

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
FORTIETH SESSION
*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE
47th meeting
held on
Friday, 22 November 1985
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 47th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

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

PROGRAMME OF WORK

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DK 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.1/40/PV.47
27 November 1985

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will proceed to take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 12.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): From 19 to 21 November 1985, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, met with the President of the United States, Mr. Ronald Reagan. In a special resolution on the Geneva meeting, the General Assembly expressed the hope that the meeting would give a decisive impetus to current negotiations on the halting of the arms race and on disarmament.

At a press conference held in Geneva on 21 November, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said:

"We found that we seem to share common ground, which can serve as a starting-point for the improvement of Soviet-United States relations, that is an understanding that nuclear war is inadmissible, that a nuclear war should not be waged and that there could be no winner in such a war. That belief has been expressed frequently both on our side and on the United States side."

We have to be realistic in our assessment of the results of the Geneva meeting. As Mikhail Gorbachev stressed,

"It was not possible at this meeting to find solutions to the most important issues relating to the task of halting the arms race and strengthening peace. We continue to have major disagreements on fundamental issues. However, the President and I have agreed that this work of seeking mutually acceptable solutions to these important questions should be earnestly pursued here in Geneva by our representatives."

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The Soviet Union believes that the real significance of the Geneva summit can be demonstrated only by specific, practical action. To that end, both parties must work hard in the spirit of the joint Soviet-United States statement accepted by both sides. For its part, the Soviet Union will make every effort, in co-operation with the United States, to achieve practical solutions to the problems of curbing the arms race, reducing stockpiles of weapons and ensuring that the conditions exist for lasting peace between our peoples, on Earth and in outer space. We say this with full awareness of the responsibility we bear towards our own people, the Soviet people, and other peoples of the world. We should very much like to be able to rely on a similarly responsible approach on the part of the United States Administration.

We firmly believe that it will be possible to halt the arms race and achieve radical reductions in nuclear weapons provided that there is no arms race in outer space. A key issue is whether there is or is not a strike weapon in outer space. The response to that question will determine developments in the world situation for many years to come.

A future of peace and strategic stability will be possible if we can prevent the addition of a mortal threat from outer space to that posed by the missiles already stationed in the earth and the seas. Let us try to picture the world 10 or 20 years hence if various types of strike weapons were to be deployed everywhere above our heads, 100 kilometres up, in the geostationary orbit, aimed at the Earth. The militarization of outer space would also be a heavy psychological burden, creating an atmosphere of general instability and uncertainty. We therefore propose the immediate prohibition of the development, including all scientific research, the testing and the deployment of space strike weapons - in other words, that we do not allow the arms race to spread to outer space.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Nor can we permit the militarization of outer space to block the peaceful exploitation of outer space, which should be a common cause for all States. In this space age, we must attempt to find ways and means of engaging in peaceful co-operation in outer space and of barring the expansion of the arms race to space.

All those important ideas are incorporated in the proposal under the agenda item "International co-operation in the peaceful exploitation of outer space under conditions of its non-militarization" put forward at this session by the Soviet Union, and we are gratified to note that those ideas have met with a very positive response from an overwhelming majority of the participants in the work of the session. Those ideas are duly reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1, which was introduced yesterday. Almost all delegations co-operated in drawing up this text.

In this connection, the Soviet Union will not insist on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.1/Rev.1 being put to a vote. Along with a number of other authoritative draft resolutions adopted at this session, draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1 shows clearly that there is no more urgent or important task today than that of preventing weapons from reaching outer space and cutting off the channels for the further accumulation of increasingly sophisticated nuclear weapons.

Outer space is an ideal area for international co-operation; it is in mankind's best interest that it should be exploited for both scientific and practical purposes. Much has been achieved in a short time: the first artificial satellite, the first man in space, the first man on the moon, the probes which landed on Venus and Mars and the wonderful map of Venus are all merely first steps. The exploitation of limitless space should be the joint undertaking of all States.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

For that purpose, the Soviet Union has proposed the creation of a world space organization to serve as a co-ordinating centre for efforts in this marvellous undertaking on a world-wide basis. The single draft resolution that has been prepared, L.68/Rev.1, contains extremely important ideas, including an appeal to all States - in particular of course those with major space capabilities - to contribute actively to the objective of the peaceful uses of outer space. Such co-operation would ensure the implementation of fundamental scientific research and the launching, for example, of inter-planetary ships to Mars for that purpose. It would make it possible to channel the results of space exploration in such areas as biology, medicine, physical surveys, weather forecasting, studying the climate and the natural environment, and a global system of communications and remote sensing of the earth by satellite, as well as the exploration of the world's oceans. The results of such co-operation could also be the creation - through joint efforts and the use of outer space in the interests of all peoples - of a new space technology, including major orbiting stations and piloted vessels, and subsequently possibly even the industrialization of space surrounding earth.

The Soviet delegation naturally will vote in favour of this single draft resolution L.68/Rev.1, which indicates practical ways and means of preventing an arms race in outer space and specifically sets the task of using outer space for peaceful purposes. The speedy implementation of the recommendations contained in that draft resolution would promote the interests of preserving international peace and security, removing the threat of nuclear war and the development of co-operation and mutual understanding among States and peoples.

(Mr. Migliorini, Italy)

role to play in the consideration of issues relating to the prevention of the arms race in outer space. They will work - and they hope other delegations will work - towards the re-establishment of an ad hoc committee on that specific issue at the beginning of session in 1986 with an adequate mandate allowing the continuation and intensification of substantive work. They believe that it is essential to promote any possible convergence of views likely to facilitate the future work of the Conference on Disarmament on such an important subject.

I wish to conclude by expressing the appreciation of the delegations sponsoring L.22/Rev.1 for the efforts of other delegations in the attempt to achieve consensus. We hope that the same spirit of compromise and the same understanding will allow future progress in the continuing multilateral consideration of this issue.

Mr. TURBANSKI (Poland): Today we end the work of the First Committee on questions of disarmament and, as the fortieth session of the General Assembly draws to a close, everybody in this room has to be aware that the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space is one drawing particular attention, often causing most serious concern for Member States. When we addressed this Committee on 12 November, introducing draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.45, concretizing, as it did, the idea put forward by General Wojciech Jaruzelski in his address to the General Assembly on 27 September, we stated that it was motivated by our serious concern about the real prospect of outer space becoming the arena of military confrontation and by our deep commitment to the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes.

(Mr. Turbanski, Poland)

We also took into account the fact that disarmament studies contribute to the promotion of general awareness of the problems involved in the arms race and disarmament and assist ongoing disarmament negotiations. This position of ours has lost none of its validity and topicality. It is precisely from that perspective that we have been following the debate in the Committee on agenda items 57 and 145. Poland remains firmly committed to making its contribution to efforts aimed at preventing the extension of the arms race into outer space.

