions in their group, contradictions between the wish to see a stable, peaceful and more secure world, one in which the Western group of States - a group of countries instrumental in bringing about their own development and stability - can function constructively and the implementation of policies they have seen fit to inscribe in some of their collective documents. One should not succumb to the illusion that successful and fruitful bilateral relations - obviously prized by many non-aligned countries - can be maximized to mutual benefit if in multilateral bodies, in such essential matters as security and disarmament, the very premises on which such relationships are built are constantly called into question. These contradictions will not go away. They call for an earnest reappraisal. There must be more realism. The multilateral disarmament process can go on only if all groups of States are convinced that their security interests receive a fair reading and



(Mr. Wegener, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

that their commitment to peace and disarmament is acknowledged as a bona fide contribution.

I note that amendments have been proposed to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1; they are contained in document A/C.1/39/L.80. My delegation regrets that these amendments have come forward in spite of a formal undertaking by leaders of the group of non-aligned countries not to put forward such amendments. At the time we were told, with an appropriate degree of solemnity, that the group of non-aligned countries, in a spirit of fairness, would heed the request I formulated on 15 November, that is, not to put forward amendments that would blunt the thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40 and turn it in a totally different direction. This breach of promise has been a painful experience for the sponsors; it is viewed as a violation of the rules of the game by which we all work. My delegation and the other sponsors do not take this behaviour lightly.

We look forward to a thorough discussion of the vital problems of the prevention of war, in particular nuclear war, in our work during the forthcoming year.

The CHAIRMAN: As we have heard, the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany, which introduced draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1, is not pressing for a vote on it. That being the case, the Committee will take no action on that draft resolution.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): I wish to make a brief statement on the same matter, because Australia was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1, which, as we have now heard, will not be put to a vote.

Australia decided to co-sponsor this draft resolution because of the very great importance my Government and people attach to the question of the prevention of nuclear war and indeed the prevention of war itself. If there is any doubt about that, let me point to the fact that in the voting yesterday my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution on the same subject which had been put before us by Argentina and a number of other delegations.

The Australian delegation regrets that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 has been withdrawn. We regret that because, as was pointed out in the statement I made on 15 November as a co-sponsor, the draft resolution had within it an affirmation of fundamental principles, principles that

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

are enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, principles to which we firmly believe all Members of the United Nations do and should attach great importance. These are the principles by which our Organization lives, principles which have at their heart our determination that we should never again face the scourge of war.

Our regret at the withdrawal of this draft resolution also rests on a fundamental procedural concern. The draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.40 was presented in good faith by a number of Member States of this Organization. The response to it was a series of amendments, which are now embodied in document A/C.1/39/L.80. Those amendments were presented in spite of the fact that we had already acted on a similar and parallel draft resolution on the subject of the prevention of nuclear war.

It is a matter of concern to my delegation that we should have to proceed in this way. We believe deeply in the democracy of the United Nations. We believe deeply in the importance of the vote, and it seems clear to my delegation that we had a vote yesterday on this subject as encompassed in a draft resolution presented by a number of other delegations. On this occasion today a decision has been taken to withdraw a parallel draft resolution on a similar subject, partly because amendments have been presented which would, if they were accepted, have the effect of distorting and indeed destroying the thrust of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.40.

If we were to proceed in this way, if we were to go beyond the fundamental principle that it is the vote that speaks, it seems to the Australian delegation that we would face a situation, possibly one causing a precedent to be established, a situation which would offer very grave difficulty with regard to the way in which we conduct our proceedings in this Committee. It is not acceptable to the Australian delegation that amendments should be put to the vote which have the purpose of completely distorting or changing the clear and evident thrust of a draft resolution such as that contained in document A/C.1/39/L.40. The longer-term implication of such behaviour is to suggest that the content of any given draft resolution in this Committee will be determined solely by one group of countries. In our view, that would be a dangerous development and one which would have grave implications for the orderly conduct of our work in this body, which should, as I have already said, have its decisions determined on the basis of a free and open vote.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

As I have already said, we regret that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40 has been withdrawn. We believe that the principles involved in the draft are important. Fundamentally, they rest upon the principles that are to be found in the Charter of the United Nations, above all, our refusal to accept war, our insistence that relations between States should be settled on the basis of peaceful negotiation rather than the use of force. But it is also important that in the conduct of our work in this Committee we show respect for the expression of an approach to these great issues, an approach formulated by groups of Member States in terms of their honest view of what is at issue in those great problems.

I agree with the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany that the issues encompassed in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1, although not pressed to a vote today, will not go away. Those are vital issues. We will address them in the future. I regret that they will not be considered fully by this Committee today, but I agree that under the circumstances that have prevailed procedurally, the wiser course is that this resolution be withdrawn so that on another day we may consider the serious issues involved in substance and that on another day we may proceed to consider those issues with a greater, more respectful regard for the orderly processes of voting on and adopting decisions within the United Nations.

Mr. DUBEY (India): I think it has come as a relief to most of us in this Committee that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 has not been pressed to a vote. I will not go into some of the points raised by the two sponsors of the draft resolution who have preceded me with their statements. They have given their perception of security; they have commented on the unity or lack of unity of the group of non-aligned countries; they have even talked of the behaviour of certain groups of delegations. I think it is quite clear to any reasonable person that there are differing and opposing views on these subjects. I do not think it is helpful to have comments and, if I may say so, insinuations with regard to these matters. So I do not intend to go into these matters at all.

I will devote my statement to outlining the basic reason why we were not able to go along with document A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 and what prompted us to submit amendments to this document. Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 represents a radical departure from the very basic approach that this Committee and the entire international community has adopted on the question of prevention of nuclear war.

(Mr. Dubey, India)

Since the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, this Assembly has been adopting resolutions based on consensus and merely incorporating the approach and concepts contained in the Final Document. It is a measure of the responsibility shown in these resolutions that until now, over the last few years, no negative votes have been cast on them. For the first time in several years, during this session of the General Assembly we have been confronted with a resolution which makes a radical departure from the basic approach of the Final Document. The approach in document A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 is completely contradictory to the approach and principles of the Final Document and those contained in the declarations of the non-aligned summit conferences and in other important declarations.

We very much understand and even respect the fact that the views contained in this document represent the attitude, position and perceptions of a particular group of countries belonging to a particular military alliance. We may differ with these views but we understand them. They have expressed these views time and again in the Conference on Disarmament, the General Assembly, the first special session on disarmament, the second special session on disarmament, and in various statements made by them. It is not correct to say, therefore, that any country or group of countries has prevented debate on this subject. These views are abundantly on record, including what has been stated at this session of the General Assembly. What made the difference this year is an attempt by these countries to go beyond the expression of this view, to go beyond debate and to expect the General Assembly as a whole to endorse this point of view. To say the least, it was an unrealistic approach. I think the sponsors should have realized that different points of view have been expressed time and again in the past and there had also been a consensus view as contained in the Final Document. The attempt to set this consensus view aside and present the partisan view of a group of countries as being acceptable to the entire General Assembly was unrealistic. From the very beginning, we told these countries that while we appreciated and understood their view, we could not endorse it because we had different perceptions and points of view. Therefore, about two and a half to three weeks ago we requested them to withdraw their resolution. We received no answer until late Friday evening. Until that time we had not decided to move any amendments to this resolution at all because we realized that it was not the most fitting way to deal with such a

(Mr. Dubey, India)

serious matter. We had to take this step because this was a drastic departure from the basic approach of the Final Document and because of the lack of response to our request that the resolution be withdrawn. The fact that we had to submit these amendments in the form of this long document A/C.1/39/L.80 is wholly due to the pressures of time, procedure, the basic nature of document A/C.1/39/L.40 and the way the sponsors of this document proceeded in pressing A/C.1/39/L.40 in the First Committee. Some have talked about a formal understanding being reached. We have informed this group of countries that we are not moving amendments and are requesting them to withdraw their resolution. We expect them to come back to us with a response as to whether they are withdrawing it or not. If they do not come back to us with this request, is this not a breach of formal understanding, if that can at all be called a formal understanding?

(Mr. Dubey, India)

Both of us acted in a particular situation in good faith and with a view to protecting a position we regard as vital. That is what is important, not the insinuations and attributions of motives or the other kinds of things we have heard. I do hope that account will be taken of the circumstances in which action had to be taken, not only by one group of countries but by the other group as well. We realize the nature of the circumstances in which they acted because we know that they did not have unanimity among themselves on the question of whether to press for the adoption of this draft resolution or not until late in the evening. We did not go to them in a rage and tell them they had committed a breach of understanding and that they were not a serious group of delegations or that it was difficult to do business with them, because that is not the way in which we should function and that is not what the representative of Australia has called the "orderly manner of functioning in this Committee". However, I shall leave this matter aside for the time being and return to the substance of the subject.

