

United Nations

**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records\*



COPY:  
DO NOT REMOVE  
FROM ROOM  
L201 (WVRR)

FIRST COMMITTEE  
41st meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 23 November 1982  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 41ST MEETING

COPY:  
FOR REFERENCE  
ONLY - DO NOT  
CIRCULATE

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

UN LIBRARY

DEC 7 1982

UN/SA COLLECTION

\* 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.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/37/PV.41  
3 December 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue its consideration of and action upon draft resolutions under the disarmament items.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): I have the privilege to introduce amendment A/C.1/37/L.66 to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.44, which relates to chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. I am speaking on behalf of the following group of countries: Algeria, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

I shall be very brief in introducing the amendment, since the recommendation contained in it does not need extensive explanations. I should like to point out that the sponsors of the amendment attach great significance to the continuation of efficient negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament aimed at the early completion of the perennial negotiations on a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction. Having in mind the experience gained from the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament so far, the sponsors are convinced that the continuation of negotiations in the Committee within the framework of an ad hoc working group which would be set up by the Committee in the course of its 1983 session, and which would be entrusted with an appropriate mandate, offers the best and most efficient instrument for the early attainment of the set goal: completion of the elaboration of the aforementioned convention.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

That is the very substance of the proposed amendment. It urges the Committee on Disarmament to intensify, as a matter of high priority, during its session in 1983, the elaboration of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction, taking into account all existing proposals and future initiatives, and in particular to re-establish its ad hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons with an appropriate mandate to enable the Committee on Disarmament to achieve agreement at the earliest date.

The sponsors of the amendment believe that their proposal will win the widest support, in view of the fact that it will lead to efficient negotiations on an issue the solution of which is in the interest of us all and that an almost identical formulation of the operative paragraph 3 which they are now sponsoring is already contained in last year's resolution on chemical weapons, which was adopted almost unanimously by the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.13 which, as representatives know, was introduced by Pakistan under agenda item 53, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece,

Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.13 was adopted by 104 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.\*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to explain their vote after the voting.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation has reservations about the reference in operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 of the draft resolution just adopted to a specific modality of negative security assurances which would seem to prejudice the work of the Committee on Disarmament. However, we note that the draft resolution reflects the trend of the work of the Committee on Disarmament's Working Group on Negative Security Assurances, in particular in the reference to a common formula that has figured prominently in discussions in the Working Group. In the hope that efforts in the Committee on Disarmament will be continued in this direction, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted.

---

\*Subsequently the delegations of Costa Rica, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jordan and Yemen advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. C. LIDGARD (Sweden): I should like to direct my remarks to draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.13 and L.29, both of which deal with negative security assurances.

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-ordinating assurances acceptable to all States must, in my Government's view, 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 a co-ordinated declaration submitted in the Security Council or in a treaty between the nuclear-weapon States.

As to the question of the legal framework for negative security assurances, the two draft resolutions to which I have referred seem to favour an international convention whereby nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States would enter into some kind of mutual obligations. The Swedish Government has on several occasions expressed strong reservations about 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.

My Government's reservations regarding the idea of an international convention in this field are also related to certain fundamental features of my country's policy of neutrality. One of the draft conventions to which reference is made contains provisions that seem incompatible with the sound basic principles of that policy. The other draft resolution, however, puts considerably less emphasis on an international convention.

The Swedish delegation has therefore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.13 and will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29.

The present unilateral declarations made by the nuclear-weapon States have serious limitations, and further efforts should therefore be made with a view to reaching a solution acceptable to all States. However, the Security Council could as an interim measure register the existing negative security assurances in a special resolution.

Although Sweden favours negative security assurances in principle, 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: The Committee has now concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.13. We will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.14 under agenda item 46, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". This draft resolution was proposed by Pakistan and introduced at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 10 November 1982.