In our statement of 12 November we stated that, with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.45, we would be acting in the spirit of genuine co-operation and compromise, guided by our common objective to promote tangible progress on disarmament and arms control.

We have therefore responded in a positive way to the desire of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68 to work towards having a single resolution on the subject of outer space. Let me add that our frequently expressed desire to keep the financial implications of resolutions to a minimum also played a role in our final attitude.

After protracted and intensive negotiations, we all managed to come to an agreement, a common denominator, in the form of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1. We are sure that the implementation of that draft resolution in its entirety would contribute to the overall objective of preserving outer space exclusively for peaceful activities beneficial to all. In particular, we expect that implementation of its paragraph 12, which reflects the gist of our original idea, will make the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) study broaden, deepen and enrich our knowledge of all the issues relating to disarmament in outer space and, what is even more important, of the consequences of extending the arms race into that realm - as would have, for that matter, the expert study that we had originally proposed.

(Mr. Turbanski, Poland)

In conclusion, I wish to announce that the Polish delegation is not asking for a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.45/Rev.1.

I wish to congratulate the delegations which participated in negotiations that produced draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1 - which we shall of course support - and in particular the delegations of Egypt and Sri Lanka for their spirit of accommodation and compromise.

The CHAIRMAN: We have all heard the statements made by the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, Italy and Poland in which, among other things, they indicated that they would not press for a vote on their respective draft resolutions. Therefore, only one draft resolution remains in cluster 12, on which we shall now take action. First, I shall call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): The United States will abstain from the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1 as a whole and will vote against its paragraphs 5 and 9.

While draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.22/Rev.1 reflected my Government's views 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 resolution on this agenda item - a draft resolution that could be adopted by consensus. We regret that such a consensus resolution has not been achieved. That it has not been, we are convinced, was not through lack of effort on the part of my delegation or of most other delegations.

With regard to operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/40.L.68/Rev.1, my delegation most strongly objects to certain wording contained therein. It is

(Mr. Akalovsky, United States)

clear that the paragraph in question has been included to give some recognition to subjects associated with agenda item 145. We see no merit in those proposals, and saw no need for any paragraph in this draft resolution that implied otherwise.

Beyond that, however, the United States believes that it is totally inappropriate for the First Committee to consider the issue of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space; that is the responsibility of the Special Political Committee under agenda item 76. Since the Special Political Committee's consideration of item 76 is based on the consensus procedure, the effect of such action by the First Committee is to denigrate the functions of the Special Political Committee, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and a 25-year tradition in the United Nations of dealing with matters relating to co-operation in peaceful uses according to consensus. For this body to countenance the linking of the question of preventing an arms race in space with the issue of peaceful co-operation in space is fraught with danger. Those who value such peaceful co-operation and the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, we believe, should stand up and speak out against that paragraph.

With reference to operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1, a certain number of delegations maintained that balanced language - language that would not prejudice the position of any group in the Conference on Disarmament - was unacceptable. Such language, we believe, was within reach. I would note in this regard as well that the language of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.22/Rev.1 avoided intervention in the internal consultations and decision-making of the Conference on Disarmament and was consistent with the conclusions set forth in paragraph 56 of the 1985 Final Report of the Conference's Ad Hoc Committee on Outer Space.

(Mr. Akalovsky, United States)

For those reasons, my delegation must record its opposition to paragraphs 5 and 9 and its abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1 as a whole.

Mr. MIGLIORINI (Italy): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the delegations of Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and my own delegation.

Those delegations will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1 because they support its general thrust. Indeed, by following this course of action we implicitly intend to express our faith in the possibility of promoting and realizing a common approach so as to facilitate progress in the multilateral consideration of this important issue.

(Mr. Migliorini, Italy)

As regards paragraph 5, however, we believe that it is inappropriate for this Committee to address the question of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space. That subject falls within the competence of the Special Political Committee. More particularly, paragraph 5 impinges directly upon the functions of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

We have similar objections to the wording in paragraph 9, which addresses in a specific and mandatory manner the organizational aspects of the work of the Conference on Disarmament. We are in favour of maintaining in the Conference on Disarmament an approach which has already permitted the accomplishment of useful work and which can make a further constructive and important contribution to the progress of the multilateral process on this issue.

The delegations on whose behalf I am speaking today welcome the agreement reached in 1985 on the creation of an ad hoc committee to undertake substantive consideration of questions concerning the prevention of an arms race in outer space. In our view, and as recognized by the ad hoc committee, all efforts should be made to ensure that substantive work on this agenda item continues at the next session of the Conference on Disarmament.

For those reasons, the delegations on whose behalf I have the honour of speaking will abstain from the vote on paragraphs 5 and 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1.

Mr. OKELY (Australia): Australia will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1 which, as all delegations will no doubt be aware, is the result of considerable negotiation and compromise. I should like to thank those representatives who have worked so long and so hard to achieve a draft resolution that should attract the widest possible support.

(Mr. Okely, Australia)

Australia will abstain, however, from the separate vote that has been called for on paragraph 5. That paragraph, with its reference to the peaceful uses of outer space, has, in our view, implications which go beyond the issues of international security and disarmament which are the rightful province of this Committee.

Australia plays an active and constructive role in the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, a subsidiary body of the Special Political Committee which takes its decisions by consensus and which considers in some technical detail matters relating to the peaceful uses of and co-operation in outer space. Australia has been concerned for some time at overt attempts to introduce into the outer space Committee elements which relate not to the peaceful uses of outer space but to the military uses of outer space, a matter which, as I have said, properly belongs in this Committee. Conversely, my delegation is concerned to see in paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1 a reference to questions of the peaceful uses of outer space, which are the legitimate concern and responsibility of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

Australia, as an active member of that Committee, will continue to resist the introduction of questions relating to the militarization of outer space into the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, and just as strenuously will resist attempts to introduce consideration of peaceful-uses issues into this Committee.

This is not a question of mere administrative tidiness, although such administrative order is not an issue without significance. Rather, it is a question of substance that is, our determination to see co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space continue to develop, and to see action designed to prevent an arms race in outer space. Those two goals should be pursued, and in the two relevant, but separate, parts of our United Nations system.

Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, because we are convinced that the exploration and use of outer space must be exclusively for peaceful purposes, and in the common interest of all of mankind.

My Government wishes once again to reiterate its concern about the militarization of outer space. That concern is certainly shared by the vast majority of the members of the international community.

The Argentine Republic vigorously opposes not only the deployment of weapons in outer space but also the use of geodesic, communication, meteorological, environmental, military or other satellites for other than purely peaceful purposes.

