

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION
*Official Records**

FIRST COMMITTEE
39th meeting
held on
Monday, 23 November 1981
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 39TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 128 AND 135 (continued)

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

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

81-64230

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/36/PV.39
27 November 1981

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.00 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 128 AND 135 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the first speaker inscribed on the list of speakers for this morning, I should like to call on the Secretary of the Committee who is going to inform the members of the Committee of additional sponsors of draft resolutions.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The following are now sponsors of draft resolutions: A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.1, Mongolia: A/C.1/36/L.7, Barbados and Canada: A/C.1/36/L.15, Zaire: A/C.1/36/L.16, Zaire: A/C.1/36/L.21, Zaire: A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.1, Mauritania: A/C.1/36/L.40, Panama: A/C.1/36/L.42, Panama: A/C.1/36/L.43, Venezuela: and A/C.1/36/L.31, Fiji.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Mexico to introduce some amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): As regards the first amendment, in document A/C.1/36/L.50, where it is suggested that certain references should be made to paragraphs of the Final Document, it seems to us that no matter how strict a criterion is applied in deciding which paragraphs of the Final Document should be referred to expressly, we should include, as we indeed do in our amendment, paragraphs 47 to 50 and paragraphs 56 to 58 and not just paragraphs 57 and 58 which appear in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43. One need only read the additional paragraphs we are proposing to understand their relevance.

I shall read just two of them now. Paragraph 47 says:

"Nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization. It is essential to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of war involving nuclear weapons." [This is something similar to the title of the draft resolution.]

"The ultimate goal in this context is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons." (A/S-10/2, para. 42)

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

As regards the other paragraph that I should like to read, paragraph 56, here too we suggest that a specific reference be made. Paragraph 56 says:

"The most effective guarantee against the danger of nuclear war and the use of nuclear weapons is nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons." (Ibid., para. 56).

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Although the additions that we are proposing would improve the draft resolution, the essential elements of these amendments, both from the practical point of view and from the point of view of principles, are those which appear in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.50, paragraphs 2 and 3. As far as the delegation of Mexico is concerned, from the practical point of view I would say that there are more than a dozen delegations which would be as interested in the question of the prevention of nuclear war, or more so, than the nuclear-weapon countries.

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43 does not give the States to which I have been referring an opportunity to transmit their views to the Secretary-General for distribution.

From the point of view of principles, I would say that the situation is even more serious. There is the possibility of reverting to a situation which existed at the beginning of the United Nations, a situation which, fortunately, has been superseded. Thanks to 30 years of persevering efforts, the situation to which I am referring is no longer tolerated. At the first session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, what we are suggesting in paragraph 2 of A/C.1/36/L.50 was expressly adopted by consensus, namely, the vital interest of all the peoples of the world in the sphere of disarmament. That is why we cannot agree to divide the membership of the United Nations into two categories, those that possess nuclear weapons and, apparently, therefore have a right to express their opinions, as the draft resolution states, and all of the remaining States. We cannot accept that there should be countries in the first rank, so to speak, and others in a second or third category. That is why we suggest that operative paragraph 1 should be modified as proposed in A/C.1/36/L.50 - "Invites all Member States" - but goes on to state "in particular nuclear-weapon States". The remainder of the proposed new paragraph 1 would remain the same as in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43.

It should be clear from all I have said that we have the same objective as that of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43, but that to achieve it we are proposing a different procedure, the one that is normally

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

followed by the United Nations in all such cases. We would hope that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43 will realize that our position is well founded and that they will be inclined to accept the modest amendments that I have just introduced in a revised version of their draft resolution. That would mean that we would not have to vote on them, and in our opinion it would mean that our draft could be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.40. This draft resolution is related to agenda item 52, United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. This draft resolution has 26 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 18 November 1981. The sponsors are the following: Belgium, Bulgaria, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Spain, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia, Viet Nam, Mongolia, Panama, and Bangladesh.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.40 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the United States who has expressed the wish to speak after the adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): The United States would like to explain its vote in joining the consensus in favour of the resolution on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects because we believe that the Convention can serve real

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

humanitarian interests. We want to emphasize once again, however, that formal adherence by States to agreements restricting the use of weapons in armed conflict would be of little purpose if the parties were not at the same time formally committed to taking every appropriate step to ensure compliance with those restrictions after their entry into force. As we have noted on previous occasions, States parties have a variety of actions, which we shall not now again list here, open to them to deal with the situations in which significant doubts might arise as to compliance with this Convention. However, the United States continues to regret that the provisions for the creation of a special consultative committee of experts, which was proposed by a number of States at the Conference, was not adopted. The United States continues to reserve the right to return to this idea at some appropriate time in the future.

We trust that States which become party to this Convention will do all in their power to ensure that its provisions are fully observed. We believe that, if States adhere to the Convention with this determination, it can be an important and useful step in advancing the humanitarian cause of giving the maximum feasible protection to civilian populations in times of armed conflict.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22. This draft resolution is related to agenda item 43, Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons. The draft resolution has 11 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the thirty-second meeting of the First Committee on 17 November. The 11 sponsors are Ecuador, Ireland, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Yugoslavia, Niger, Panama and Bangladesh.