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

Mr. SARAN (India): Over the past several years now it has become crystal clear that countries of South Asia have no consensus on the setting up of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the area. My country has consistently opposed this proposal and our reasons for doing so have been set forth before this Committee in clear and unambiguous terms. Let me reiterate once again that India rejects the proposal contained in document A/C.1/37/L.14. It is a matter of regret to us that the submission of this proposal in the General Assembly has become an annual and pointless ritual, especially at a time when the countries of South Asia are engaged in a delicate process of weaving a web of beneficial regional co-operation amongst themselves in a number of important fields. The insistence with which this initiative is pursued each year at the General Assembly only serves to add an unnecessarily discordant note to the spirit of harmony that the countries of South Asia are seeking to foster through gradual and painstaking efforts.

India will, as in the past, vote against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.14.

Mr. JAYAKKODY (Sri Lanka): As in previous years, the delegation of Sri Lanka will vote in favour of the resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. This affirmative vote flows from our principled and consistent support for the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various areas of the world, which in our view would contribute to the strengthening of regional and international peace and security. However, it is also our view that a nuclear-weapon-free zone in any particular area of the world would be viable only to the extent that such a zone has the consent and support of all countries in the zone, as well as their co-operation.

(Mr. Jayakkody, Sri Lanka)

It is therefore essential that close consultations take place among all States in the declared zone, taking into account the particular characteristics of the zone so that the conditions for its establishment can be agreed upon.

We understand the concerns of those who feel that a nuclear-weapon-free zone cannot exist in a vacuum and that it requires from the nuclear-weapon States and States in contiguous areas a commitment against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against the States in the zone. We are well aware of the complex questions that must be addressed before a nuclear-weapon-free zone can be established in South Asia and of the need to take account of the concerns of all the States in the zone.

Mr. MUAZZEM ALI (Bangladesh): Bangladesh believes that the establishment of effective nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world would contribute to creating conditions that would further strengthen international peace and security. In this context, Bangladesh supports the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, and we welcome the draft resolution sponsored by Pakistan.

In conformity with our position in past years, the Bangladesh delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution pertaining to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as contained in document A/C.1/37/L.14. While we support this draft resolution, my Government strongly believes that the necessary contacts and consultations must take place between the States of the South Asian region to ensure unanimity on this issue, including such aspects as defining the limits of such a zone and other matters.

At the same time, the Bangladesh delegation also believes that there should be adequate and intensive consultations among all the States of the region to help to promote a position of consensus on this important issue, without which the purpose of establishing such a zone will not be achieved.

Mr. C. LIDGARD (Sweden): The Swedish Government has on many previous occasions stated its position on the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones. A detailed explanation was made in relation to the comprehensive review of nuclear-weapon-free zones which was carried out in 1975 under the auspices of the then Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The views of my Government are contained in document A/31/189. The positive attitude of my Government to this question is further demonstrated by the fact that Sweden is one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.52 on a follow-up of the earlier study on nuclear-weapon-free zones, to which I have just referred.

On this occasion I shall limit my remarks to basic Swedish views on nuclear-weapon-free zones. In the opinion of the Swedish Government, one of the most fundamental prerequisites is that general agreement should exist among all the States concerned. Another is, of course, the non-possession of nuclear weapons by zonal States. The third is the non-development or non-presence of nuclear weapons in the zone and the withdrawal of such weapons as could only be used against targets in the nuclear-weapon-free zone, thus establishing a safety area or security belt adjacent to the zone. A fourth condition is the commitment by the nuclear-weapon Powers not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against targets within the zone.

In explaining its votes on previous draft resolutions on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, the Swedish delegation declared that Sweden would welcome the submission of a draft resolution supported by all the States in that particular region. Unfortunately, the draft resolution submitted this year does not enjoy unanimous regional support.