The Delhi Declaration, adopted and issued at New Delhi on 28 January 1985 by the Heads of State or Government of Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, the United Republic of Tanzania and Argentina clearly reflects our position on this subject. In the words of that Declaration,

"Outer space must be used for the benefit of mankind as a whole, not as a battle-ground of the future. We, therefore, call for the prohibition of the development, testing, production, deployment and use of all space weapons. An arms race in space would be enormously costly, and would have grave destabilizing effects. It would also endanger a number of arms limitation and disarmament agreements." (A/40/114, p. 4)

The 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies, reflects the commitment of its signatories to use space exclusively for peaceful purposes. That Treaty, which unambiguously lays the foundations on which we should base our future action on this subject, must be supplemented. In that connection, paragraph 80 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General

(Mr. Campora, Argentina)

Assembly, reflects the international consensus when it states that in order to prevent an arms race in outer space, further measures should be taken and appropriate international negotiations held in accordance with the spirit of the 1967 Treaty. Thus, we consider that draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1 establishes a general basis for the adoption of relevant measures to prevent an arms race in outer space.

Undoubtedly, our concern - and that, I dare say, of most of the international community - will persist until negotiations to that end are commenced and successfully completed.

For all those reasons, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): Canada wishes to take this opportunity to explain how we intend to vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1. Having reviewed the content of that draft resolution, and having been involved in the negotiations surrounding it, we are convinced that it represents a shared desire by all delegations to promote progress in the consideration of this very important matter. Consequently, we shall vote in favour of this draft resolution, and we should like to commend delegations who worked so hard and diligently to achieve a single draft resolution on this subject.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

While supporting the draft resolution in general, the language in operative 5 causes us some concern. Canada considers that fully adequate institutional machinery for multilateral negotiation of measures to prevent an arms race in outer space already exists in the Conference on Disarmament. Consideration of the establishment of other machinery for that purpose is not only unnecessary but could be prejudicial to the seriousness of efforts currently under way in the Conference on Disarmament to come to grips with the substantive issues involved in this area.

Canada believes that the General Assembly has a responsibility to ensure that its actions do not lead to undesirable effects on either the ongoing discussions on peaceful activities in outer space or the efforts under way in appropriate forums to define effective arms-control measures for outer space.

The maintenance of the present institutional division of labour, whereby the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space is the main United Nations focus for peaceful co-operation and the Conference on Disarmament the forum for consideration of arms-control measures, seems to us the best way of ensuring that these separate issue areas do not become entangled with each other.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from French): Mongolia's position on the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space is well known. We are resolutely opposed to the militarization of outer space and favour the use of space exclusively for peaceful purposes to develop co-operation among States in that area for the well-being of one and all.

We are convinced that one of the most urgent and effective ways of dispelling the growing threat of nuclear war is to prevent an arms race in outer space and to proceed to a drastic reduction in nuclear weapons until they are completely eliminated. We attach considerable importance to the Soviet-American negotiations on the broad range of issues relevant to nuclear and conventional weapons. Those negotiations can make an important contribution. We are pleased that after their

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

summit meeting in Geneva the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, and the President of the United States, Mr. Reagan, agreed to speed up those negotiations in order to fulfil the commitments mentioned in the joint Soviet-American statement issued on 8 January 1985.

At the same time, Mongolia remains convinced of the role the Conference on Disarmament can and should play, as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament and in preventing an arms race in outer space, by initiating practical negotiations to that end. The efforts made in this connection, both bilaterally and multilaterally, should be followed up and aimed at achieving the same objective, namely, the erection of a solid barrier to the possibility of the extension of the arms race to outer space.

As for draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1, it contains a number of extremely important provisions with regard to speeding up bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States and the initiation of multilateral negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament, as well as the development and widening of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space.

In light of my country's fundamental position, and in keeping with the provisions of the draft resolution to which I have referred, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1. The draft resolution has 22 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are: Algeria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe.

(The Chairman)

Separate, recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 5 and 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1. The Committee will vote first on operative paragraph 5.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, 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: United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1 was adopted by 105 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1.

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, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia,

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, 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: United States of America

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

Operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1 was adopted by 118 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution

A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, 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, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/L.68/Rev.1, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 131 votes to none, with one abstention.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the representative of France, who wishes to explain his vote.

Mr. JESSEL (France) (interpretation from French): A moment ago the representative of Italy explained the reasons for the abstentions of a number of delegations on paragraphs 5 and 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.68/Rev.1. For the same reasons, we abstained in the votes on those two paragraphs.

I should now like to explain the reasons why we voted for the text as a whole.

First I wish to state that in our view, as far as outer space is concerned bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union take pride of

(Mr. Jessel, France)

place. Nevertheless they are not exclusive; an appreciable part of these outer-space questions is an appropriate subject for multilateral discussions, and therefore is within the competence of the Conference on Disarmament which, at its 1985 sessions, began considering the subject, in particular through the Ad Hoc Committee set up for that purpose, and did very useful work which is far from completed and which we sincerely hope will continue at its next session.

In fact, taking into account the various difficulties encountered during the establishment of that Committee, it was able to deal with substantive questions for only three weeks. No one could expect the subject to be exhausted in three weeks. That is why we think it essential that work should continue, in similar conditions and hence with a similar mandate, on the work already begun, which needs to be pursued.

On the other hand we consider that the 1967 Treaty on Outer Space, in particular article III, provides a fairly satisfactory legal basis on the question of the peaceful uses of outer space.

Finally, we support the provisions relating to the inquiry that the draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to carry out, as also the study that the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) is to undertake on the subject. In this connection I am in a position to state that the French Government is ready to make a contribution towards the financing of that study amounting to \$30,000.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded our action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68/Rev.1.

We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8 and on the amendment to that draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/40/L.80.

Does any delegation wish to make a statement other than an explanation of vote on this draft resolution?

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like to give the response of the sponsors of draft resolution L.8 - that is, the delegations of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Rwanda, Swaziland, Turkey and my own delegation - to the amendment to paragraph 2 deleting the words "and without preconditions", which was proposed orally the day before yesterday by the representative of Mexico when we were about to vote and which has subsequently been circulated as document L.80.

As I said on Wednesday, this amendment to our draft resolution on the ongoing nuclear and space negotiations in Geneva came as a surprise to us, since the delegations concerned had not in fact approached my delegation beforehand. None the less we have now considered the suggestion with care.

The sponsors of the draft resolution remain doubtful about both the purpose and the desirability of this amendment. If accepted, it would suggest that the Committee thinks that the imposition of preconditions on the progress of these vital negotiations might be desirable. We do not believe that that would be in the interests of any of us or the international community which we collectively represent. I believe that we all have a strong common interest in the success of the bilateral negotiations that are the subject of this draft resolution and that it is important that we should say so.