The main thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 is that there is nothing unique about a nuclear war, that nuclear war is nothing but an extension of war in general and that, by preventing wars in general and not nuclear war specifically, or nuclear disarmament, the world can get rid of nuclear war. It goes without saying that this approach is contradictory to the approach outlined in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It is contradictory to the approach the entire international community has adopted for dealing with the question of the prevention of nuclear war and the question of nuclear disarmament. The Final Document unanimously declared that the danger of nuclear war flows from the very existence of nuclear weapons and that the escalation of the nuclear-arms race also poses the danger of nuclear war. The prevention of nuclear war is therefore directly related to forswearing the use of nuclear weapons and eliminating them altogether. There is nothing of that sort in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1. As a matter of fact, that document contains a great deal that directly contradicts the point of view of the Final Document. I shall demonstrate how these elements contradict the basic tenets of the Final Document.

We also feel that lumping all wars together at one swoop is either a dangerous over-simplification or a wilful disregard of the realities of our times. By so

(Mr. Dubey, India)

doing we deliberately ignore the fact that there cannot be a limited or localized nuclear war, that - unlike wars in general - there cannot be a series of nuclear wars separated in time and history. The fact is that there can be only one nuclear war, the first one and the last one, after which there will be no trace left of human civilization or the human race. The draft resolution in A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1, in its basic approach, ignores that fundamental fact.

We are acutely aware of the dangers of wars in general and of the suffering that they heap upon the people. We also know that the prevention of war has been the goal of the human race since even before the famous Biblical advice to turn swords into ploughshares was given. We are also convinced that this process will have to be pursued over a long period of time, however difficult that may be. But, while conscious that such a process will be a very long and painstaking one spanning generations of people and of leaderships, we must not forget that the prevention of nuclear war is an immediate necessity, one that will, if not attended to, deny to us and to our progeny even a chance to deal with the more complicated and larger question of the elimination of all wars.

The authors of A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 have presented to us the frightening picture of nuclear weapons as a fait accompli. They prescribe for us only the means of managing a nuclear world, not of eliminating nuclear weapons altogether. They would also like us to believe - and the whole General Assembly to endorse - that they are entitled to use nuclear weapons in the exercise of their right of self-defence. The draft resolution also implies that failure to prevent a war anywhere could become a legitimate cause for them to use nuclear weapons.

We would like to ask who has given these few nuclear States and their allies the right to hold the entire world and humanity as a whole hostage to their so-called self-defence? Can the security of one nation or group of nations be placed above the imperatives of the survival of mankind? It is astonishing enough that such a view should persist anywhere in the world, but it becomes really tragic if an attempt is made to make the General Assembly as a whole endorse such a view.

I would like this Committee to judge how we can prevent a nuclear war and, at the same time - as the draft resolution does - propound principles and put forward arguments justifying the use of nuclear weapons. How can one prevent a thing from happening if one believes at the same time that such a thing is legitimate and even necessary? That is what is stated in this draft resolution.

(Mr. Dubey, India)

We all find it really sad that an attempt has been made to relate the immediate and overriding objective of preventing nuclear war to such goals as respect for the dignity of man and ensuring basic freedoms. Such goals are relative, but the danger of nuclear weapons is real, unique and invariably the same, regardless of whence it comes. Such objectives as human dignity and basic freedoms are defined, interpreted and applied differently in different parts of the world. It is unrealistic and dangerous in the extreme to link such a burning issue of our times as the prevention of nuclear war with those subjectively conceived and defined objectives.

Are we not aware that most of the wars in human history have been fought in the name of the dignity of individuals and the dignity of nations, of freedoms defined as such by the countries waging the wars. If we really accept such a proposition, it will be a blanket sanction for waging a nuclear war in the world.

The representative of Australia said that the draft resolution does nothing but state certain fundamental principles to which we all subscribe. I agree with him that in many of its parts the draft resolution does no more than that. We are prepared to vote for some other draft resolution if there is any real necessity, but why should we do it under the heading "Prevention of nuclear war"? With due humility, I would reply that invoking those principles in the context of the immediate, urgent need to prevent a nuclear war is like taking the Holy Bible to an a hospital operating theatre.

I should like to state once again that we are prepared to discuss this subject. It is for that reason that we have worked so hard to get a suitable mandate for an ad hoc committee on the subject in the Conference on Disarmament. The representatives who have submitted this draft resolution are aware of the reasons why we were unable to succeed in getting suitable terms of reference for the Conference on Disarmament. One of the most regrettable features of this draft resolution is that it tries to go back on the agreement or near agreement reached in the Conference on Disarmament on the possible terms of reference for the proposed ad hoc committee.



(Mr. Dubey, India)

In fact, the implication in paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 is retrogressive compared with what has already been achieved there. It falls short of recommending what almost all the authors of the draft resolution had already agreed to in the Conference on Disarmament in 1984, but they were not prepared finally to clinch it, for reasons that I did not go into in the Conference.

I should like to turn the tables and ask the representative of Australia the following question. In view of what happened in the Conference on Disarmament regarding the terms of reference, is it responsible behaviour to come here, to the General Assembly, with terms of reference consisting of one line just to consider this subject? Is it a serious way to approach such an important matter?

I hope that the answer to those questions will be given when we resume our discussions in the Conference on Disarmament.

I repeat that it is a great relief to us that the draft resolution has been withdrawn. It is well understood that our amendments to it are therefore also withdrawn.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I shall try to cover several matters in this statement, which will be as brief as possible, although I feel forced to refer to all of them.

First, the representative of India, who is the current Chairman of the group of non-aligned and neutral countries, enjoys the full respect of the Mexican delegation. At no time in meetings of the group did he or anyone else refer to a commitment being made that no amendments would be submitted to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1.

My delegation - and this relates to something said by the representative of Australia - believes that as long as the General Assembly's rules of procedure are not amended the provisions that govern debates in the Assembly and the submission of amendments are rules 108 to 133, and not the self-serving, subjective interpretations of one representative or another. If those provisions are to be amended, the way to do it is to follow the accepted procedure: amending the rules. That was the means used by the Mexican delegation in another case where modification of the rules was required. I am referring to the rules of procedure of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

A long time ago my delegation submitted a working paper explaining why it believed it necessary for procedural questions, which even the Security Council

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

considers should not be subject to the veto, still to be subject to a form of veto - that is, consensus - in the proceedings of the Geneva Conference. That is all I have to say on that point.

My second point concerns the procedure that some delegations have followed. This is not new. Anyone who has taken part in the debates on this item of the Conference on Disarmament - until two years ago called the Committee on Disarmament - will know that, as I said at the beginning, it is nothing new; this is a repetition of certain tactics that were used in Geneva. In 1982 we had discussions in the then Committee on Disarmament for three months merely in order to achieve inclusion in the agenda of the item "Prevention of nuclear war". That was the title that the Assembly had used in its relevant resolution, and it was the title that we thought the most appropriate, because it implied anything that directly or indirectly related to the prevention of a nuclear war. However, it necessitated, first, three months of debate and, secondly, agreement by the members of the Group of 21 that the title should be changed by adding the words "including all related matters".

The General Assembly, I believe, continues to think that prevention of nuclear war is the appropriate title. That is why last year's item and this year's have the title "Prevention of nuclear war".

This sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 considered it opportune to introduce a new amendment in the title of the draft resolution itself: "Prevention of nuclear war including all related matters". They thought that that was insufficient and added "Prevention of war in the nuclear age". But we are not in the Conference on Disarmament, where in 1983, because of the negative vote of one or two delegations, it was impossible to establish a subsidiary body, despite the fact that many representatives of Western European and other countries publicly acknowledged that the representative of India, who had been the spokesman for the Group of 21, had given proof of exceptional flexibility and endless patience.

It has been said here that the draft resolution is close to the provisions of the Charter. Of course, many of its provisions come very close to the provisions of the Charter, but we must bear in mind that nuclear weapons were not known in 1945, when we - I say "we", since I had the honour to participate in that Conference - drew up and approved the San Francisco Charter. But from the moment when those weapons exploded - one over Hiroshima and the other over Nagasaki - the

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

General Assembly showed the importance it attached to this question and its concern about the destructive effects of those weapons. That is why the first resolution of the Assembly was devoted to establishing a Commission whose functions included finding ways and means to avoid nuclear war and to destroy existing nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The last aspect I should like to refer to is that of offering clear and concrete examples which speak for themselves as to why we think and continue to think that this draft resolution was and is an attempt at surreptitiously obtaining amendments to what we adopted in the Final Document in 1978 and which received - and I am quoting the 1982 resolution - "unanimous and categorical reaffirmation" during the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Committee paragraphs like the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 which I shall now read out so that it is included in the record:

"Noting with grave concern the implications of a continuing arms build-up, particularly in its nuclear aspect, and expressing its profound conviction that the prevention of nuclear war, indeed all war, remains the most acute and urgent task of the present day".