A recorded vote has been requested. A separate vote was requested on operative paragraph 5, which reads:

"Calls upon the States depositaries of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, by virtue of their special responsibilities under those two treaties and as a provisional measure, to bring to a halt without delay all nuclear-test explosions, either through a trilaterally agreed moratorium or through three unilateral moratoria." (A/C.1/36/L.22 , para. 5)

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. MARTIN (New Zealand): The New Zealand delegation has for many years taken an active part in the preparation and sponsorship of draft resolutions calling for the early conclusion of a treaty to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions in all environments for all time.

We wish to reiterate our firm and unequivocal support for the resumption of negotiations and the conclusion of such a treaty at the earliest possible time. That is, indeed, what operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22 calls for - a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Martin, New Zealand)

On the other hand, what operative paragraph 4 (b) calls for is the negotiation by the Committee on Disarmament not of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, but only of a treaty for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests.

It has also long been New Zealand's hope that the nuclear-weapon States would see their way to suspending their testing programmes without waiting for the conclusion of negotiations and entry into force of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We have in the past supported calls for a comprehensive moratorium of this kind -- for example, General Assembly resolution 33/71 C. We would have been willing to do so again this year.

Regrettably, that is not what draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22 proposes. It advocates only a partial moratorium -- a moratorium that does not cover tests by all nuclear-weapon States in all environments and that could be interpreted as condoning the kinds of explosions that are called peaceful, which is a category of explosion that we do not accept embodying a notion to which we cannot subscribe.

For these reasons, New Zealand will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. LENNUYEUX-COMNENE (France) (interpretation from French):

The French delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22. Its position on the question of nuclear tests has repeatedly been set forth. The French Government considers, for its part, that the cessation of tests must be connected with the process of nuclear disarmament itself. We do not think that an agreement on banning them can constitute a preliminary or isolated measure. This agreement would not represent a step forward towards nuclear disarmament. Furthermore, in the light of the number of tests carried out by the two major nuclear Powers, and the technological advances for them which follow from those tests, the cessation of tests would essentially lead to the consecration of the quantitative and qualitative advantages which those Powers have secured.

(Mr. Lennuyeux Commene, France)

With regard to the recommendation expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22 for the establishment of a working group on the prohibition of tests in the Committee on Disarmament, the French delegation would like to recall its position, which it expressed in the Committee on Disarmament. We would have no objection to a consensus on this point, subject to the wording of the mandate of the group.

For the French delegation, the rule of consensus remains fundamental for all decisions in the Committee on Disarmament. That is why we cannot approve the recommendation contained in operative paragraph 4 (a) of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22. We do not think that recourse to the rule of the majority for the establishment of subsidiary bodies in the Committee can in any way contribute to progress in negotiations on the substance.

Mr. TOMA (Samoa): The Samoan delegation is strongly in favour of the cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons. We are accordingly also in favour of measures aimed at achieving wider adherence to existing treaties banning nuclear testing and on nuclear-weapon proliferation.

It is for these reasons that in spite of private reservations on our part, we voted in favour of last year's version of this draft resolution.

At this point, however, we can no longer contain our concern about the implications of aspects of the draft resolution as it is again presented in document A/C.1/36/L.22. In our view, the draft resolution stops short of what would be desirable. In its present form, should it be fully implemented, it would at best bring about universal adherence to existing, very important treaties, and total cessation of explosions by some States.

(Mr. Toma, Samoa)

Viewed in a broader context, however, such results -- laudable as they may be -- are being urged at the expense of, and in a manner that seems to compromise what we believe should be our central aim -- the cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons.

In our view, a serious implication of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22 is that it condones by omission the test explosion of nuclear weapons by some States in environments other than the atmosphere, outer space and under water.

My country is opposed to any explosions of nuclear weapons in any environment. We shall therefore abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): In spite of Japan's well-known position in favour of the early realization of a comprehensive test ban treaty, my delegation, with regret, has been instructed to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22, entitled "Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons".

The first reason for our abstention is that this draft resolution in its operative paragraph 4(a), appears to challenge the basic procedural principle in the Committee on Disarmament - the rule of consensus. My delegation is not in a position to accept the idea of trying to change this basic rule, which is clearly defined in paragraph 120(a) of the Final Document adopted at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and which is also reflected in paragraph 18 of the rules of procedure of the Committee on Disarmament.

The second reason for our abstention is that, while my delegation has always been in favour of all States refraining from all nuclear tests in the period prior to the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty, the language of operative paragraph 5, on which I understand a separate vote is to be taken, is not sufficient in this respect, since it calls upon only three nuclear-weapon States to bring their nuclear test explosions to a halt.

My delegation will therefore abstain from the draft resolution.

Mr. DABO (Guinea) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation will vote in favour of operative paragraph 5, because it is a matter of choosing between the worst and the bad, and we shall simply choose the bad in preference to the worst in this case.