Although my Government supports in principle the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region in question, the Swedish delegation, for the foregoing reasons, will not vote in any way differently from that in previous years, and it will consequently abstain from voting on the draft resolution. Notwithstanding the fact that the Swedish delegation is unable to vote for the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, we urge the States concerned to continue to explore all avenues to facilitate the attainment of the objectives contained in the draft resolution. Efforts to that end by the countries concerned



(Mr. C. Lidgard, Sweden)

may also have a confidence-building effect and thereby contribute to a lessening of tension in the area. All States should take action to reduce tension in the South Asian region through active disarmament and confidence-building measures and refrain from actions that run counter to these objectives.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.14, entitled, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Bhutan, India

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba,

Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Sao Tome and Principe, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.14 was adopted by 79 votes to 2, with 39 abstentions.\*

---

\* Subsequently the delegations of Costa Rica and Guyana advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

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

Mr. LOEIS (Indonesia): My delegation is convinced of the need for, and therefore supports, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world. The establishment of such zones, we believe, will help to bring about non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and general and complete disarmament.

However the efforts will be effective only if at least all the countries concerned in the region agree to the concept.

With these considerations in mind, the delegation of Indonesia has abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.14.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): The United States voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted by the Committee, namely, A/C.1/37/L.14, calling for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

When we voted for this same resolution last year, I noted that it reflected our continuing support for the concept of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in South Asia and in other appropriate regions of the world. We believe that effective nuclear-weapon-free zones, negotiated and supported by the States of the region, can not only enhance their security, but reinforce non-proliferation goals on a regional basis. The criteria by which the United States judges the effectiveness of any nuclear-weapon-free zone have been elaborated by my delegation at previous sessions of the Committee. However, it may be useful to mention them again briefly.

First, the initiative for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should come from the States in the region concerned. Secondly, all States whose participation is deemed important should participate in the zone. Thirdly, the zone arrangement should provide for adequate verification of compliance with the zone's provisions. Fourthly, the establishment of a zone should not disturb existing security arrangements to the detriment of regional and international security. Fifthly, the zone arrangement should effectively prohibit its parties from developing any nuclear explosive device for whatever

(Mr. Fields, United States)

purpose. Sixthly, the zone arrangement should seek not to impose restrictions on the exercise of rights recognized under international law, in particular the principle of freedom of navigation of the high seas, in international air space and in straits used for international navigation and the right of innocent passage through territorial seas. Lastly, the establishment of a zone should not affect existing rights of parties under international law to grant or deny transit privileges, including port calls and overflights to other States.

While we strongly support this draft resolution, we want to make it clear that our vote is not directed against any particular State in the region. Moreover, it is our firm belief that in the nuclear-weapon-free zone arrangements must effectively preclude the conducting of any nuclear explosions. Moves by any State towards the development of nuclear weapons concerns us all equally.

As we did last year, I should like to take particular note of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution which urges all States in the region to refrain from any conduct contrary to the objective of the draft resolution. The United States decision to vote for the draft resolution is based on our expectation that the sponsors and others supporting it will demonstrate that they also take this provision with the utmost seriousness.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): Having signed and ratified the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, Brazil has taken a keen interest in the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We fully subscribe to the requirements set forth in the Final Document as regards the establishment of such zones, namely, the consensus of the States directly involved and the commitment on the part of nuclear-weapon Powers to respect the status of the free zone and to refrain from interfering in the respective process of negotiation.

Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.14 does not reflect adequately those concerns, and for that reason my delegation abstained in the vote. Moreover, the approach to the general question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones must take into account the need that such establishment does not legitimize in any way the existence of nuclear weapons in the territories

(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

of the nuclear-weapon Powers themselves, and especially their presence in the oceans and airspace all over the world. Such a practice, which is becoming increasingly widespread as technology advances and which amounts to horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons in its geographical dimension, constitutes a flagrant betrayal of the purpose of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation considers that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia or, for that matter, in any other region will contribute to the over-all objectives of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, as well as to the peace and security of the region in question, and we therefore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.14.

My delegation would like, however, to reiterate its view that the establishment of such a zone, if it is to strengthen the security of the region, would require the fulfilment of a number of conditions, among them, for example, that it should be agreed upon by all the countries concerned, including the nuclear-weapon States, and that it is based on the initiatives of the countries in the region.