So it is no longer nuclear war which is the most acute and urgent task of the present day but the prevention of all wars. I should like paragraphs like the above compared with the ones I shall quote later on from the Final Document. Operative paragraph 2 - and the representative of India referred to this a few moments ago - states:

"Urges all States, in conformity with their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State," - so far it is practically a verbatim repetition of the Charter - "and thus never to use any of their weapons, except in the exercise of their inherent right of individual or collective self-defence". Operative paragraph 3:

"Calls upon all States to maintain, as a priority objective of their policies, the removal of the danger of war at any level of hostility, thereby precluding the use of nuclear weapons".

I should like the members taking part in the work of the First Committee to compare, at their leisure once we have concluded our debates on this item, these texts with the ones I shall quote from the Final Document. Paragraph 8 of the Final Document states:

"While the final objective of the efforts of all States should continue to be general and complete disarmament under effective international control, the immediate goal is that of the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war".

(S-10/2, para. 8)

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Paragraph 18 states:

"Removing the threat of a world war - a nuclear war - is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation."

(S-10/2, para. 18)

The third paragraph I think I should quote is paragraph 45:

"Priorities in disarmament negotiations shall be: nuclear weapons; other weapons of mass destruction ..." (S-10/2, para. 45)

The fourth and last paragraph I wish to bring to the attention of members of the Committee is paragraph 47:

"Nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization. It is essential to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of war involving nuclear weapons. The ultimate goal in this context is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons." (S-10/2, para. 47)

The delegation of Mexico, which was not and is not willing to accept any indirect or direct attempt surreptitiously or openly to amend these statements adopted by consensus in 1978 and reiterated, also by consensus, in 1982, has considered it necessary to sponsor, together with the delegations of Argentina, India and Yugoslavia, the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation welcomes the decision adopted by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 not to put it to a vote. That draft resolution is extremely negative and in no way beneficial to disarmament and peace. I will not repeat its defects, which have been pointed out by other speakers, nor will I question the position of other countries on the matter. I shall merely say that we do not oppose a discussion on the prevention of war in general, in particular because we have suffered from wars that have been imposed on us in attempts to defend the interests of imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, economic exploitation and the plundering of our natural resources. We do oppose a distortion of the most critical and urgent task of our times.

Permit me therefore to say something about draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1, which has been withdrawn: first of all, in referring to the most acute and urgent task of the present day, that draft resolution - although it does not say so - attempts to amend, as the representative of Mexico has just

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

pointed out, the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament; secondly, that document tries to place on the same footing the so-called confidence-building measures and the adoption of effective nuclear-disarmament measures, thereby detracting from the importance and priority which disarmament measures should have; thirdly, that draft resolution states that bilateral negotiations have been suspended and adds that other negotiations are making slow progress - there are no other negotiations, because they are being hampered and avoided by the same ones who, with their militaristic and aggressive policy, try to prevent or avoid bilateral negotiations; lastly, it is interesting to see that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 calls upon the Conference on Disarmament to continue its substantive consideration of this item.

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

Here again it would seem difficult to oppose having the Conference on Disarmament continue with what that draft terms its substantive work. We therefore think it necessary to recall what is stated in the report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly on this question. That report states:

"In connection with agenda item 3, a contact group was established to consider the question of establishing a subsidiary body. The Group of 21 during the spring session submitted a proposal to set up an ad hoc committee to deal with the question ... The Group of 21 also indicated during the consultations within the Contact Group that it was willing to accept a non-negotiating mandate permitting an open and full discussion of all proposals relevant to item 3, without assigning any priority among them. A group of socialist States, too, had submitted its proposal ... for establishment of an ad hoc committee but it had also agreed to support the efforts made by the Group of 21 in the search for a consensus. Although the meetings of the Contact Group had made encouraging progress towards attaining a consensus on the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee, it was felt at the end of the spring session that some more time was necessary for the formation of requisite consensus on the proposal and the matter was deferred until the summer session. Towards the end of the summer session, the Group of 21 made a formal proposal contained in document CD/515, which was meant to represent the lowest common denominator of the positions held by various delegations in the Conference on item 3. This proposal for the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee was placed before the Conference for decision at the 275th plenary meeting on 24 July 1984. It was supported by the group of socialist countries, although they regarded it as a minimum mandate for an ad hoc committee which would deal with this most urgent and important problem. A nuclear-weapon State not belonging to any group also supported this proposal ... Certain delegations however could not support such a proposal nor did they find it possible to present any amendment to CD/515, which would make it acceptable to them. As a result, there was then no consensus possible on the adoption of the draft mandate contained in document CD/515. The Group of 21 expressed its deep regret that in spite of the maximum flexibility displayed by it, the Conference was prevented from fulfilling its mandate as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating body on by far the most important item on its agenda, due to the inability of a few delegations to support CD/515." (A/39/27, para. 78)

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

In the light of these facts it is clear that some seem not yet to realize that it is urgent to work to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war. Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 assumes that the General Assembly of the United Nations will ask the Conference on Disarmament, paradoxical as it may seem, to continue its substantive work of not doing anything substantial. Had it not been withdrawn we would have voted in favour of the amendments contained in document A/C.1/39/L.80.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): I will try to be true to my practice of being brief. My delegation has taken note of the statement of the main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 that it would not be pressed to a vote. Had the statements we have heard been confined to conveying that decision on their part, we would not have asked to speak at this stage. Since, however, comments of substance have been made, I should like to say a few words on the question at hand.

Let me make it clear at the outset that had it come to a vote, my delegation would not have supported draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1. By utilizing selective quotations from the Charter of the United Nations and from the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, that draft resolution sought, in our view, to justify and condone policies and practices which are actually contrary to the letter and the spirit of those commitments.

Moreover, some of its provisions dangerously distort the meaning and the objectives of the process of disarmament, as it is spelled out in international consensus documents. It is sufficient to note that the word "disarmament" does not appear in the operative part of the draft resolution, except where it is necessary to identify the Conference on Disarmament.

Mention has been made of contradictions in the position of a particular group of countries. Let me simply state that those who would like to impose the absolute rule of consensus on all decisions in the field of disarmament are also those who now seem to be saying that a group of countries should not exercise its right to make amendments to a particular text.

May I also call the attention of this Committee to the fact that those who support and promote doctrines and ideas aimed at maintaining the present situation in the world are also those who, through their attitudes and actions, also condone the unbridled proliferation of nuclear weapons by the nuclear-weapon Powers. The current proliferation of nuclear weapons has already increased the danger of



(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

nuclear war, since only those who possess such weapons are in a position to wage it. We all agree that the consequences of such a war would jeopardize the very survival of all mankind.

We have heard from the main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 a call for what they define as realism. To my delegation the true meaning of realism is to act in full accord with the common interest of mankind to ensure that the proliferation of nuclear weapons currently engaged in by the nuclear-weapon Powers is curbed and that they subsequently take effective measures of nuclear disarmament. Only then would they and their allies be taken seriously by the majority of the community of nations in the common effort to prevent nuclear war.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation had not intended to take part in this discussion, especially since draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 has been withdrawn and is not being put to a vote. However, in the light of some statements that have been made here this afternoon, and because my delegation is one of the sponsors of the amendments that have been referred to by various representatives, we feel that we must speak at this time.

At this late stage, draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 has been submitted. I think that it is advisable, indeed necessary, for my delegation to say a few words about it, in order to make our position clear.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1, which in fact is basically the same as the original text, has a title that clearly illustrates the approach being taken on this matter - an approach that is developed in the preamble and operative part of the draft resolution. That title is: "Prevention of war in the nuclear age". That is different, indeed, from "Prevention of nuclear war", the title of agenda item 59 (f), on which many statements have been made in the past. This is also the wording used in the Final Document.

It is obvious that the views expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 reflect the security perceptions of a group of countries, or in any event of several of the members of a group of countries. My delegation believes, and it has so stated repeatedly, that each State or group of States is fully entitled to support any position it deems appropriate to its security interests, and that all positions deserve respect.