Nor do we accept that paragraph 2 is in any way contrary to the third preambular paragraph. They deal with different aspects of the problem. It is clear to us that paragraph 2 of L.8 is even-handed in urging the two parties to the negotiations to work unreservedly towards the achievement of the objectives set out in their joint communiqué of last January. The sponsors of L.8 would therefore prefer to maintain their text, which they consider is a fair and constructive one, intact in its entirety.

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

However, the sponsors do not wish to impose this view on the Committee in relation to a draft resolution which is of considerable importance. They would therefore like the Committee as a whole, in a free and open vote, to indicate whether it is in favour of the amendment or whether, having heard the sponsors' explanation, they wish to retain this phrase.

When the Committee has expressed its will in this democratic manner, the sponsors will be entirely content to be guided by its decision. Whichever way it goes, we hope that it may then be possible to adopt the draft resolution as a whole with general support, including that of the proponents of the amendment. This approach would, I believe, be in the spirit of the impressive appeal made in his statement on 20 November by the representative of the Bahamas, Ambassador Hepburn.

We therefore ask that the amendment be put to the vote, and that a vote on the draft resolution should follow as soon as possible in order to resolve the situation.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their positions or votes before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The First Committee is now about to take a decision on draft resolution L.8, on an extremely important issue, the bilateral Soviet-American nuclear and space arms negotiations. The significance of these talks was borne out by the result of the meeting just concluded in Geneva between Mr. Gorbachev and President Reagan.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The joint Soviet-United States statement which was adopted at the conclusion of that meeting states that the sides agreed to accelerate the work at these negotiations, with a view to accomplishing the tasks set out in the Joint United States-Soviet Agreement of 8 January 1985, namely, to prevent an arms race in outer space and to terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and enhance strategic stability.

Moreover, noting the proposals recently tabled by the United States the Soviet Union, they called for early progress, particularly in areas where there is common ground, including appropriate application of the principle of a 50 per cent reduction in the nuclear arms of the two sides, as well as the idea of an interim agreement on intermediate range missiles. The statement further said that during the negotiation of these agreements, effective measures for verification of compliance with obligations assumed would be agreed upon.

The Soviet Union feels that the Soviet-United States negotiations in Geneva were constructive. We shall try to find a solution that will halt the arms race and achieve a radical reduction of nuclear weapons so that subsequently, at some stage in this process, we can really take up the question of completely eliminating nuclear weapons with the participation of the entire world community. "We are firmly convinced that this is possible", said Mr. Gorbachev, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on 21 November at a press conference in Geneva, "if the Soviet Union and the United States are firmly resolved to close the door to the arms race in outer space."

As for draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8, submitted under agenda item 65 (i), we have, I must say quite frankly, some doubts - great doubts - about the genuine desire here to make a constructive contribution to the General Assembly's consideration of the question of nuclear and space arms. To the agreed wording in

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

the draft resolution have been added provisions which are quite obviously in contradiction with historical facts and therefore unacceptable to one of the parties to the negotiations, namely, the Soviet Union. For example, in the second preambular paragraph, it is asserted that on 12 March 1985 bilateral negotiations were resumed - and I repeat, resumed - between the Soviet Union and the United States. Yet, as members of the First Committee are well aware, the agreement reached in November 1984 between the Soviet Union and the United States says something quite different, namely, that they "agreed to enter upon a new round" - and I repeat, "a new round" - "of negotiations with a view to achieving a mutually acceptable agreement on the entire range of issues relating to nuclear and space arms." Nor was anything said about a resumption of negotiations in the joint communiqué of 8 January 1985 between A. A. Gromyko and the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Shultz. I am sure that the delegation of the United Kingdom as well as the other sponsors of this draft resolution are aware of this.

It is clearly no accident that the draft resolution contains a reference to resolutions 38/183 P and 39/148 B, against which a considerable group of States voted, including the Soviet Union. That resolution has absolutely nothing to do with the bilateral negotiations which are being conducted on nuclear and space arms.

Just now in his statement, which I have before me, Ambassador Cromartie stated his dissatisfaction that the delegation of Mexico did not give prior warning to the sponsors about what he intended to say, and particularly about the amendment which is to be voted upon. I should like to inform all members of the First Committee that the Soviet delegation 10 days ago explained its misgivings about these matters in the draft resolution. At the outset it appeared that there had been an oversight, and that the sponsors were to take our comments into account. But this

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

did not happen. Furthermore, the Soviet Union, one of the two parties to the Soviet-United States negotiations, was not even given a reply to its request. And up to now we still have not received a reply, so we will have to vote in the way we do on this text. It will not therefore come as a surprise to anyone that we will not support this text, for not only has a lack of respect been shown to a delegation which is negotiating with the United States in Geneva, but the actual state of affairs has been grossly distorted. We would appeal to other delegations to adopt a similar attitude to this draft.

Mr. JESSEL (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain the vote that the French delegation will cast on the amendment proposed to paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8. The draft resolution in question constitutes, in our view, the wish of the international community addressed to the great Powers which are negotiating bilaterally in Geneva. In this text, the States which do not themselves participate in the negotiations request the two negotiators to make every effort to ensure the success of those negotiations and advise them not to complicate those negotiations unduly, in particular by establishing links with other questions, as the matters to be dealt with are in themselves sufficiently complex. This is what is stated in the passage which suggests that no prior questions be put forward and which also requests the two Powers to deal with each question on its own merits. Why, then, seek to delete this reference? Are we to understand that the authors of the amendment are in favour of prior conditions which might lead to the failure of the negotiations and which, in any event, would complicate them?

It is for this reason that the French delegation will vote against the proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegations wish to explain their positions or votes before we take a decision, we shall now proceed to the vote, first on the amendment contained in document A/C.1/40/L.80. This amendment has three sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico in the First Committee on 19 November 1985. The sponsors are: Argentina, Ecuador and Mexico. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Portugal, Rwanda, Samoa, Spain, Swaziland, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Gabon, Ghana, Jamaica, Mauritania, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan

Draft amendment A/C.1/40/L.80 was adopted by 61 votes to 24, with 23 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8, as amended. This draft resolution has 15 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland at the Committee's 30th meeting on 7 November 1985. Its sponsors are: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Rwanda, Swaziland, Turkey, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8, as amended, was adopted by 71 votes to none, with 51 abstentions.

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

Mr. DHANAPALA (Sri Lanka): At the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, Sri Lanka voted for the two resolutions on bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations as an earnest of our sincere desire to see those negotiations commence and despite our reservations on the more limited approach of one of them.