Mr. NOLAN (Australia): Representatives will be aware that Australia has long stressed the urgent need for the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty. We see such an agreement as a necessary further restraint on existing nuclear arsenals and a further major obstacle to the spread of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Nolan, Australia)

It is therefore with regret that the Australian delegation will be forced to abstain on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.22. The Australian delegation cannot accept a resolution which, by calling on some States to agree to a moratorium on nuclear testing, excludes from its call other nuclear-weapon States. Operative paragraph 5, even when coupled with operative paragraph 3, has that effect. The resolution is therefore selective and, in the Australian delegation's view, insufficient.

In addition, operative paragraph 4(b) of the draft resolution calls only for the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and not all nuclear tests. To be truly effective a comprehensive test ban must cover all nuclear test explosions in all environments.

In view of Australia's active stand on comprehensive test ban issues, it was only after considerable deliberation that a decision was taken to abstain on this draft resolution. To vote in favour would have indicated a willingness by Australia to entertain the idea of a ban on nuclear tests applying to only some nuclear-weapon States. We wonder how many States really accept such a selective result.

Mr. MEGALOKONOMOS (Greece): My country is also, like all the countries represented by the speakers who have preceded me, in favour of the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty, which we think should solve many problems if it could be attained. But we must now decide on our position regarding this draft resolution. In our opinion draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22 goes against the principle of consensus, which should prevail in disarmament matters. That is why we much regret that we shall have to abstain on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

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

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, Zambia.

Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22 was adopted by 84 votes to 2, with 38 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, 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, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tomé and Príncipe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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 Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Turkey, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22 was adopted by 103 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions.

* Subsequently the delegation of Congo advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour, the delegation of Israel advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

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

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): My delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22 as a whole, while it abstained on operative paragraph 5. This is because India has consistently supported the urgent conclusion of a treaty for the complete cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons by all States, in all environments, for all time. Pending the conclusion of such a treaty we consider that all nuclear-weapon States should immediately suspend their testing of nuclear weapons. This has been the position of my Government ever since the late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India issued an appeal to nuclear-weapon States to suspend nuclear-weapon testing as early as 1954. My delegation would therefore have wished that the appeal for the suspension of nuclear-weapon testing contained in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22 had been addressed to all nuclear-weapon States without exception and not merely to the parties engaged in trilateral negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Mr. KLINGLER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22, entitled "Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons". I should like to go on record as stating that this abstention does not in any way mean that my Government is in disaccord with the noble aim which the authors of the draft resolution have set themselves. Quite to the contrary, the Federal Republic of Germany whole-heartedly agrees with the principles laid down in paragraph 51 of the Final Document and has been able to support a great many resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly purporting to make progress towards that important objective. However, the draft resolution on hand contains a certain number of formulations which my delegation has found objectionable. There is no useful purpose served, in our opinion, by the deliberate singling out of some nuclear-weapon States in the ninth preambular paragraph and by inflicting a process of intention upon those countries. The implicit accusation in the language of that paragraph is not justified and even from a methodological standpoint my delegation considers it unwise to look for monocausal attributions of guilt in matter as complex as the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests.

(Mr. Klingler, Federal Republic of
Germany)

My delegation has found it equally difficult to subscribe to the interpretation of the consensus rule contained in operative paragraph 4 of the text, even apart from the well-established fact that the Committee on Disarmament -- the body obviously referred to in this paragraph -- is by no stretch of the imagination a subordinate or subservient body of this General Assembly. In the same vein, it is the view of my delegation that the programme of work to be taken in hand by the Committee on Disarmament should be decided upon by the Committee itself in the light of other tasks ascribed to that body and in the light of the consensus potential of the various issues it may have before it.

The Government and the freely elected Parliament of my country are deeply committed to the cause of eliminating the dangers of nuclear war by every means at their disposal. We have never hesitated to remind the nuclear Powers of their undertakings, given in solemn form in United Nations documents and treaties, to agree on a nuclear test-ban treaty. That is why we regret particularly that the language chosen in some parts of the draft resolution has made it impossible for my delegation to vote in its favour.

Mr. JITOKO (Fiji): My delegation has abstained on both operative paragraph 5 and on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22 as a whole, even though we believe in the objective and the framework, although not the mandate, under which such an objective, that is, the complete cessation of all nuclear tests, should be realized. In supporting a similar resolution last year, we had in good faith hoped that future drafts on this item would, in making reference to the Treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests in outer space, in the atmosphere and under water, have also considered and included in the appropriate form the prohibition of nuclear tests in other areas not covered under that Treaty. This, unfortunately, has not been done. It is this somewhat glaring omission which we believe forms an essential part of the call for a comprehensive nuclear test ban and it has left my delegation with no alternative but to abstain on the draft resolution.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The draft resolution we have just adopted is devoted to a question to which the Soviet delegation has always attached and continues to attach particular importance. Bearing in mind that the draft resolution as a whole is aimed at activating efforts to bring about an early solution to the problem of halting nuclear-weapon testing, which our country is, of course, in favour of, the Soviet delegation has voted in favour of the adoption of this draft resolution. Accordingly, in order to bring about the full and complete prohibition of nuclear tests the Soviet Union is ready to use any ways and means in order to attain that goal. Thus it is well known that thanks to the constructive position of the Soviet Union, it was possible to make considerable progress at the trilateral talks on this question the resumption of which as has now become entirely clear, is now being threatened and not through any fault of ours. It is also well known that the Soviet Union from the very beginning supported the proposal to create, within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament, a special working group on the question of prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests. But here again the matter is being blocked by the Western Powers, as is quite rightly pointed out in the draft resolution. Similarly positive has been and remains the attitude of the Soviet Union to the idea of establishing a moratorium on nuclear-weapon tests. At the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union supported resolution 33/71 C, containing an appeal to all Powers which possessed nuclear weapons to refrain from any testing of nuclear weapons. As was pointed out in the proposal of the Soviet Union on certain urgent measures to reduce the danger of war, submitted at the thirty-fifth session, we consider that a decision by all nuclear-weapon States not to carry out nuclear explosions for a certain period of time will do a great deal to facilitate the working out and conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Unfortunately, we are compelled to note that, in the draft resolution adopted, the idea of a moratorium is clearly selective in character, and we drew the attention of the sponsors to that fact during both the thirty-fifth session and the current session. Our views, however, were not taken into account. As a result, the Soviet delegation was compelled to abstain on operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