In our view, however, there are two important limitations in this respect. First, the position taken should not in itself lead to an increase in the insecurity of third countries that are totally removed from possible areas of conflict. Secondly, it is one thing for the views of one member or several members of a group of countries to be presented. It is quite another thing to claim that those views must be accepted as the expression of the policy of the international community.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 no doubt represents the thinking of its co-sponsors, and my delegation certainly respects that. But we and many other delegations cannot passively agree that this way of thinking, respectable in itself as an expression of the position of a group of countries, should be endorsed by the General Assembly and thus become the policy of the Assembly.

This is obviously not the right time for an analysis of the draft resolution. It contains some paragraphs that could have been accepted without difficulty. But,

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

at least in my delegation's view, it also contains elements that are contrary not only to the Final Document but also to fundamental positions of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. Since the attitude of non-aligned countries on this matter has been mentioned this afternoon, I would recall that the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has taken a very clear position on the matter of the prevention of nuclear war. That position is succinctly but clearly reflected in, for example, the Political Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries - the highest level of the Movement - held at New Delhi in March 1983. That Political Declaration includes a chapter devoted to disarmament, and I wish to quote in full the first paragraph of that chapter because it very clearly reflects the position on this question of the Movement at its highest level. That paragraph reads as follows:

"The Heads of State or Government consider that the greatest peril facing the world today is the threat to the survival of mankind from a nuclear war. Disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, is no longer a moral issue; it is an issue of human survival. Yet the renewed escalation in the nuclear arms race, both in its quantitative and in its qualitative dimensions, as well as reliance on doctrines of nuclear deterrence, has heightened the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war and led to greater insecurity and instability in international relations. Nuclear weapons are more than weapons of war. They are instruments of mass annihilation. The Heads of State or Government therefore find it unacceptable that the security of all States and the very survival of mankind should be held hostage to the security interests of a handful of nuclear-weapon States. Measures for the prevention of nuclear war and of nuclear disarmament must take into account the security interests of nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States alike and ensure that the survival of mankind is not endangered. They rejected all theories and concepts pertaining to the possession of nuclear weapons and their use under any circumstances". (A/38/132, Political Declaration, para. 28)

I believe that that position of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, adopted at the highest level, is extremely clear. So long as it is not changed by another decision of the Movement at the same level, it should be and is the position of the non-aligned countries, and those of us that are non-aligned countries must act in accordance with it. I say this because references have repeatedly been made to possible or hypothetical attitudes on the part of non-aligned countries on this

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

question. Now, my delegation has attended all the meetings, without exception, of the co-ordinating group of the group of non-aligned countries, and I can state that no non-aligned delegation attending those meetings expressed at any time support for draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40. This applies also to the plenary meeting of the Movement held yesterday. At that time, at the group level, we took the decision to submit amendments to this draft resolution in the light of the procedural circumstances which the representative of India, the Chairman of the Movement, has explained. No non-aligned delegation expressed opposition to or reservations on the submission of amendments to the draft. On the contrary, all of them expressed agreement that this should be done. It was on the basis of such agreement that some delegations in the group decided to co-sponsor these amendments.

In the light of what I have said, and especially in view of the paragraph that I have quoted from the 1983 New Delhi Political Declaration, it is clear - at least to my delegation, and I think to many others as well - that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40 is not in keeping with that Political Declaration.

Of course, we cannot expect that delegations that are not members of the Movement will act according to the decisions or the policy of the Movement on matters of such importance. On the other hand, it is not surprising - quite the contrary - for non-aligned delegations to act in accordance with the positions taken by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at its highest level.

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 had serious shortcomings, which I will not go into in detail, for obvious reasons, the main one being lack of time - nor is this the most appropriate time - but it was obvious to us that the purpose, which was clear in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, was to dilute the question of the prevention of nuclear war, which, in the words of the Final Document is the most urgent and critical task of the moment, in order to subsume it in a broader question which it has been impossible to resolve, as shown by 6,000 years of history: the prevention of war in general. It would be difficult to find a more effective way in which to avoid dealing with such a priority issue as the prevention of nuclear war than to divert the discussion to the prevention of any war or any act of force in international relations - in other words, trying to change human nature. This in no way means that it does not continue to be one of the fundamental purposes of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security, but it is obvious that measures to ensure the survival of mankind have a special urgency and nature.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 legitimizes the doctrine of nuclear deterrence. It accepts the use of nuclear weapons in self-defence, totally independently from the types of weapons which may have been used in the conflict previously and depending on the decision of some nuclear-weapon States or their allies. It relates the prevention of nuclear war or any other armed conflict to respect for certain fundamental rights and freedoms - which are, of course, deserving of respect - but with the implication that, if such rights are not observed, even nuclear war would be justified. There are other shortcomings on which I will not dwell, as I have said, for obvious reasons.

That is why my delegation and many others had serious objections to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 - I repeat, not as an expression of the position of a group of countries but as the expression of an attempt to make that position, respectable in itself, into the position of the entire United Nations. Those were the reasons why my delegation submitted the amendments which, as the representative of India has said, have also been withdrawn.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): During the course of this exchange of views reference was made to what I had said earlier, in particular by the representative of India. I would like to respond briefly.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Let me begin by saying that I was very grateful to the representative of India for the commitment he gave in his statement to further work on this vital problem. I believe most delegations in this room share that commitment, and I want to make it very clear that that commitment is certainly the commitment of the Australian Government.

Some delegations have suggested that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 constituted a departure from the language of the Final Document. I should like to reject that. There was no departure from the language or purpose of the Final Document. There was no attempt in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 to break consensus with the Final Document. I ask, is it inconsistent with the Final Document to argue, as was done in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1, that all wars should be prevented? Is it inconsistent with the Final Document that we should emphasize the importance that all of us honour our commitments to the Charter of the United Nations? The honouring of such commitments, the reaffirmation of the terms of the Final Document, is precisely what was involved in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1.

It has been suggested by one delegation that we have entered into selective quotation. The implication of that suggestion is that selective quotation was entered into with the design of distorting the language and purpose of the Final Document. I think you will understand that I am bound to reject such a suggestion. I would draw attention, by way of example, to the fact that the amendments suggested in document A/C.1/39/L.80 include one amendment which would delete the fifth preambular paragraph of document A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1, which is itself an expression of the language of the Charter of the United Nations. In circumstances such as these, my delegation has found it hard to understand the purpose of the suggested amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1. There was nothing in that draft that questioned the value of nuclear disarmament. On the contrary, that draft reaffirmed unequivocally the value and importance of nuclear disarmament and of negotiations to that end. I want it to be clear that the Australian delegation would not have associated itself with that draft if it had been anything less than crystal clear on that point. The policy of my Government is a policy of nuclear disarmament and of negotiations to that end.

I am sorry that the consideration of this issue has ended in the way it has. As I said earlier, I believe this is a subject that will not leave us, nor should

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

it leave us. Australia looks forward to working further with others on the question of the prevention of nuclear war, because, as we all know, it is one of the vital problems of our age.

Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): I should like to make a brief statement on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1. First of all, we want to express our satisfaction at the fact that the draft resolution was not pressed to the vote, because it was not acceptable to my delegation or the delegations of many other socialist countries. Many of the provisions of the draft resolution are contrary to the views we hold on that issue.

I do not want to repeat here at length what has been stated by us clearly and unequivocally at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. Many of those views coincide fully with what has been stated by the delegations of the non-aligned countries that have taken the floor before us. We agree with them that some of the views stated in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 are contrary to what is stated in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and in fact place the issue of nuclear war in jeopardy.

We agree that all wars should be prevented, as much as all weapons should be abolished. However, as we are dealing here with the most dangerous weapons, we should deal first with the most dangerous kind of war, which is a war in which nuclear weapons would be used. Therefore we were ready to support the amendments presented by members of the group of non-aligned States.

This vitally important issue must be deliberated upon again at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, and we would express the hope that the Powers that stood behind the withdrawn draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1 will reconsider their approach to the problem, so that the results we achieve in the future may be more positive than what has so far been achieved.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other representative wishes to speak on this matter, we have concluded consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.40/Rev.1.

We shall now take up draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 and L.69/Rev.1.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 37th meeting, on 14 November 1984, and it is sponsored by Bangladesh, India, Mexico, Pakistan, Romania, Sweden, Uruguay and Yugoslavia. I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): It is important to note at the outset that what my intervention is about is consensus. Canada prizes consensus. I am trying for consensus here. It has been the consistent intention of Canada to work towards a consensus resolution on the extremely important subject of nuclear winter.

Canada believes it is in the interest of the world community that ongoing studies on the climatic effects of nuclear war be known to all Members of the United Nations. We in Canada are ready to make available a study now being undertaken by the Royal Society of Canada on this subject.