My delegation also considers it highly advisable for the realization of nuclear-weapon-free zones that all the countries in the region concerned adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and accept full-scope IAEA safeguards.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): Whenever it is possible, the Netherlands will support initiatives that can lead to arms control measures. In this context we support the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones because of the positive contribution they can make to security and to the cause of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

As a West European country, the Netherlands is well aware of the difficulties involved in reducing the role of nuclear weapons once they are introduced into a region. We therefore hope that the major South Asian countries will succeed in preventing the introduction of nuclear arms.

Although the Netherlands Government is well aware that regional arms control measures can be successfully applied only when all the States of a region agree

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

and although our serious concern over certain perplexing developments has not abated, we think that the proposal of Pakistan is a step in the right direction. The Netherlands Government has therefore decided to maintain its traditional vote in favour of this draft resolution. Recent events have given us hope that relations between India and Pakistan are developing in a positive sense. We hope that developments will continue in the same direction and we want our positive vote to be understood also as an expression of the importance we attach to non-proliferation and the peaceful development of South Asia.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

To conclude, I should like once again to express our firm conviction that from a disarmament viewpoint no distinction can be made between nuclear-weapon explosions and so-called peaceful nuclear explosions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has completed its action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.14.

The Committee will now begin its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.17 under agenda item 136 - the relationship between disarmament and development. This draft resolution has 31 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 11 November 1982. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of the sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.17 are Austria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Jamaica, Kenya, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Norway, Pakistan, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and Zaire.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall begin the voting procedure with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.17.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it should be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation will be unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.17, and therefore it cannot be adopted without a vote. I request that this draft resolution should be put to the vote, in connection with the fact that in operative paragraphs 1 and 4 of this draft resolution we find a provision that is not in accordance with the position of the Soviet Union on the question of the relationship between disarmament and development. In particular, in operative paragraph 1, the Secretary-General is requested to take appropriate administrative action in accordance with the recommendations contained in chapter VII of document A/36/356, although, as has been repeatedly stressed by the Soviet delegation, the Soviet Union does not support

all those recommendations; in operative paragraph 4 reference is made to the fact that the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research should undertake an investigation of the modalities of an international disarmament fund for development and this approach to the question also seems unjustified to us at this stage, since we have not yet settled the question of the basis on which we can create such an international fund.

In the course of consultations the Soviet delegation brought to the notice of the sponsors of this draft resolution its views on the various points. However, unfortunately, these points of view were not taken into account and the draft resolution was not amended accordingly. In the circumstances the Soviet delegation will abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.17.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia,



Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.17 was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.\*

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

Mr. SARAN (India): India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.17. However, we regret that the draft resolution that has thus been adopted has opted for an unduly narrow focus in proposing follow-up action on the report of the Secretary-General on the relationship between disarmament and development. A major conclusion of the report was the incompatibility between the continuing arms race on the one hand and progress towards the establishment of a more equitable and just international economic order on the other. The draft resolution which has just been adopted fails to reaffirm this important conclusion.

Furthermore, the resolution focusses attention on the problem of conversion, which is of concern mainly to the major Powers members of military alliances and other militarily significant States, since it is they who have a substantial portion of their industry devoted to the manufacture of armaments. The majority of small developing or non-aligned States in any event are obliged to maintain only the most essential level of defence preparedness in order to safeguard their newly-won independence and territorial integrity. In the event of general and complete disarmament being achieved, the latter would easily be able to reallocate

\* Subsequently the delegations of Costa Rica, Lebanon and the United Arab Emirates advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Saran, India)

and convert their resources from military to civilian purposes. Therefore the problem of conversion is of limited relevance as far as the majority of the countries of the world are concerned. It is not conversion, but rather the reallocation of resources released through the adoption of measures of disarmament to economic and social development, particularly of developing countries, which needs to be the subject of follow-up and implementation.