We also have reservations about certain provisions of operative paragraph 4. As we have repeatedly stated, the solution of questions regarding the organization of the work of the Committee on Disarmament and the application of the rules of procedure of the Committee are the exclusive prerogative of the Committee itself.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7. This draft resolution is related to agenda item 55, "General and complete disarmament: Preventing an arms race in outer space". This draft resolution has 17 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Italy at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 13 November 1981. The sponsors are the following: Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Denmark, Greece, Japan, Norway, Spain, Niger, Uruguay, Barbados and Canada.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. KABIA (Sierra Leone): The delegation of Sierra Leone will support draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7 currently before the Committee. We would like to make certain observations with regard to operative paragraphs 3 and 4.

Paragraph 3 requests the Committee on Disarmament to consider the question of negotiating effective and verifiable agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space. Paragraph 4 requests the Committee on Disarmament to consider as a matter of priority the question of negotiating an effective and verifiable agreement to prohibit anti-satellite systems in outer space.

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

The Sierra Leone delegation is of the opinion that, rather than requesting the Committee on Disarmament to "consider" these two matters, the General Assembly must request the Committee on Disarmament to embark upon serious negotiations on the effective and verifiable agreements aimed at preventing the arms race in outer space, and also to embark upon serious negotiations to obtain effective and verifiable agreements to prohibit anti-satellite systems in outer space.

We know that the Committee on Disarmament has many items on its agenda; some of the items have not yet been completed. We believe that the Committee on Disarmament needs to establish priorities for its programme of work. If the Committee on Disarmament is requested merely to consider the question of negotiating any item, that would mean that some items, such as the one before us now, would be shelved indefinitely. Therefore, since this question of preventing the arms race in outer space is important, my delegation would like to ensure that the Committee on Disarmament is called upon to start negotiations immediately on the items regarding preventing the arms race in outer space.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): As the Swedish Under-Secretary of State, Mrs. Thorsson, emphasized in her statement before this Committee on 26 October 1981, a decisive effort should be made now in order to stop the current tendencies to expand military competition in outer space. That is why the Swedish delegation welcomes the initiatives being taken in that direction at this session. For that reason, we are going to vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.7 and A/C.1/36/L.8. However, my delegation has some reservations which I should like to express.

We think that it is entirely redundant to have two different resolutions on the same subject. We regret that efforts have not been made to amalgamate them into one draft resolution. What is even more regrettable, by adopting the two draft resolutions we would seem to be giving permanence to this situation since both resolutions contain decisions to include in the provisional agenda of the General Assembly next year two items with different titles.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

We would, therefore, appeal to the sponsors of the two draft resolutions to consult before this matter comes up in the plenary Assembly, and to try to agree on the title of a single item on this subject to be included in next year's provisional agenda.

My second remark also covers both draft resolutions. We would have preferred a draft resolution of a more general character that addressed itself to the procedural aspects, that is, how to deal with this important matter in the future. We have no objections to the consideration or to the appeal contained in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7. On the contrary, we wholeheartedly support them. We believe operative paragraph 3, in which the Committee on Disarmament is requested to consider the question of negotiating agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space to be the key element in that draft resolution. We would have preferred a different formulation of paragraph 4, dealing with anti-satellite systems, so as not in any way to prejudge the consideration by the Committee on Disarmament.

My delegation would also like to draw attention to the problems related to space-based anti-ballistic-missile systems. It seems to us that this matter should be subject to negotiation in the context of the arms race in outer space.

Also, as regards draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8, we would have preferred a more general approach to the matter than the one which is reflected in the final operative paragraph containing the decision concerning the title of the item to be included in the provisional agenda of the thirty-seventh session. Such a more general description of the task is contained in paragraph 1: "to prevent the spread of the arms race to outer space". We can accept draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8 on the basis that it provides for further action aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space.