On behalf of a number of sponsors, Canada introduced draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.69/Rev.1, which attempted to treat this subject in broader terms than A/C.1/39/L.22 in the hope of building a consensus. Subsequently, discussions were held among the sponsors of A/C.1/39/L.22 and L.69/Rev.1.

We noted the introduction yesterday of A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1, which, in our view, should go some distance in broadening the support we believe this important resolution should obtain. We think, however, that a number of modifications to the text would make the support broader still, always with the aim and hope of achieving consensus.

With that in mind we accordingly propose that A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 be amended in two places. These are not substantive amendments. First, we would replace the third preambular paragraph with the following words:

"Bearing in mind that some recent scientific studies have concluded that a nuclear war could trigger large-scale climatic consequences, leading in the worst analysis to what is sometimes termed a nuclear winter".

And secondly, to insert the words "within existing resources", in operative paragraph 1, so that the paragraph would read as follows:

"Requests the Secretary-General to compile and distribute as a document of the United Nations within existing resources appropriate excerpts of all national and international scientific studies on the climatic effects of nuclear war, including Nuclear Winter, published so far or which may be published before 31 July 1985".

Now, just a few words of explanation. Along with a number of other delegations, we believe it is important that the subject of the climatic effects of nuclear war be addressed by the United Nations in as dispassionate and scientific a manner as possible. The prospects of wide-scale climatic effects of nuclear war



(Mr. Roche, Canada)

are a source of universal concern and no avenue of research into these consequences should be overlooked. We therefore believe that the framework of this resolution should encompass all possible climatic effects and not have its focus limited exclusively to one possibility, particularly at the current stage of research on this issue. A number of delegations, including that of Canada, have also noted the assurance made yesterday that there would be no above-budget costs involved in the production of the document suggested in A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1. Since this is the case, we are confident that the sponsors of A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 will readily agree that this point can be spelled out in a modest way in the resolution.

These suggestions are intended to be helpful and are made in the spirit of achieving a consensus resolution whose subject-matter is of deep concern and universal importance.

The CHAIRMAN: As you have heard, the representative of Canada has proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 in order to obtain a consensus on this draft resolution. For the purpose of proceeding in an expeditious and orderly way, I shall put questions that can be simply answered. First, are the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 prepared to accept the amendments just proposed by the representative of Canada?

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): In the statement just made by the representative of Canada, while there was one element which could have been expected because it was one element on which the group of sponsors of resolution A/C.1/39/L.69/Rev.1 had insisted in our talks, the other element is somewhat of a surprise for me and I think for the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 as well.

The first one of those elements refers to the wish to include in operative paragraph 1 the words "within existing resources" after the words "Requests the Secretary-General to compile and distribute as a document of the United Nations within existing resources ...".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The original proposal was "existing financial resources," but now I see that it is "existing resources". I think that what applies to financial resources would also apply to this. I should like in this connection to recall that when introducing draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 I referred specifically to this point. I said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 wished or had in mind that that compilation - I do not think there could be a more modest term or a more modest task - to be carried out by the Secretary-General should be done within existing resources. I added that, after informal consultations with the Secretariat, I had been informed that there was no problem in undertaking the compilation in that manner.

In view of what the representative of Canada has just said, however, I should like to ask the Secretariat, through the Chairman, whether my interpretation is correct. Once an answer to that has been given, I should like to speak again.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the Secretary of the Committee, if he is in a position to do so, to clarify the point raised by the representative of Mexico.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Without going into the elaborate details of the question raised by the representative of Mexico, I would give a positive answer and say "yes" to the query he has made, on the basis, of course, of the discussions to which he referred, which were held earlier with the Secretariat.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The statement just made by the Secretary of the Committee, together with what I said when I introduced the draft resolution, reflects for the record that the compilation will be done as wished by the representative of Canada and the sponsors of the draft resolution. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 consider that to request, in addition to that, such an explicit inclusion in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution - aside from being somewhat insulting to the sponsors and to the Secretariat - would create a precedent that we are not, as a matter of principle, prepared to accept.

Nor are we prepared to agree that on matters that are said to involve the very survival of mankind and that include the most critical and urgent task of the present day - removal of the threat of a nuclear war - and speaking of the possible effects of certain uses of nuclear weapons - and despite what has been said by the sponsors and the Secretariat, all of which will be in the verbatim record - there

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

should be an insertion into operative paragraph 1 of such an express reference. I think that in terms of future draft resolutions that would create an extremely dangerous precedent.

For those reasons, my delegation - and here I am also expressing the views of the other sponsors - does not accept the proposed amendments made in extremis by the representative of Canada.

The other proposal, as I said a moment ago, has come as a surprise to us. The informal consultations we held with the sponsors of the original draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.69, now L.69/Rev.1, with the exception of the specific point I have referred to, had reached what I would not hesitate to term a happy conclusion. My delegation's files contain a typewritten text that bears not only the date but the time it was handed to me by one of the representatives of the sponsor States. That text does not contain anything at all about the amendment being proposed today to the third preambular paragraph.

The third preambular paragraph had been agreed to expressly by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.69/Rev.1, and we do not see anything in the new text that might cover something not already foreseen in our draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1, which was known to them. Our text says:

"Noting that as a result of recent atmospheric and biological studies there have been new findings which indicate that in addition to blast, heat and radiation" -

and those are the three elements that, ever since the Hiroshima explosion, we well know to be among the effects of nuclear weapons. We would hope that they will not now create difficulties for the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.69/Rev.1. Our draft resolution continues:

"in addition to blast, heat and radiation, nuclear war, even on a limited scale, would produce smoke, soot and dust of sufficient magnitude as to trigger an arctic Nuclear Winter".

Those are also the words of the English text.

(spoke in English)

The words "even on a limited scale" were expressly accepted by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.69/Rev.1 at the request of one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1. In English, the text reads:

"even on a limited scale, would produce smoke, soot and dust of sufficient magnitude as to trigger an arctic Nuclear Winter which may transform the Earth into a darkened, frozen planet where conditions would be conducive to mass extinction".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

(continued in Spanish)

Our text is not something we have just pulled out of a hat. It is not something we have sprung as a surprise. It is something that has been before the First Committee in its final, revised form since 23 November 1984, and, prior to its last revision, for at least five days - and more - prior to that - from 7 November 1984.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Therefore, my delegation regrets that this surprise text is proposed at this late date, when this meeting is supposedly the last in the Committee's work on disarmament. We are not prepared to reopen the debate at this stage; we think that if the draft resolution cannot be accepted by consensus, as we had hoped, it should, as is customary, be put to the vote.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Mexico for answering my question.

Having heard the reply of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1, does the delegation of Canada insist on pressing its draft amendments to a vote? If so, I shall have to ask the Committee's approval to dispense with the rule requiring that a written amendment be circulated at least the day before action is taken on it. As we are not in a debate on substance, but are only trying to clarify a matter of procedure, I ask the representative of Canada to speak on matters of procedure.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): I address this comment to the procedure that I followed, Sir. As I said earlier, it represents a very serious effort by a number of nations represented here to deal with this resolution by a consensus vote. That is why very serious consideration was given to the introduction on behalf of several countries of the two amendments now before us. They were born out of last weekend, when negotiations still continued, but were peremptorily ended by the sudden issue of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1. That necessitated consultations, which produced the two amendments. That is why the amendments were not submitted yesterday - because of the speedy issue of the revised draft resolution.

I now wish to put a question to the Secretariat. On what basis did it carry out the study that enabled it to state a few minutes ago that no extrabudgetary costs would be incurred as a result of the compilation of the document in accordance with what has been termed, in the Secretariat's words, the informal consultations? Was a standard of, for example, 100 pages set for the proposed document?

I understand the Secretariat to be saying that there will be no increased budgetary costs, but on what basis - a 100-page document? If the document exceeds 100 pages, is the Secretariat prepared to stand by what it said: that there will be no extrabudgetary costs?

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

That is the question I respectfully put to you, Mr. Chairman, in an effort to clarify the situation so that we may proceed to determine whether a consensus will be available on this very important subject.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): In my earlier intervention, I referred not to "informal consultations" but to the reference made by the representative of Mexico to the consultations that had been held with the Secretariat in that context.

On behalf of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, I can say with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 that it is not possible at this early stage to estimate with accuracy the number of pages that the work would involve. However, from a preliminary assessment the Department for Disarmament Affairs believes that the length of such a United Nations document might be less than 100 printed pages. It has been ascertained that the processing of such a document - here I again emphasize the quantitative aspect - could be absorbed into the regular workload of the documentation services, with no need for additional resources. However, I understand that the representative of Canada has now asked specifically what happens if that limit should be exceeded.