(Mr. Saran, India)

When that reallocation of resources takes place account must be taken of the fact that over 80 per cent of the world's military expenditure is incurred by five or six militarily significant States. The proposed investigation concerning the setting up of an international disarmament fund must also take account of that undeniable reality. Those same militarily significant States bear the major responsibility in the creation of the fund.

It is also our contention that the question of the reallocation of resources from military purposes to economic and social development, particularly of developing countries, is essentially a question of political will on the part of the major Powers. This essential fact should not be obscured by a misguided attempt to set in motion an elaborate or institutionalized follow-up action in the area of the relationship between disarmament and development at this stage, particularly when not a single measure of real disarmament has been adopted in recent years.

Mr. BUNTIG (German Democratic Republic): The German Democratic Republic attaches great importance to practical measures of disarmament and the use of the funds thus released for the economic and social development of States, including the developing countries. It has acted accordingly, inter alia by actively participating in the preparation of the study on the relationship between disarmament and development, contained in document A/36/356. The draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.17 contains some elements based on conclusions of that study, with which the German Democratic Republic agrees.

In our view, however, some important conclusions are missing -- above all, the most significant one, contained in paragraph 391 of the study, which says:

"the world can either continue to pursue the arms race with characteristic vigour or move consciously and with deliberate speed toward a more stable and balanced social and economic development". (A/36/356, para. 391)

Of the individual paragraphs of the draft resolution, I wish to refer only to operative paragraph 4, which provides for the establishment of a disarmament fund. We believe that it should be made clear in this context that the measures involved are to ensure that resources released as a result of practical disarmament steps should be used for development purposes. It is well known that the socialist

(Mr. Buntig, German Democratic Republic)

countries, as early as 1973, put forward a concrete proposal to this end. The German Democratic Republic regards such an approach as a genuine stimulant to disarmament.

We drew the attention of the sponsors to the considerations that we had in mind. Regrettably, they were not able to take them into account. Consequently, my delegation had to abstain from voting.

Mr. ABDELWAHAB (Sudan): At a time when the survival of mankind is threatened by the ever-escalating arms race and growing military expenditure, which constitute a heavy burden for the economies of all nations, real and effective disarmament measures to halt and reverse this race is in the interests of mankind.

In 1978, during the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, the international community scored a point when it stressed the strong relationship between expenditure on armaments and economic and social development, and called for the release of real resources currently used for military purposes for economic and social development. To achieve that, the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of qualified governmental experts, was asked to initiate an expert study on the relationship between disarmament and development. Paragraph 95 of the Final Document of the tenth special session stipulated that the study should be made in the context of how disarmament could contribute to the establishment of the New International Economic Order. It also said that the study should be forward-looking and policy-oriented and place special emphasis on both the desirability of a reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes and the substantive feasibility of such a reallocation. The principal aim of the study was, as the Final Document indicated, to produce results that could effectively guide the formulation of practical measures to reallocate those resources at the local, national, regional and international levels.

(Mr. Abdelwahab, Sudan)

The study which was carried out under that mandate, and under the chairmanship of Mrs. Inga Thorsson of Sweden, is, of course, an integral part of the continuing efforts of the international community to accelerate the development of all nations - in particular, the developing countries - and to establish the New International Economic Order.

We note with satisfaction that the group of experts made several worthwhile recommendations. Of particular interest to my delegation are the following. First, the group unanimously recommends that Governments urgently undertake studies to identify and to publicize the benefits that would be derived from the reallocation of military resources in a balanced and verifiable manner, to address economic and social problems at the national level and to contribute towards reducing the gap in income that currently divides the industrialized nations from the developing world and establishing a New International Economic Order. Secondly, the group recommends that Governments create the necessary prerequisites, including preparation and, where appropriate, planning, to facilitate the conversion of resources freed by disarmament measures to civilian purposes, especially to meet economic and social needs, in particular in the developing countries.