I should like to make it clear that our support for this draft resolution does not imply acceptance of the draft treaty proposed by the Soviet Union and referred to in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8. It is quite obvious that the draft treaty referred to in the last preambular paragraph would not suffice to achieve the purpose of an effective prohibition of the arms race in outer space. On the contrary, we have serious reservations about the proposed draft treaty because of the loopholes it contains, in particular in its articles 1, 3 and 4. Furthermore, it is quite possible that more than one treaty will be necessary; we would therefore have preferred draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8 to be less specific in that respect.

In conclusion, I should like to state that my Government takes great interest in this important issue, and that we intend to contribute actively to the work of preventing the spread of the arms race into outer space.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina)(interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina believes that the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva is the body with competence to negotiate agreements on the limitation of the arms race in outer space and, thus, that all draft resolutions and other initiatives with that aim in view should be referred to that Committee in spite of its very busy schedule.

On that understanding, the delegation of Argentina will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.7 and L.8. We believe that both items should be dealt with by the Committee on Disarmament, which is the competent body. I should like to make it clear that this does not mean that my delegation agrees with all the language in both draft resolutions, or that we accept in advance certain priorities in the consideration of items or certain texts of treaties which have not yet been studied in depth.

On that understanding, the delegation of Argentina will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.7 and L.8.

In conclusion, and for the same reasons put forward a moment ago by the representative of Sweden, I should like to join in his appeal to the sponsors of the draft resolutions to make an effort between now and the time when the items are considered by the General Assembly in plenary meeting to arrive, if possible, at a suitable draft resolution combining both texts and using simpler language than that of either of the present initiatives.

Mr. DUMLEVI (Ghana): With regard to the two draft resolutions, A/C.1/36/L.7 and A/C.1/36/L.8, I think that what we should do, in light of appeal made by the representatives of Sweden and Argentina, is to ask the sponsors of the draft resolutions to react so that the Committee can determine whether they are prepared to accept the appeal which my delegation considers to be a quite reasonable one, before we proceed to take a decision on these two important draft resolutions.

We can perhaps devote some time to this, for as the matter stands now, I think that the Committee on Disarmament is likely to become confused if the Assembly presents it with two resolutions giving it instructions on an identical item from different angles.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): My delegation is going to vote in favour of both draft resolutions. We are very heartened to note that there is a great response to measures for the protection of outer space from the stationing there of nuclear weapons.

I would like to be able to see the same zeal with regard to the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, where there is now insufficient zeal on all sides to have even two resolutions on that item. I wish that we could see the countries so closely connected to the need for a comprehensive test-ban treaty support one single resolution for the conclusion of such a treaty, which is so necessary in the present situation of international security.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to give the following summary of the situation: the representative of Sweden has suggested that the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.7 and L.8 meet before those draft resolutions are considered by the General Assembly in plenary meeting; the representative of Argentina supported that idea. The representative of Ghana has suggested that this might be done right now.

I would like to ask the sponsors of the two draft resolutions to state whether they consider this possible. If we have a clear-cut answer to this, we can either postpone the vote on these two draft resolutions or vote on them right now.

Mr. CIARRAPICO (Italy): We have considered draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8; there are certain points of contact with our draft resolution, A/C.1/36/L.7. At the same time, each has its own identity, and we think that both could be useful. In any case, we will be able to consider the suggestion made this morning before the vote in the General Assembly, but at this time it is not realistic to consider it.

The two draft resolutions have different approaches and are intended for discussion under different items.

I would ask representatives who have spoken this morning to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7. While we shall consider their suggestion before the drafts are taken up in plenary we repeat that we believe that both draft resolutions would be useful for the future work of the Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): As my delegation sees it, the Committee has already embarked on the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7. Basically, we have the same view as that just expressed by the representative of Italy and we are ready to take a decision on that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no other delegation wishing to explain its vote before the voting, we shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7 was adopted by 110 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

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

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7 because it considers that the proposals for preventing an arms race in outer space deserve due attention and support.

We agree with the request in operative paragraph 3 that the Committee on Disarmament should consider, as from the beginning of its session in 1982, the question of negotiating effective and verifiable agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space, taking into account all existing and future proposals designed to meet this objective.

Our vote in favour of the draft resolution does not in any way prejudice our view either in regard to the substance of the problem concerning the prevention of an arms race in outer space or in regard to the sequence of issues to be negotiated in the Committee on Disarmament.

I should like to take this opportunity to state that my delegation, motivated by the same stance and reasons, will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8, concerning the "Conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space".

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7, on the understanding that the consideration of the subject in the Committee on Disarmament would have to be determined in the light of the existing priorities before it. We are also of the view that the scope of any agreement to prevent an arms race in outer space should be determined during the course of the negotiations themselves.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to explain its reasons for abstaining in the vote on the draft resolution sponsored by Italy and other countries, contained in document A/C.1/36/L.7. Of course, on the whole, we support the idea of preventing an arms race in outer space.

However, in the draft resolution on which we have just voted, pride of place is given only to one aspect of the problem of preventing the spread of this race, that is, the prohibition of anti-satellite systems. Thus, in essence, we are moving away from resolving in general the whole problem of preventing an arms race in outer space, which is the main goal of the Soviet proposal put forward for the General Assembly's consideration. The Soviet draft Treaty on the Prohibition of the Stationing of Weapons of Any Kind in Outer Space includes the question of anti-satellite systems but within the context of other measures aimed at achieving this goal.