I have referred to the preliminary assessment, and once again emphasize that aspect. However, the Department of Conference Services has also stated that should a document exceeding 100 final pages be necessary, given that a very heavy workload is expected for next year, 1985, additional resources might have to be requested for the documentation services in order to ensure the timely processing of such a document.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): I respectfully request that we proceed with the amendments that I have introduced.

The PRESIDENT: The Committee will now vote on the amendment in paragraph 1 of the document circulated by the delegation of Canada, which reads:

"Replace preambular paragraph 3 in L.22/Rev.1 with the following:

"Bearing in mind that some recent scientific studies have concluded that a nuclear war could trigger large-scale climatic consequences, leading in the worst analysis to what is sometimes termed a nuclear winter."

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Rwanda, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Burundi, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, Mozambique, Niger, Oman, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Zaire

The first amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 was rejected

by 63 votes to 24, with 31 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on the amendment contained in paragraph 2 of the document circulated by the delegation of Canada for the purpose of amending operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution

A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Malawi, Mongolia, Mozambique, Niger, Oman, Poland, Singapore, Sudan, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The second amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 was rejected by 56 votes to 27, with 35 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.



A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African 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, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, 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, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 was adopted by 123 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now invite delegations to speak in explanation of their vote after the vote.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): As I explained before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1, it has been the consistent intention of Canada to work towards a consensus on the important subject of nuclear winter. On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.69, Canada entered into negotiations with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22. Those discussions bore fruit. A compromise draft resolution was developed. Many points of view were folded into one draft resolution; indeed, it was one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22 who suggested the language of the operative sections in the compromise draft resolution which we found acceptable.

Mr. Roche, Canada)

The final version of that draft resolution was typed and the time was put on it - 21 November at 3 p.m. I circulated that draft resolution to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22, one of whom was withholding consent. I asked that the relevant parties take a few days for reflection and I expressed my desire to continue to make whatever modifications were mutually acceptable.

When I returned to the United Nations yesterday, following the weekend, I was confronted by a new document, A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1, which was issued without proper consultation with Canada or for that matter with any of the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.69. The very existence of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 produced in such a manner calls into question the conduct of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22, who were still in negotiation with me.

Leaving this question aside and still desirous of working towards a consensus, Canada submitted the amendments which have just been defeated. It is important for those who voted against those non-substantive amendments to realize what they have done. They have broken the possibility of a consensus approval for the nuclear winter studies to be brought into the United Nations, studies that would enrich our total understanding of the subject and which would enhance the work and value of the United Nations.

It is surprising that the good faith which Canada and the other sponsors brought to the negotiations on this subject was treated in such a manner. This unseemly process we have just been through reflects little credit on our work. None the less, Canada refused to allow our final vote on the nuclear winter studies to be affected by a distasteful process, because Canada believes essentially that the climactic effects of nuclear war, including nuclear winter, should be studied at the United Nations. We voted yes on the draft resolution despite our continuing reservations about certain passages in the text and we see no need to continue now with draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.69/Rev.1.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

Canada has made its point at this session. We believe that the nuclear-arms race poses great dangers for the world and we want the question given professional and thorough study in the United Nations. That is part of the constant, consistent, dominant priority that the nuclear-arms question is given in Canadian foreign policy. We will not be deterred by those who so lightly dismiss the value of consensus. We will go on, determined to put forward what we believe in.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 without the amendments because we consider that widespread understanding and acknowledgement of the possible climatic effects of nuclear war - including in an extreme case the possibility of nuclear winter - are very important. We agree with the view that the world population is entitled to be informed about the latest scientific investigations which have led to the possible scenario of nuclear winter.

My delegation, however, is not completely satisfied with the manner in which the concept is presented in some of the paragraphs in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1. My delegation, together with other delegations, tried to express the same concept in a somewhat different way, and that was the reason why we favoured the amendments proposed by the representative of Canada.

Instead of running the risk of sounding alarmistic and giving the impression that nuclear winter is a proved scientific fact of life, it would be more appropriate to explain the extent of the difficulties even with the latest computer technology - involved in calculating the different stages of world-wide climatic changes subsequent to multiple nuclear explosions. In fact, there are equally knowledgeable authorities who would argue against the nuclear winter theory. Rather than have the General Assembly participate directly in what may be a scientific debate among scientists, we would have thought it more advisable to remain fair and unbiased, while making it clear that, nuclear winter or not, nuclear war should be prevented.

In this regard, I should like to add that my delegation appreciates the fact that the sponsors saw fit to include the second preambular paragraph. I should also like to restate our understanding, as was just confirmed by the Secretariat, that the task called for in operative paragraph 1 can and will be carried out within the existing means of the Secretariat.

(Mr. Imai, Japan)

We regret that the efforts made by the countries concerned, including Japan, to improve the language of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22 in this regard did not come to fruition and we thus are forced to register our reservation regarding the financial aspects of this draft resolution.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): I should like to explain briefly our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1, on which my delegation abstained. My delegation regrets that the sponsors of the draft resolution were unable to agree to the relatively small changes to achieve a compromise text which would have commanded consensus. I should like to place on record the importance my delegation attaches to this subject. For this reason, we fully supported draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.69/Rev.1. However, in our view, the language of the revised draft resolution prejudices the results of continuing scientific studies on this important subject. We expect that, none the less, the Disarmament Commission will reflect on the full range of views available. We also expect that the resolution will have no additional financial implications.

Mr. DEPASSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): In scientific matters we should not confuse hypothesis with proved theory, which is the error made in the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1, and the reason why the Belgian delegation abstained in the voting on it.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1, we shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.69/Rev.1. I understand that the sponsors of this draft resolution are not pressing for a vote. It being so understood, we have concluded our consideration of and action upon draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.69/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.46/Rev.1. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the 40th meeting, on 15 November. The amendments to this draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/39/L.75/Rev.1.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting. I see that the representative of Iran is asking to speak. May I inquire on what point he wishes to speak, because we are starting with explanations of vote and we are not supposed to hear explanations of vote from the sponsors of draft resolutions.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Before we proceed to the voting stage, I wish to indicate that my delegation is withdrawing revision 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.46.

The CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding, then, that no action is required on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.46/Rev.1 and the relevant amendments.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): It is the original draft resolution, in document A/C.1/39/L.46, on which action remains to be taken.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for that clarification. I shall now ask the representative of Iraq, who introduced the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.46/Rev.1, what his position is in regard to the amendments he has proposed.

Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): I think that what we have just seen in this Committee is ample evidence of the juggling theatrics that we have had to put up with.

In view of the request that has just been made by the Ambassador of Iran, my delegation maintains the amendments that appear in document A/C.1/39/L.75. As members will recall, those amendments were introduced in order to inject some balance into draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.46.

The manoeuvring in which the delegation of Iran has just engaged and the clear-cut admission of the defeat of Iran's own case prompt my delegation to submit to the Committee that this is no longer a question of a weapon; it is, by the admission of the delegation of Iran - the sponsor of the original draft resolution - an extension that does not pertain to the item before this Committee.

Therefore, on the basis of rule 116 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure, my delegation formally moves that the debate on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.46 and the amendments contained in document A/C.1/39/L.75 be adjourned.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard a proposal made under rule 116 for the adjournment of debate. For the benefit of those who do not have the rules of procedure in front of them, I shall read out rule 116:

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. The Chairman may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule".

(The Chairman)

Before turning to the procedural motion made by the representative of Iraq, I would state that it is my conviction that this Committee attaches great importance to the matter now under consideration. The matter has indeed been thoroughly discussed by the delegations most concerned - in their main statements, in their statements in exercise of the right of reply, in their statements introducing their respective draft resolutions and draft amendments. It is therefore my understanding that the Committee is fully aware of the positions of both delegations involved.

I shall put to the vote, as I must do in accordance with the rules of procedure, the motion submitted by the representative of Iraq. I shall call on representatives, not more than two, wishing to speak in favour of the motion; and on representatives, not more than two, wishing to speak against it.

I call first on the representative of Sudan, who wishes to speak in favour of the motion for adjournment, in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure.

Mr. ELFAKI (Sudan): My country's position on the question of chemical weapons is well known and has been set forth on several occasions, most recently during the Committee's general debate at this session and when action was taken on the four other draft resolutions relating to this issue.

In view of the circumstances facing the Committee now and in view of the adoption of the four other draft resolutions on this issue - draft resolutions that, in my delegation's opinion, are fairly comprehensive - my delegation at this stage supports the motion for adjournment presented by the Ambassador of Iraq, in accordance with rule 116 of the General Assembly's rules of procedures.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other representative wishes to speak in favour of the motion, and since no representatives wish to speak against it, it must, in accordance with rule 116, be immediately put to the vote.