(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

This year we are convinced that draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60, which my delegation had the privilege of co-sponsoring, is a more comprehensive and balanced text. It has been said that that text sought to score points. I submit that it is a far better thing that we should score points for the peace and development of all humanity than for the interests of military alliances locked in power rivalry and competition.

The essential complementarity and linkage between bilateral and multilateral negotiations on nuclear issues are stressed in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60 but is absent from A/C.1/40/L.8. However, we note with some satisfaction that the sponsors have acknowledged paragraph 114 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

My delegation would like to draw attention to paragraph 121, which has not been mentioned in draft resolution L.8. The security interests of the 157 nations not involved in the bilateral negotiations can be negotiated only by themselves multilaterally.

We are also concerned that after three rounds of these negotiations no perceptible progress has been reported from the bilateral negotiations. We are not convinced, therefore, that the extravagant hopes reflected in the language of draft resolution L.8 are justified. We were unable therefore to support that text.

Mr. MEISZTER (Hungary): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8, entitled "Bilateral nuclear and space arms negotiations".

We abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. We were constrained to do so although we shared the core formulated in many of its operative paragraphs and the contents of its majority of its preambular paragraphs. The reasons that prevented us from casting an affirmative vote are the wording of

(Mr. Meiszter, Hungary)

certain preambular paragraphs which do not correspond to the reality and the recalling of certain previous General Assembly resolutions against which my delegation voted when they were adopted. We are now faced not only with the problem of the content of those resolutions but also by the fact that they have been completely overtaken by developments. Recalling them is completely irrelevant. We find it unfortunate, because otherwise that draft resolution could have conveyed an important message; but it is instead overburdened with those elements.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): On several occasions Yugoslavia has expressed its position regarding bilateral negotiations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on nuclear and space arms. We have supported such negotiations, since through them concrete results on complex issues can be achieved.

My country has been resolutely engaged in all efforts to halt any further stockpiling of nuclear weapons and for the prevention of an arms race in outer space. This time again we wish to repeat that there is no alternative to persistent negotiations in the present nuclear era and that these negotiations must be conducted in the interests of all members of the international community.

For all those reasons we support the basic idea with regard to negotiations between the United States and the USSR contained in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8. However, in view of the fact that that draft resolution expresses the position of only one group of countries and that on that basis it was not able to achieve a consensus in the Committee, my delegation abstained in the vote on it.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): The Committee has just adopted draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8 after amending it as proposed in document A/C.1/40/L.80. The effect of that amendment is to put the First Committee, and ultimately the General Assembly, on record as saying that efforts to advance the objective of nuclear-arms reduction and disarmament may legitimately be impeded by the imposition of pre-conditions. What is particularly striking - and also quite ironic - about that amendment is that its main initiators are precisely those who all these years have been among the most ardent and vocal proponents of absolute priority of negotiations on nuclear disarmament over any other consideration, political or military.

Parenthetically, I also note that two of the three sponsors of the amendment were unable to support the draft resolution, even though their amendment was incorporated in it. For these proponents now to advocate an approach that endorses the notion of pre-conditions to progress towards deep reductions in nuclear weapons and the ultimate objective of their elimination represents a truly stunning reversal. One can only wonder if the initiators, as well as the usual majority that supported them in this move, recognize the implications of their new position, implications which are even more serious if that position is applied selectively.

Be that as it may, it is clear that this development puts an entirely different complexion on the statements and proposals calling for urgent action in the field of nuclear disarmament that the main sponsor of the amendment and a number of its supporters have made in this Committee and elsewhere. The United States cannot but take most careful note of this situation and will be mindful of it in considering and assessing any such statements and proposals in the future.

Mr. JESSEL (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain the affirmative vote the French delegation has just cast in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8 concerning bilateral nuclear and space arms negotiations.

(Mr. Jessel, France)

The French Government has on repeated occasions expressed its satisfaction on the resumption of the negotiations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States. We hope that they will lead to agreements between the two States, which possess by far the largest arsenals in the world, on verifiable and balanced levels of weapons.

It is clear, however, that those bilateral negotiations can deal only with the weapons of the two parties and cannot, directly or indirectly, take into account the nuclear forces of third parties. Nothing in the draft resolution that has just been adopted can be interpreted as giving anyone a mandate to stipulate for third parties.

For its part France, which maintains nuclear forces at the levels strictly necessary to guarantee its own security, has repeatedly stated the conditions under which it would be in a position to take part in multilateral negotiations on the reduction of nuclear weapons. Although the ultimate objective of those bilateral negotiations is total elimination of nuclear weapons, these negotiations, if successful, will, we sincerely hope, represent a step in the right direction but cannot in themselves achieve that goal. As I said, we would then have to go through a multilateral stage that would include all the nuclear Powers.

Finally, let us be realistic. The total elimination of nuclear weapons in and of itself will only come about within the context of general and complete disarmament.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8. We did so for a number of reasons. First, many draft resolutions have been adopted by consensus, and there was a genuine desire to achieve consensus before their adoption. I think that the subject of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8 would also have merited the sponsors'

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

sincere efforts to try to find a consensus solution. That, in fact, was not done.

Secondly, draft resolutions that refer to particular parties always seem to include attempts to accommodate the positions of all countries. That is sometimes difficult, but it is necessary, and those attempts should have been made particularly in the case of a draft resolution that deals with bilateral negotiations. However, here again the sponsors failed, as I understand it, to evince sufficient interest in achieving the kind of text that could have fully reflected the positions of both sides. For those reasons, the draft resolution as a whole is unbalanced in a number of its preambular and operative paragraphs.

At the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth sessions of the General Assembly my delegation voted against the resolutions referred to in the first preambular paragraph of this draft resolution. We note that the second preambular paragraph makes reference to the resumption of the bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States. If we compare that statement with the joint communiqué of the United States Secretary of State and the Foreign Minister of the USSR of 8 January 1985, we immediately note a contradiction. Instead of speaking of a resumption, the communiqué refers to new negotiations to be conducted on nuclear and space weapons, both strategic and intermediate range.

Of course, one of the parties to those negotiations has subsequently placed a different construction on the communiqué and on statements agreed upon during the course of the January meeting. It has not yet been a year since the American side signed the statement that negotiations were to be initiated, and today it voted in favour of a text that refers to a resumption of negotiations. This, too, has added to the lack of balance in the text and its reflection of the position of certain States.

If the first and second preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution had been voted on separately, my delegation would have voted against them.

Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8 on bilateral nuclear and space arms negotiations for two reasons. We did so, first, because the text of the draft resolution expresses optimism about those negotiations which, at least as far as we know, is not confirmed by reality. Secondly, Argentina abstained in the vote because draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8 reflects neither the way in which multilateral mechanisms can participate nor the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament negotiations, mention of which had originally been contemplated in a draft resolution, A/C.1/40/L.60, that has been voted upon and adopted.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8; I shall endeavour to do so without ranging far afield, as I believe some representatives, including the representative of the United States, did. I believe that the latter representative was trying to make an explanation which he should have left to the representative of Mexico.

My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8 for a reason very similar to that given by the representative of Yugoslavia. We believe that, as the result of the voting has clearly and irrefutably shown, this draft resolution is not conducive to agreement between the two negotiating States. For that reason, my delegation considers that, having a few days ago voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60, it would have been not merely superfluous but counterproductive to vote in favour of L.8. Moreover, together with the delegations of Argentina and Ecuador, my delegation put forward the amendment in document A/C.1/40/L.80 in order not to be compelled to request a separate vote on the words whose deletion is suggested in that amendment: "and without pre-conditions". We did not wish to appear to be mutilating the paragraph by a vote against a part of it. We thought it more appropriate, and clearer, to submit a separate amendment, which we did.

My delegation, of course, did not wish in any way to circumscribe its absolute freedom in the voting on the amended text. The amended text is not exactly more acceptable but less unacceptable than the unamended text. That is not to say that the cardinal sin to which I referred earlier has been expunged. This remains an unbalanced draft resolution which does not help the negotiating Powers in any way. That is the true reason why my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8, as opposed to any other interpretation which might have been invented by any other delegation.

Mr. TONWE (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation too wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8. The bilateral negotiations to which the call for action in the draft resolution addressed have already commenced. In the negotiating process, all serious disagreements imply to some extent the existence of pre-conditions. Consequently, to state in a draft resolution that there should be no pre-conditions for negotiations already in progress would be tantamount to saying that any major negotiating position on the substance of the talks imply a pre-condition.

The Nigerian delegation does not believe that the words "and without pre-conditions" would have been helpful in that context. It believes that the question was polemical and, given the importance that our delegation attaches to these negotiations, we decided that the phrase "and without pre-conditions" should be deleted so that we could support the main thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8, which we did.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.62/Rev.1. The draft resolution has 11 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

It is my understanding that the First Committee may wish to adopt this draft resolution without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.62/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those delegations that wish to explain their positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. NAZARRIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.62/Rev.1 and in this connection we should like to make the following statement.

As the Committee is aware, a great deal of speculation has grown up around verification problems, and at the same time the Soviet Union's position has been deliberately distorted. But the truth is that the Soviet Union is open to control by reliable and effective verification. We are no less anxious to bring this about than other States. Proper measures of verification that provide certainty that obligations undertaken have been honoured are an integral part of all our disarmament proposals.

At the same time we have consistently defended the central principle of verification, which is enshrined in a number of universally recognized international documents, including the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, namely the principle of the balanced relationship of disarmament measures and verification measures. Where the verification of national technical measures may not yield the requisite degree of certainty we are quite prepared to supplement it with additional mutually agreed procedures, including, when necessary, international verification. In particular this is true of the problem of prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests.

During the summit meeting with President Reagan in Geneva, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union declared at a press conference:

"If the American side calls a halt to any nuclear testing and if we can arrive at an agreement on that, there will be absolutely no problems on our side with regard to verification, including international verification".

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

There can be no doubt that in every agreement on arms limitation specific verification measures and specific ways and means of carrying these out can be spelled out. However, the essential point of any such agreement is the actual means of limiting and reducing the arms themselves. Verification abstracted from specific steps to limit arms is senseless. Experience in disarmament negotiations, including the Soviet-American negotiations, has indicated that when there is a genuine desire to reach agreement verification does not prove to be an obstacle. The deliberate complication of this issue is obviously intended to disguise the reluctance of certain States to have their hands tied by any kinds of constraints that would impede their pursuit of the further improvement and stepping up of their own armaments.

Mr. DOLEJS (Czechoslovakia): Czechoslovakia's position on the question of verification is well known. We believe that verification is a very important issue, but it must be connected directly to concrete disarmament treaties. In no case can that question take precedence over such treaties, because without concrete results in the field of disarmament there is nothing to be verified. We therefore oppose the attempts to deal with this question of verification separately from disarmament questions or as a pre-condition of negotiations on and the conclusion of disarmament agreements.

On that understanding we associated ourselves with the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.62/Rev.1.

Mr. GONSALVES (India): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1, on compliance, for reasons we explained at that time. Additionally, the representative of Sri Lanka on that occasion very appropriately emphasized the undesirability of adopting superfluous resolutions which divert our attention from the central task of making progress on concrete disarmament measures. Our approach to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.62/Rev.1 is exactly the same.

(Mr. Gonsalves, India)

There can be no doubt whatsoever about the critical importance of effective verification arrangements, acceptable to all parties, to disarmament agreements. However, as the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament stipulated, verification has to be related to individual disarmament agreements. We are accordingly unable to appreciate the need to restate the obvious in a general way without relation to any such specific agreements.

We are also acutely aware that the verification aspect is being overstressed and exploited by certain States to frustrate progress on disarmament negotiations. Separate emphasis on verification could only encourage that negative tendency. Above all else, we have serious doubts as to whether verification issues, which are argued essentially on the basis of the political and military interests of interested States, can be readily resolved by merely inviting the views of all Member States.

Though my delegation did not obstruct the consensus on L.62/Rev.1, we wish to recall our most serious reservations about the separate consideration of the issue of verification becoming an annual exercise requiring the adoption of superfluous resolutions by the General Assembly.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): My delegation would hope that the consensus achieved on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.62/Rev.1 is a sign that agreement can also be achieved on adequate verification provisions to be included in specific disarmament agreements as provided for in paragraph 31 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, which the draft resolution itself reaffirms. I also wish to put it on record that my delegation takes the expression "fair and balanced, acceptable to all parties" which appears in the second preambular paragraph and, in a slightly different form, in operative paragraph 1, to mean that

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

verification measures included in specific agreements in the field of disarmament must be universal and non-discriminatory among the parties to such specific agreements.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): We share the view expressed in the draft resolution the Committee has just adopted that disarmament and arms limitation agreements should provide for adequate measures of verification and that the form and modalities of the verification to be provided for in any specific agreement depend upon and should be determined by the purposes, scope and nature of the agreement.

However, verification measures should not be artificially singled out from the context of the concrete agreements to which they relate. Verification measures should depend on each concrete disarmament agreement.

Despite the reservations we still have in connection with some formulations in the draft resolution, particularly those implying that the issues of verification should be considered as separate institutions, and the issue per se, my delegation has joined in the consensus having in mind the basic thrust of the draft resolution.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to say a few words by way of explanation of the Mexican delegation's participation in the consensus whereby we have just adopted draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.62/Rev.1.