The Soviet delegation would like to stress that the most important task is now to exclude the possibility of converting outer space into a source of danger of war for States, a danger which would inevitably arise should outer space be filled with various kinds of weapons. It is precisely the solution of this task which is the goal to which, in our view, the efforts of States should be directed.

Furthermore, in the preambular part of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7 the matter is represented in such a way as to suggest that talks are going on between the Soviet Union and the United States on limiting anti-satellite systems. But, as is well known, these talks were broken off by the American side and are not now being carried on, and the prospects of their resumption, for us at least, remain not at all clear.

In conclusion, I should like to express my gratitude to the delegations of a number of countries - Sweden and Argentina, among others - which have expressed some interesting ideas, which, of course, we shall take into account in our further work on this problem.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7 and shall do the same on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8. We should, however, like to make a few brief comments in explanation of our vote.

First, we consider that when the Committee on Disarmament takes up this study it should do so without prejudice to the existing priorities relating to some of its items. In the opinion of my delegation, these priorities for next year are, first, to complete the comprehensive programme of disarmament; secondly, to reach a positive conclusion regarding the creation of a working group on the complete prohibition of nuclear tests; thirdly, to do the same with regard to the item entitled Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament and fourthly, to give the working group on the elimination of chemical weapons a new mandate which would allow it to negotiate that particular convention immediately.

Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.7 and shall vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8. In this connexion, I wish to put on record that our favourable vote stems from Egypt's support for the objective of the draft resolutions rather than their contents.

Egypt's long-standing position on the desire to prevent the spread of the arms race to outer space is well known. In addition, my Government has always maintained that the outer-space Treaty constitutes the conceptual legal framework for evolving a régime that would ensure the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Therefore, we do not consider it advisable to be so specific in connexion with the proposed new international Treaty, as stipulated in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8, nor on the issue of the proposed priority to be accorded to an agreement to prohibit anti-satellite systems, as stipulated in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

Finally, our favourable vote with regard to both draft resolutions should not be interpreted as prejudicing in any way the position of my Government in the future developments in this field as a result of the adoption of the two draft resolutions before us.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8 on the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. This draft resolution has 13 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, on 12 November 1981. The 13 sponsors are: Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam and Angola. The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

I call on the representative of the Netherlands.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): We request that a registered vote be taken.

The CHAIRMAN: Upon the request of the delegation of the Netherlands, we shall proceed to a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, 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, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8 was adopted by 105 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

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

Mr. YANG Hushan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): China has consistently held the view that as the common heritage of mankind outer space should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. All outer space exploration and use should serve the interests of world peace and mankind. We are opposed to any military activities in outer space which might endanger peace and security.

(Mr. Yang Hushan, China)

Like many other countries, China is equally concerned and perturbed by the increasingly intense rivalry between the super-Powers in outer space in the military field. We support any effort which might lead towards the peaceful use of outer space and against its militarization.

In the two draft resolutions adopted by the Committee on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, references have been made to a draft Treaty on the Prohibition of the Stationing of Weapons of Any Kind in Outer Space, to preventing an arms race in outer space and to the prohibition of anti-satellite systems. We have our own views on these two questions of substance, but it is not my intention to comment on them at this point.

In view of the fact that those two draft resolutions are aimed primarily at requesting the Committee on Disarmament to consider and to negotiate these questions, they are basically of a procedural nature and the Chinese delegation voted in favour of them. We merely wished to place on record our explanation of vote.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): Our positive vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8 is a reflexion of our desire to see that outer space does not become another arena for a costly and potentially disastrous arms race. However, as we have already pointed out during the general debate in this Committee, we are convinced that measures to prevent an arms race in outer space should cover not merely the deployment, but also the testing of weapons of any kind in outer space. It is with this clear understanding that we voted for the draft resolution just adopted.

We interpret operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution to imply that the scope of a future treaty to prevent the spread of the arms race to outer space will be determined during the course of the negotiations themselves.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.7 and A/C.1/36/L.8 because we consider that the question of the militarization of outer space requires urgent action by the international community.

This Committee is aware of the suggestion put forward by the Brazilian delegation to the extent that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space be formally seized of the question. We should still like to see that appropriate procedures are adopted so that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space may be kept informed of the status of the consideration of this question by the General Assembly and by the multilateral negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation hopes that that request will be favourably considered on the appropriate occasion by the General Assembly.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): The Albanian delegation did not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8, and we had the same attitude towards draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7.

We do not want to take up too much of the Committee's time in explaining our attitude. We should simply like to recall that we expressed our views on the subject of the arms race with regard to the stationing of weapons in outer space in our statement of 18 November in this Committee. We should like to recall also, as we have already stated, that we cannot go along with the idea of the conclusion of a treaty, as called for in draft

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

resolution A/C.1/36/L.8, in particular a treaty that would have as its basis the draft presented by the Soviet Union.

Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.7 and A/C.1/36/L.8 because basically, despite different approaches, they seem to express the belief that outer space should be used for peaceful purposes, for the benefit of all mankind and not as an arena for the arms race.

We would have preferred had there been only one draft resolution on the subject. The draft resolutions do have a sort of "separate identity", as the representative of Italy has stated. Still, it would be ideal if the sponsors of the two draft resolutions would seek to present a single consolidated draft resolution. A common approach on the part of all members of this Committee would prevent an unnecessary dissipation of effort and blunting of the noble purpose that the two resolutions seek to promote. My delegation is therefore glad that the two sponsoring groups have agreed to get together in order to try to achieve a single such draft resolution before the plenary General Assembly takes up this item.

Mr. DABO (Guinea) (interpretation from French): The adoption of both draft resolutions by basically similar votes, without any opposition, means, in our opinion, that neither of them has its own personality, but they have the same objectives and should be complementary. We hope that this spirit will prevail in the negotiations that will take place in the outer-space Committee.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): The United States fully supports the goal of protecting outer space for peaceful purposes and is committed to avoiding a military confrontation in outer space. For this reason we have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7, which was sponsored by a number of Western countries. We believe that it can form an adequate basis for future consideration of this question in the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation is prepared to participate fully in the discussions in the Committee on Disarmament on the question of the need for outer space arms control measures.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

We have abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8, which was sponsored by Mongolia and others. The purpose of that draft resolution is noble and worthy, but to my delegation it smacks of hypocrisy for the Soviet Union to seek a treaty that would prohibit the stationing of weapons in outer space when in fact it is the only country that has already deployed a weapons system for destroying satellites. The existence of the Soviet ASAT system clearly complicates this entire issue. My delegation is of the view that when the Committee on Disarmament begins its discussions on the question of outer-space arms-control primary emphasis should be placed on the threat posed by the Soviet ASAT system.

Mr. YANGO (Philippines): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8 in the same way that we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7, because it is the firm position of my delegation that outer space should be devoted solely to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind. Any resolution that reinforces this position of my delegation will receive our support.

Mr. OSAH (Nigeria): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.7 and A/C.1/36/L.8 because our delegation was one of those which referred to the growing problem of the militarization of outer space in the Special Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. We believe that activities in outer space should be confined to peaceful uses.

It is the hope of this delegation, however, that the Committee on Disarmament will be able to decide on its priorities, taking into consideration other important disarmament issues now before it. We hope, however, that the militarily significant States on the Committee on Disarmament will co-operate with all other States to ensure the setting up of all mechanisms, including that of working groups on nuclear disarmament. By their so doing, the Committee on Disarmament will be able to discharge its duties effectively and expeditiously on all matters referred to it. We regret, however, that the sponsors of the draft resolutions have not deemed it appropriate at this stage to reconcile their differences in the two draft resolutions, which in our delegation's view have the same objective, that is, to prevent any military activities in outer space.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.8

We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10, which relates to agenda item 53, entitled "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". This draft resolution has 10 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 31st meeting of the First Committee on 16 November. The 10 sponsors are the following: Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Mongolia, Nicaragua, USSR and Congo.

A recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10 has been requested.

I call on the representative of Sweden for an explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): I should like to direct my remarks to both draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.10 and A/C.1/36/L.17, both of which deal with negative security assurances.

My delegation will abstain on both those draft resolutions for the following reasons. The Swedish Government favours in principle the idea of negative security assurances - that is, co-ordinated and binding commitments by the nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States which have explicitly abstained from acquiring such weapons. The responsibility for formulating co-ordinated assurances acceptable to all States must, in the view of my Government, rest primarily with the nuclear-weapon Powers themselves. Such assurances should be made in a legally binding form. They could, for example, be given in the form of a co-ordinated declaration submitted in the Security Council or in the form of a treaty between the nuclear-weapon States.

As to the question of the legal framework for negative security assurances, the two draft resolutions before us seem to favour an international convention whereby nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States would enter into some kind of mutual obligations.

The Swedish Government has on several occasions expressed strong reservations as regards such arrangements. The vast majority of non-nuclear weapon States have already done their share in adhering to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and there is no reason for them to undertake further obligations in this respect.

The reservations of my Government as regards the idea of an international convention in this field are also related to certain fundamental features

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

of my country's policy of neutrality. One of the draft conventions to which reference is made contains positions which seem incompatible with some basic principles of that policy.

The present unilateral declarations made by the nuclear-weapon States have serious limitations and further efforts should therefore be pursued with a view to reaching a solution acceptable to all States. However, as was proposed in the Swedish statement in the general debate of the First Committee on 26 October, the Security Council could, as an interim measure, register the existing negative security assurances in a special resolution.

Although Sweden in principle favours negative security assurances, I wish strongly to underline that they cannot be regarded as substitutes for nuclear disarmament and should in no way divert our efforts from curbing the nuclear-arms race.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic,

Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Swaziland, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Austria, Burma, Greece, Guatemala, India, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Morocco, Niger, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10 was adopted by 93 votes to 16, with 14 abstentions.

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

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10. We should like, however, to make our position clear on a number of questions related to the subject matter of the draft resolution.