I therefore now put to the vote the motion for adjournment of the debate submitted by the delegation of Iraq. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Djibouti, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Oman, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Yugoslavia

Against: Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe\*

The motion was adopted by 34 votes to 2, with 68 abstentions.

---

\* Subsequently, the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to the next draft resolutions on which action is to be taken, that is, those contained in cluster 10: draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.1, L.3, L.37/Rev.2 and L.61. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to state their positions on the four draft resolutions in cluster 10.

I call on the representative of Turkey on a point of order.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): The Turkish delegation wishes to explain its vote concerning draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.46.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the representative of Turkey that, according to the rules of procedure, the adjournment of the debate means that the item is no longer under consideration. I am very sorry, but I must abide by the rules of procedure.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): We wish to explain our vote concerning the voting that has just taken place.

The CHAIRMAN: I have a most liberal mind, and if I hear no objections from any member of the Committee I shall give you the floor.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): The Islamic Republic of Iran and Iraq are Turkey's neighbours, with which my country has always had friendly and brotherly relations. The Turkish Government, having equally close relations with both, has taken the utmost care to maintain strict neutrality concerning the war between its two neighbours, while trying to contribute to a settlement which is mutually acceptable to them in its bilateral and multilateral efforts to that effect. For that reason, the Turkish delegation abstained in the voting that just took place.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Bangladesh wished to speak, and I would ask him on what point he wishes to speak.

Mr. ALI (Bangladesh): Mr. Chairman, since you have given the opportunity to the representative of Turkey to explain his vote, could I also have the opportunity to explain our vote on the procedural motion?

The CHAIRMAN: Let me put two conditions. The first is that as Chairman I can limit the time for explanations of vote, and so I will allow no more than one minute, and the second is that no other delegation has any objection.

Mr. ALI (Bangladesh): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on the procedural motion which took place on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.46, submitted by the brotherly Islamic country of Iran on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons.



(Mr. Ali, Bangladesh)

My delegation's position on the question of chemical and bacteriological weapons is firm and categorical and we have consistently emphasized the need for the adoption of effective measures to prohibit the development, production and stockpiling of all such deadly weapons. In this spirit my delegation last week voted in favour of all four draft resolutions on this subject.

As regards our vote this afternoon, let me make it quite clear that the draft resolution presented by the brotherly Islamic country of Iran and the amendments proposed by the brotherly Islamic country of Iraq clearly showed the wide divergence of their views.

Bangladesh, as a member of the Islamic Peace Committee, has made and will continue to make every possible effort for the peaceful resolution of the conflict between those two brotherly countries. In view of the existing situation, my delegation was unable to take any position which may have the possibility of affecting our future role and activities in our various capacities. Our abstention on the procedural motion should be seen in that light. It is our earnest hope that the brotherly Islamic countries of Iraq and Iran will fully appreciate and recognize our position. Before concluding, permit me to reiterate Bangladesh's firm desire to make every possible effort for a peaceful resolution of this long-drawn-out conflict.

The CHAIRMAN: I have invited representatives to present their positions or explanations of vote on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 10.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In an effort to make it easier for the General Assembly to endorse a decision aimed at the adoption of effective steps to prevent the militarization of outer space, and in view of the desire expressed by a number of non-aligned countries for the adoption of a single draft resolution along these lines, the Soviet delegation has decided not to insist upon a vote being taken on its draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.1. We will support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2, which we drafted together with the delegations of non-aligned countries.

The CHAIRMAN: As members of the Committee have heard, the Soviet delegation is not pressing for a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.1. Thus consideration of and action on that is concluded.

Mr. QIAN Jiadong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The prevention of an arms race in outer space is one of the items of the highest priority in the disarmament field today. The United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions at three consecutive sessions expressing concern that outer space might become a new arena for the arms race and appealing to the international community to take prompt and effective measures to prevent this dangerous development.

In the First Committee at the last session of the General Assembly, as a result of the consultations and efforts by all sides, three proposals on the question of outer space were merged into one, which was then adopted by an overwhelming majority. This was a great achievement. It shows the importance the international community attaches to this problem and it reflects the consensus of views on this question.

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

It is regrettable that this resolution, which was developed after arduous efforts was not translated into reality and that negotiations on outer space have not yet started. In view of this situation, the Chinese delegation in the First Committee at the current session of the General Assembly proposed draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.3 on outer space. We did this because we wanted to re-emphasize the urgency of this question and to promote progress in this field. At the same time we have always maintained that this question is so important that we have to progress instead of regress on this question on the basis of what we achieved last year. Last year we adopted only one resolution, so there should not be more than one resolution this year. Last year, the resolution had the agreement of the overwhelming majority of States. The resolution this year should win even greater support. Only such a resolution can really have practical meaning. I believe that this is not only the wish of the Chinese delegation but also the wish of the people of the world.

In this spirit, our delegation from the very beginning sought comments from all parties on the proposal of China. When the representatives of Egypt and Sri Lanka, as sponsors of last year's resolution, resubmitted their proposal A/C.1/39/L.37 and consulted with all parties for the purpose of adopting a single resolution as was done last year, the Chinese delegation immediately reacted positively in a most co-operative spirit.

China has always respected and supported the many views of the non-aligned countries. Therefore, in spite of the fact that there are some differences between the proposal of China and that of Egypt and Sri Lanka, we did not insist on our views and both sides quickly reached agreement. We are glad to learn that the representatives of Sri Lanka and Egypt as well as representatives of other countries, after repeated consultations, have also reached agreement. We thank them for their efforts and congratulate them on their achievements.

Having said this, the Chinese delegation would now like to tell you that we do not ask for a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.3, and China has also become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2. Apart from some additions and modifications in the light of the development of the present situation, draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2 is essentially the same as resolution 38/70 adopted at the previous session of the General Assembly. We believe it represents a consensus view. Now that the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to conduct negotiations on a series of disarmament questions, including outer space

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

weapons, we have all the more reason to expect that A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2 will win greater support than last year.

We are now at a crossroads in dealing with the outer space issue. Either we take prompt measures to stop the arms race in outer space so that outer space can be used for peaceful purposes, or we can just sit idly by and watch outer space become an arena for an arms race, threatening mankind with unprecedented disaster. We should make the right choice at this critical juncture.

The CHAIRMAN: As members of the Committee have heard, the delegation of China will not press for a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.3. With this consensus, we have concluded our consideration of and action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.3.

We shall now take up consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation should like to explain the positive vote we are going to cast in connection with operative paragraph 8 of resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2. The request for a separate vote on this paragraph of the draft resolution has not yet been formally moved, as I understand it. But if you have no objection I am quite prepared to explain my delegation's position on this individual point.

The CHAIRMAN: You may proceed.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation would like to explain why it intends to vote in favour of operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2. Of course, we have certain reservations on the request made of the Conference on Disarmament in this paragraph. We do not believe - and we have previously made this clear - that it is up to the General Assembly to make explicit recommendations to the Conference on the way in which it should organize its work, particularly in connection with the establishment of subsidiary bodies.

Nevertheless, in this particular case we felt that the principle of having a subsidiary body was generally acceptable to all members of the Disarmament Conference. Furthermore, we do not regard the phraseology in operative paragraph 8, "with a view to undertaking negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement or agreements", as amounting to a formal proposal for the mandated auxiliary body to be set up, which we hope will happen at the beginning of the next

session. After all, it is up to the Conference itself to negotiate and adopt such a mandate.

In this connection, today's situation is analogous to the one we had last year in connection with General Assembly resolution 38/70, which was adopted with the support of the French delegation. Paragraph 7 contains a formulation similar to that found in operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2. If we had regarded this formulation as a mandate last year, we would undoubtedly have supported a similar recommendation during the consultations which were held in Geneva on the mandate of a subsidiary body which we hope will be set up. To our thinking, the formulation of operative paragraph 8 simply points out an objective. The Conference on Disarmament is called upon to carry out negotiations in the context of a subsidiary body on a particular agenda item, to wit, that which refers to the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The French delegation has already stated its support for this idea in the Conference on Disarmament.

In consultations which will be initiated next year in Geneva, the French Delegation will endeavour, as before, to contribute to having a mandate adopted which is acceptable to one and all.

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

I would recall that last year we supported a draft resolution favouring exploratory talks that would have made it possible for the Conference on Disarmament, through a subsidiary body, to proceed to a further necessary stage in its work. The time will come, and we hope in the very near future, when the Conference on Disarmament will, after examining the many aspects of the problem, be in a position to identify which of those aspects are best dealt with in a multilateral context and will then initiate appropriate negotiations thereon.