To begin with, one of the fundamental reasons that enabled us to join the consensus was the fact that the draft resolution contains sub-paragraph (b) of the fourth preambular paragraph. This sub-paragraph reflects a provision of the Final Document, since it reads as follows:

"The form and modalities of the verification to be provided for in any specific agreement depend upon and should be determined by the purposes, scope and nature of the agreement".

In other words, no provision can be adopted that covers verification in the abstract.

The second point I should like to make quite clear, also in explanation of our participation in the consensus, is that we do not believe that there is perfect

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

verification. But in most cases we must ask ourselves what is preferable: imperfect verification, or no verification at all. On the strength of the argument that perfect verification is impossible, I think the answer is obvious.

Lastly, our participation in the consensus should not be construed as meaning that we have changed in the slightest our well-known position that verification should not be used as a pretext to prevent the conclusion of agreements on disarmament, which are so much desired by the overwhelming majority of peoples in the world.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no other delegations wishing to explain their votes, we have concluded taking action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.62/Rev.1.

We shall now proceed to take up draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2. I shall first call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of vote.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): I am intervening on this occasion on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2 - Bolivia, Cameroon, Fiji, Greece and Samoa and my own delegation. I am conscious of the hour, so I shall make my remarks as brief as possible. But I want to say straightaway that what I have to say on behalf of the sponsors is designed to assist this Committee's consideration of it.

I mentioned two days ago that we the sponsors were involved in a process of consultation with all groups with regard to the terms of this draft resolution. That process of consultation continued yesterday and resulted in L.70/Rev.2, which is now before the Committee. To put simply the result of that consultation, it would be sufficient to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that there are four changes to the previous draft and the origin of those changes, as already indicated, is within all of the groups that make up this Committee. There were suggestions made to us from members of the non-aligned group, all of which were

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

considered, some of which were accepted; there were suggestions made by members of the socialist group, all of which were considered and some of which were accepted.

In our firm view, the draft resolution has been improved in the second revision and, in particular given that one of its main purposes is to facilitate the implementation of the principles and the priorities that are set forth in the Final Document and, indeed, in the Charter, the amendments we have made have strengthened the draft resolution in that regard. The draft resolution therefore continues to reaffirm the validity of the Final Document; it continues to declare the urgent need for effective measures to ensure the achievement of the principles and priorities of disarmament, as outlined in the Final Document. May I say that those principles and priorities are now, according to the draft resolution, to be supported by the objectives that are enunciated in operative paragraph 1. It is also important for me to point out that the draft resolution specifically includes some language taken from the Lomé Declaration of August 1985 and from subsequent language adopted at the Ministerial Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement in Luanda, which took place a couple of months ago.

I think it is fair to say that one of the important characteristics of this draft resolution is that it takes fully into account, not only the needs and concerns of large countries or countries with the largest military systems, but to a good extent too, the very particular concerns and needs of medium and smaller States. And so, for example, the issue of conventional arms is referred to in the main operative paragraph.

It is the hope of the sponsors that this draft resolution can be adopted with considerable support. Its clear, irreducible purpose, on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, is to reaffirm our commitments made in the Charter, to reaffirm and declare the urgent need for the implementation of the

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

principles and priorities of the Final Document, and to draw attention to a proposition that is encapsulated in its title, a proposition to which we believe all delegations are committed, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security and, for that purpose, the irreducible importance of action in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

I should like to conclude by expressing my delegation's gratitude to all those who have assisted us in what has been a fruitful process of consultation. I am particularly grateful to the sponsors for the role that they have played. If I may, without disrespect to anyone else, I shall mention particularly the constructive role that has been played in these consultations by the delegation of Cameroon for whose efforts we are very grateful.

I now commend this draft resolution to the First Committee.

Mrs. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like in a few words to express my delegation's decisive support of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2, entitled "Disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security", which in our view reflects the reality and urgent need of many countries in various parts of the world. To combat violence in all its forms, to proceed to diagnose its root causes, to struggle against violence, first from the aspect of peace and disarmament, and later by re-educating peoples and discouraging those economic and social phenomena that incite violence - all these are tasks to which the United Nations has devoted much effort during its 40 years of existence.

Consequently, to seek causes and effects justifying violence and war, to condone its cruelty, to argue that some crimes are simply a reaction to others, are merely an excuse for engaging in inadmissible polemics. We must quite clearly and categorically state as a basic principle that violence, whatever the condition or political characteristics of its victims, deserves the condemnation of the entire international community. As soon as we in any way tolerate or condone resort to the threat or use of force, we risk spreading this inhuman and barbaric wave of violence, as is the case in many parts of the world.

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

Hatred is completely senseless, and so is engaging in destruction. The possibility of peacefully solving disputes, sometimes an utopian dream, is simply an expression of civilization and collective maturity.

Understanding this feeling of coexistence represents the truest possible expression of the purposes of the Charter, is its very embodiment, and throws the field wide open to a whole series of creative efforts at reconstruction.

As soon as political fanaticism has been set aside and people are guaranteed the right to live in society without discrimination, ill-treatment or suffering, people will see open to them a whole range of possibilities for economic and social progress and prosperity.

In the United Nations Charter and the draft resolution that we are now considering, it is quite properly reaffirmed that it is possible to commit oneself to practise tolerance and to live together in peace, particularly if we want mankind to survive the present stage of history which is threatening its existence and overshadowing events, so it can move forward to a just and peaceful existence.

We know the tragedy of innocent persons losing their lives and political pretexts and subterfuge that are resorted to in order to prolong given situations. In recent years that tragedy has taken on inhuman proportions and dimensions - indeed, terrifying dimensions. Arms trafficking plays a very shady part in this tragedy, very often owing to the risks of the arms race and the dark future that seems to face us. Nevertheless, we should point out who is responsible. We should indicate how people are to behave. People should not base their future on resort to force but, rather, on the validity of their moral values.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2 meets the wishes of the whole world in disarmament matters. It deserves to be adopted by this Committee, which has resolved to fight vigorously against all those factors that prevent the positive

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

evolution of social progress and to discourage all factors making for social imbalance and disturbing the precarious process of development and peace, wherever they exist.

In the final analysis, acting in accordance with the United Nations Charter is the very essence of this draft. Respect for the norms that link all the partners in the international community is involved. It is a question of behaviour. It is a question of civilization. We must become accustomed to building confidence. We must suppress any instinct that promotes supremacy and regression. We must condemn bad faith in all its forms and manifestations. We must give back to life its full dimensions.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): I should like, first of all, to acknowledge that there were at least two major contacts between my delegation and the sponsors of this draft resolution: the last one occurred yesterday afternoon when I had an opportunity to explain, again, to the sponsors the difficulties that my delegation and several others continued to have with their revised text. It is, of course, the sponsors' right to have incorporated some changes in what is now draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2, but that is the result of the sponsors' decision to include those changes.