(Mr. de Souza E Silva, Brazil)

Brazil has consistently stated that the reference to the non-stationing of nuclear weapons in the territories of States where such weapons do not exist at present should be understood as not legitimizing in any way the presence of such weapons in the territories of States where they do exist. The efforts of the international community should be directed, in our view, to the elimination of nuclear weapons through multilateral negotiations and nuclear disarmament.

Brazil has also called attention to the need for negative security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States not to be approached from the point of view of the security perceptions of the nuclear-weapon States, but rather in the wider context of effective measures towards nuclear disarmament. Otherwise the extension of security guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States would be tantamount to legitimizing the possession of nuclear weapons by those States that already possess them and that continue to engage in vertical proliferation and technological improvement of their nuclear arsenals.

Mr. LEHNE (Austria): As a non-nuclear-weapon State situated between the two military alliance systems of Europe, both of which include nuclear-weapon States, Austria has a natural interest in the question of arrangements to ensure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threats of use of nuclear weapons.

In our view, such measures can to a certain extent alleviate the threat perceived by non-nuclear-weapon States and thus strengthen their commitment to non-proliferation. Austria has therefore welcomed the unilateral declarations issued by the nuclear-weapon States.

Unfortunately, as these undertakings reflect the different strategic doctrines and security perceptions of the nuclear-weapon States, they are burdened with loopholes and limitations. Clearly, only co-ordinated and binding commitments free of conditions and escape

(Mr. Lehne, Austria)

clauses will produce the desired confidence-building effect. We therefore support the efforts undertaken in the Working Group of the Committee on Disarmament to develop on the basis of the unilateral declarations more effective arrangements and regret that those endeavours have so far not yielded any tangible results.

We believe that the lack of progress in the Working Group is largely due to the fact that far too much emphasis is placed on the security concerns of the nuclear-weapon States. If attention were rather to focus on the interests of non-nuclear-weapon States, it would prove easier to reach agreement on a common approach.

The Austrian delegation holds the view that the Committee on Disarmament should continue to concentrate its efforts on the substantive issues rather than on the legal form of the security commitment, but it wishes to reiterate its reservations with regard to the idea of a convention.

(Mr. Lehne, Austria)

The quid pro quo concept of a convention would imply that the non-nuclear-weapon States would have to enter into new obligations. We believe that this cannot be expected of States which have already adhered to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Since the draft resolution in document A/C.1/36/L.10 seems to have prejudged the further course of action in the direction of the eventual conclusion of a convention, my delegation had to abstain.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): Ireland abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10. I should like to stress that my Government wishes to see progress in the important field of security assurances. We should therefore have preferred to be in a position to support the resolution. However, in my Government's view the resolution before us does not take into account the possibility of different approaches to the achievement of international arrangements in this matter or reflect the balance of opinions expressed on this question in the Committee on Disarmament.

Furthermore, the draft resolution clearly favours the idea of an international convention, which would seem to imply further obligations for non-nuclear-weapon States. We have doubts about this approach.

For these reasons, my delegation had regretfully to abstain on this resolution.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): In accordance with our position at recent General Assembly sessions, the delegation of Argentina voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10. However, that does not mean that we completely agree with the language of all the paragraphs of the draft resolution. On previous occasions my delegation has said that it has very serious doubts about the practical value of mere unilateral declarations by the nuclear-weapon countries as a means of strengthening security, and we have doubts about the measures adopted on this basis by the Security Council. Therefore, if there had been a separate vote on the paragraphs accepting this concept, such as the fifteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5, the Argentinian delegation would have abstained.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey): As all delegations in the Committee well know, in past years Turkey has consistently favoured the idea of strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States by appropriate guarantees given to them by States possessing nuclear weapons prior to the achievement of nuclear disarmament. We shall do the same this year by casting a positive vote for resolution A/C.1/36/L.17, submitted by Pakistan on the same subject. Unfortunately, we felt obliged to vote against resolution A/C.1/36/L.10, because the text contains certain elements directly related to the defence posture of the two alliances - for example, the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs, which in our view are alien to the substance of the whole concept of negative security assurances.

Mr. WRIGHT (Niger) (interpretation from French): As you and the Committee have no doubt noticed, Mr. Chairman, the delegation of Niger is not one of those that speak the most frequently in this Committee. The reason is not that we do not want to participate in the work, we have sponsored a number of draft resolutions, but that we do not wish needlessly to slow down the Committee's work.

However, my delegation wishes to state that it of course has very definite views on the draft resolutions. As regards draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10, the first that we have not voted for, the Niger delegation is of course in favour of any measure which would lead to treaties, to irrefutable and irreversible juridical texts, which would offer all possible guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States such as Niger. We fully subscribe to the noble objectives set out in resolution A/C.1/36/L.10, but we regret to say that we did not vote for it because of operative paragraph 5, which seems to us somewhat ambiguous. Merely to call for solemn declarations from the nuclear-weapon States does not seem to us to offer all the necessary guarantees that would be contained in the text of the convention recommended by the Committee on Disarmament, as mentioned in operative paragraph 2. That is why my delegation decided to abstain on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.