Indeed, the particular agenda item before us is of concern to the whole of the international community, and for that reason it should be the subject of multilateral commitments to which all countries would be welcome to subscribe. The 1966 Space Treaty has already set an excellent example for this. It is for that reason that we deem it legitimate and necessary to acknowledge even now that the Conference on Disarmament is authorized to negotiate. It is also obvious that the two major space Powers have particular responsibilities, which is clearly recognized in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2. That is why we attach the greatest importance to operative paragraph 9 of that draft resolution, which urges the two Powers concerned to initiate negotiations immediately.

That is a goal that is recognized to be a matter of urgency, which is not true to the same degree of multilateral negotiations that will, in any event, require very detailed prior preparation, particularly in connection with singling out which questions should be the subjects of which particular negotiations. The French delegation believes that operative paragraphs 8 and 9, taken together, give a balanced and realistic reflection of the responsibilities peculiar to the Powers with the major space capabilities and of those of the Conference on Disarmament, whose rights and authority should be clearly recognized.

Mr. MIGLIORINI (Italy): In response to the appeal of several delegations that we should attempt to consolidate our draft resolutions dealing with the agenda item under consideration into a single draft resolution, I should like to inform the Committee that, taking into account the changes that have been introduced to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.61, on whose behalf I am speaking, will not ask that that draft resolution be put to the vote.

With that decision the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.61 wish to show their spirit of compromise, without, however, forgoing their own approach to the

(Mr. Migliorini, Italy)

problem of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The sponsors wish, above all, to pursue their objectives in a constructive manner and to promote any possible convergence of views likely to facilitate the future work of the Conference on Disarmament on such an important subject.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): I wish to explain in brief why the United States will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2 and will vote against operative paragraph 8. While draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.61 reflects the views of my Government on outer space arms control issues in a satisfactory way, my delegation was more than willing to bend every effort to achieve the objective of a single draft resolution on this agenda item, a draft resolution that could be adopted by consensus.

We regret that such a consensus draft resolution has not been achieved. That it has not been achieved was, we are convinced, not through lack of effort on the part of my delegation or of most other delegations. However, a certain number of delegations maintained that balanced language in operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2, language that could not prejudice the position of any group in the Conference on Disarmament, was unacceptable. Such language, we believe, was contained in operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.61.

Operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.61 avoided intervention in the internal negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament aimed at an acceptable basis for its further work in outer space arms control and disarmament. It avoided would-be instruction to the Conference on Disarmament on the detailed conduct of its affairs and the insistence on taking sides between competing mandates for a Conference on Disarmament subsidiary body.

So be it; however, my delegation must - in sorrow but not anger - register its dissent on operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last statement in explanation of vote before the voting. In the light of the statement just made by the representative of Italy, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.61 will not be put to the vote. In cluster 7, therefore, we have only to deal with draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2. The Committee will now proceed to the voting on that draft resolution.

A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Cameroon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2 was adopted by 114 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.\*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2, as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

---

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



A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, 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, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2, as a whole, was adopted by 127 votes to none, with 1 abstention.\*

---

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

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

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Our Committee has just taken an exceptionally important decision in adopting a draft resolution aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space. It is one of the crucial aspects of alleviating the threat of nuclear war and providing means to halt the arms race and bring about a situation in which the peoples of the world no longer need to fear for their future. It is the issue of issues in international relations.

As is well known, the Soviet Union has made important proposals - in particular, some very recent proposals - for a practical solution. As a result of those efforts, we recently succeeded in bringing about agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to begin new negotiations to reach mutually acceptable agreements on a whole series of questions relating to nuclear weapons and weapons in space. These are entirely new negotiations covering the non-militarization of outer space and strategic and medium-range nuclear weapons. This comprehensive approach is dictated by the need to take urgent and effective measures to prevent the destabilization of the strategic situation and to prevent a new spiral in the arms race. It is an initiative of the Soviet Union demonstrating its policy of principle aimed at ensuring real progress in reducing the threat of nuclear war, ending the arms race and improving the international situation.

Of course, only time will tell whether the United States this time, contrary to what has happened on past occasions, will adopt a realistic position that will allow the negotiations to succeed.

The Soviet Union, faithful to its consistent policy of principle, is prepared to work on all these questions with a view to seeking the most effective solutions, which will allow for progress towards the total prohibition and ultimate destruction of nuclear weapons. This was clearly stated by Konstantin U. Chernenko at a meeting in the Kremlin yesterday with the leader of the Labour Party of the United Kingdom, Mr. Kinnock.

An objective solution to the arms race in space is crucial to solving all the problems of arms limitation and reducing the threat of war. If an arms race were to begin in outer space, not only would it prevent our speaking about a true limitation and reduction of strategic weapons, but it would inevitably act as a

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

catalyst in the arms race in other directions. One cannot fail to see that such a development, if not halted in time, would lead to a marked increase in the threat of nuclear war and create insurmountable obstacles to the peaceful use of space.

Through its initiatives at this session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union wishes to avoid the militarization of space, which is inadmissible, and to prevent the nuclear threat. Outer space must be used exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind.

Our proposal includes the adoption of urgent measures to prevent all militarization of space, to prohibit forever the use of force in outer space and from space towards the earth, as well as from the earth towards objects placed in space.

The exclusion of space from the arms race must be an unshakable norm of the policy of States and an international commitment accepted by all.

The guaranteed prevention of the militarization of space would permit the use of space for peaceful purposes in order to resolve important economic, social and cultural problems now faced by mankind in its development. It will also allow for further development by mankind.

We note with satisfaction that this Soviet initiative has been understood and supported at this session by many delegations, which have taken part in the debate to say that they hope for success in the negotiations aimed at reaching agreement on a bilateral and multilateral basis.

The attempt to prevent an arms race in outer space is reflected in the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries (A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2), which has just been adopted. The resolution also takes account of the position of the Soviet delegation, and we take this opportunity to thank the sponsors, including the representatives of Egypt and Sri Lanka, for their constructive approach. They tried to draw up a text to prevent an arms race in outer space, and the vote on the draft resolution gives convincing proof of the support of the overwhelming majority of Member States for its adoption. The 127 votes in favour of the draft resolution, after a debate on the Soviet initiative and all the proposals intended to prevent the militarization of space, show the will of the international community to ensure that the conquest of space takes place exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind. Effective measures can be taken to resolve this historic question.

Mr. MIGLIORINI (Italy): I am speaking on behalf of the delegations of Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey and the United Kingdom in order to explain why they abstained in the voting on paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2.

The abstention of those delegations in the voting on paragraph 8 does not detract from our general support for the overall spirit of the draft resolution itself; indeed, by voting in favour of it we have demonstrated the great importance which all our delegations attach to the constructive development of ways, both bilateral and multilateral, to prevent an arms race in outer space. We are particularly grateful to the sponsors for the changes introduced in the draft resolution, which allowed us to give it our support. However, we could not vote in favour of operative paragraph 8, which deals with the way in which the Conference on Disarmament should tackle its work regarding the prevention of an arms race in outer space, because its language does not reflect the views of all States represented in that body. We wonder whether it is appropriate for the General Assembly to prejudge the outcome of discussions which are still taking place with encouraging prospects in the Conference on Disarmament. It is, nevertheless, our fervent hope that it will be possible at the beginning of the 1985 session of the Conference on Disarmament to reach agreement on a mandate acceptable to all for an ad hoc committee which would allow, without further delay, substantive consideration of all issues related to this subject.

Mr. ROWE (Australia): Australia voted in favour of the single draft resolution on the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space contained in document A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2. We support fully the concepts and aspirations that are embodied in that draft resolution. In giving it our support, however, I would like to stress clearly, as the head of the Australian delegation in his statement to the First Committee on this subject did, that Australia supports completely all peaceful uses of outer space, but we also totally support other uses of outer space which contribute to the preservation of international peace and security. We would also like to register our satisfaction that the First Committee was again able to agree to a single draft resolution on this important subject. We are even more pleased to see that for the first time no delegation registered a negative vote on the draft resolution as a whole. We regard this as an indication of the commitment of all of the countries in the world to ensuring that outer space will not become an arena for an arms race.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded consideration of and action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2. We still have pending the decision on item 62, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". We shall not have interpretation as from this moment and so we cannot proceed this evening. It is therefore my intention to take up this last question for action at our meeting tomorrow afternoon.

At 10.30 a.m. tomorrow the Committee will take up the item on Antarctica and at 3 p.m. it will take up the item on the Indian Ocean.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.