I asked to be allowed to speak last Wednesday in this Committee to make some comments on the then existing version of that draft resolution. In the light of the present text of A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2, I must say that those comments still stand. I do not intend to repeat them here or go through the draft resolution extensively.

However, I wish to say that my delegation very sincerely regrets that it was not possible to achieve general agreement on a draft resolution on such an important matter as the relationship between disarmament, peace and international

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

security. It is possible - and I think that is perhaps the reason - that it may be very difficult to improve on the United Nations Charter and the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Those documents still reflect the broader consensus of the international community on such matters, and attempts to improve upon them must be made with the utmost care.

I should like to quote the following from the resolution on the Final Document, adopted that by consensus, which states that all of us are:

"Convinced that disarmament and arms limitation ... are essential for the prevention of the danger of nuclear war and the strengthening of international peace and security" - and I stress that - "and for the ... social advancement of all peoples, thus facilitating the achievement of the new international economic order". (Resolution S-10/2)

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

In paragraph 5 of the Final Document we have said that we are all fully aware of the conviction of our peoples that the question of general and complete disarmament is of utmost importance and that peace, security and economic and social development are indivisible, and we have therefore recognized that the corresponding obligations and responsibilities are universal.

The proponents of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2 have assured this Committee that it is not their intention in any way to detract or deviate from the Final Document, and I take their word for that. They have also stated that in their view their text is fully compatible with the Final Document. I respectfully disagree with them here.

In the opinion of my delegation, and of many other delegations, the main concepts on which the draft resolution is based, as well as its operational thrust as it springs from the operative part, are not only at variance with the Final Document but in several respects diametrically opposed to it.

Again, it is my delegation's opinion that the adoption of this draft resolution would in fact detract from the Final Document.

I have explained before that the disagreement between my delegation and the sponsors is one of approach; it is a conceptual disagreement. Faced with such a disagreement, my delegation would prefer to remain faithful to the entirety of the formulations of the Charter of the United Nations, the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament and other texts that we have adopted by consensus, instead of making selective quotations from them.

We remain attached to the letter but we are also committed to the spirit and significance of such unanimous expressions of our collective will, and in that I am sure there is not, and indeed there cannot be, any disagreement among us.

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

My delegation cannot therefore endorse formulations which, if accepted, would in our opinion result in further detraction from and dilution of the concepts which have been agreed by all and which we deem to be fundamental.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. GONSALVES (India): The purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2 appears to be to collect together a variety of principles and objectives in the general fields of disarmament and international security for adoption by the General Assembly on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. This is certainly a laudable objective. However, in order to serve this purpose effectively the draft resolution should necessarily reflect a carefully negotiated balanced consensus.

So far as disarmament is concerned, the only available international consensus is to be found in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament and in the Declaration relating to the Second Disarmament Decade. Those documents outline programmes of action on the basis of clearly defined priorities. Those programmes, regrettably, remain virtually unimplemented. Nevertheless the identification of those priorities by consensus was a notable achievement of international diplomacy, and it is accordingly essential that that consensus is not tampered with lightly.

We had been assured that the sponsors of L.70/Rev.2 have fully respected that consensus. However, despite the pleadings of delegations, including my own, that the draft resolution should not constitute any erosion or re-writing of the Final Document, to a large extent it still does. As pointed out by the delegation of Brazil, quotations from the Charter and the Final Document have been included on a random and arbitrarily selective basis in such a way as seriously to distort the

(Mr. Gonsalves, India)

existing consensus on disarmament. This is particularly unfortunate in the case of what purports to be a declaration on the solemn occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

The signal achievement of the first special session on disarmament was to shift the focus of the international community from the amorphous dialectical interdependence of disarmament and international security to disarmament per se. In our view L.70/Rev.2 constitutes a disturbing attempt to reverse this important progress made in disarmament concepts.

The non-aligned Foreign Ministers declared in the clearest terms at Luanda that international peace and security can only be assured through general and complete disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, under effective international control. This central emphasis on disarmament, and nuclear disarmament in particular, sacred to the non-aligned and indeed to the international community at large, has been, in our view, seriously blurred by L.70/Rev.2.

Thus paragraph 1 places on the same level such vital issues as the prevention of nuclear war and the cessation of the nuclear arms race and a number of other vastly less important and intangible objectives. I do not propose to take the time of the Committee to point out in what respects L.70/Rev.2 in our view distorts the consensus achieved on the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament. However, for the various reasons I have mentioned, my delegation, regrettably, will not find it possible to support draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2.

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First, we are sympathetic to the motives that prompted the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2 to propose it. It contains a number of

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

constructive ideas concerning the strengthening of international security and disarmament the realization of which would be of some significance at this fortieth commemorative session of the General Assembly.

In this draft resolution, however, there is wording with which we cannot agree. On the other hand, we believe that it fails to contain a number of important ideas that are part and parcel of the overall major problem with which it deals. During the consultations with the sponsors on the draft resolution we put forward a number of amendments but only one of them was taken into account, which we find unsatisfactory.

For the reasons I have just given, the Soviet delegation will abstain when the vote is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2. This draft resolution has six sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are: Australia, Bolivia, Cameroon, Fiji, Greece and Samoa. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2 was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 50 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon the representative of Indonesia, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote.

Mr. WISNOEMOERTI (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2, "Disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security". We note with appreciation the fact that the sponsors made a serious effort to improve the text of the draft resolution. It is regrettable, however, that the improvement made was not sufficient to enable my delegation to support the draft resolution.

The text as it now stands in document A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.2 continues to pose difficulties for my delegation. In particular, the basic approach in operative paragraph 1 will, in our considered view, have the effect of undermining the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Another difficulty my delegation has with the draft resolution concerns the eighth preambular paragraph. Arms limitation and disarmament negotiations and agreements must take account of all the concerns of all countries, large and small, and those of nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States alike, not just those of the participating Governments.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus completed action on the draft resolutions contained in all the various clusters, excepting for one draft resolution in cluster 13, namely, the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. I have been notified that work is still continuing on that draft resolution and, accordingly, the Committee will have to take action on it at a later stage in its proceedings.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: As I mentioned yesterday, beginning on Monday, 25 November, the Committee will proceed to the next phase of its work, namely, general debate on, consideration of, and action on agenda item 70 on the question of Antarctica. I would once again urge delegations to inscribe their names on the list of speakers for that item as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.