My delegation has just voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.17, although we believe that it does not fully reflect the spirit of the report of the group of experts. It also does not reflect the emphasis that the recommendations placed on the need to reallocate resources released through disarmament measures to the economic and social development of the developing countries. We take it that the draft resolution represents the first attempt to address the interrelationship between disarmament and development, and that in future a more comprehensive decision will be taken by the General Assembly.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): In voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.17, my delegation would like to reaffirm our deep and abiding commitment to the goals of disarmament and development. With this in mind my country supported the United Nations group of experts studying the question of disarmament and development in deed as well as in principle. A United States expert participated in the group, and my Government contributed \$175,000 to finance supporting research - the second largest contribution.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

We believe that there is much in the study that deserves commendation. We, along with other nations, have also expressed reservations about some aspects of the study. We continue to hold these reservations.

Before I address some of these concerns, it might be worth while to focus on a historical perspective on the interrelation between disarmament and development.

In 1945 the United States emerged from the ravages of the most destructive war in human history as the only undamaged industrial Power in the world. Recalling those years, President Reagan told the General Assembly on 17 June this year at its second special session devoted to disarmament:

"Our military supremacy was unquestioned. We had harnessed the atom and had the ability to unleash its destructive force anywhere in the world. In short, we could have achieved world domination, but that was contrary to the character of our people.

"Instead, we wrote a new chapter in the history of mankind. We used our power and wealth to rebuild the war-ravaged economies of the world, both East and West, including those nations which had been our enemies." (A/S-12/PV.16, p. 3)

Despite its unparalleled and unchallenged military might, the United States sought no territories, it occupied no countries, it built no walls to lock people in. Instead, my country began the most massive disarming of its armed forces and military arsenal the world had ever witnessed. In 1946 the United States brought to the United Nations a proposal known as the Baruch Plan to control nuclear weapons and nuclear energy by an international authority. The Soviet Union unfortunately rejected this plan.

At the same time, we voluntarily proposed to the devastated countries of Europe an innovative programme of economic assistance known as the Marshall Plan.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

Of course, the United States did not extend its hand merely as a gesture of one-sided altruism. We realized that such considered development assistance was - and is - mutually beneficial. One need merely look at the post-war development of the strong and vibrant economies of Western Europe and Japan and compare them with the economies of the countries which were unable to participate in the Marshall Plan to judge the relative merits of United States and Soviet development assistance policies.

Since the end of the Second World War, much of mankind - not only Europe - has been preoccupied with the urgent challenge of economic development. There have been some remarkable gains in much of the developing world in a relatively short period. Over the past 30 years, the economies of developing countries have grown faster than the economies of industrial nations have grown during a comparable stage of development; life expectancy and adult literacy have risen dramatically. Much has been accomplished, but much more certainly needs to be done.

The Government and the people of the United States are proud of the contributions that we have made to development assistance. Many other nations in this hall can also be justifiably proud of their records in this field.

President Reagan reaffirmed the American commitment to continue this path at the economic summit at Cancun last year. We have provided \$57 billion to the developing nations in the last decade - \$43 billion in development assistance and \$14 billion in contributions to the multilateral development banks. Each year the United States provides more food assistance to the developing nations than all other nations combined. Last year, we extended almost twice as much official development assistance as any other nation.

Even more significant is the United States contribution in trade. We absorb about one half of all the manufactured goods that developing countries outside the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries export to the industrialized world, even though our market is only one third of the total industrialized world market.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

We recognize that continuing American support for rapid social and economic development is both a moral imperative and a political necessity.

The nature and scope of American and other Western programmes are manifest. We welcome frank and open discussion of these programmes, as well as future programmes, as our President stated at Cancun. Unfortunately, the Soviet Union chose not to be present at that international gathering in Mexico. Certainly we should not be surprised. Despite its oft-professed sympathy for the plight of developing nations, the Soviet Union has refused to submit detailed data on its assistance programme or its military expenditures.

The extent of the unprecedented Soviet arms build-up should by now be clear to all present. I shall not dwell on these sad statistics.

However, the corollary of the massive Soviet build-up - an almost total lack of any commitment economically to assist most of the developing world - is just as sad and equally lamentable. Last year in the First Committee we pointed out that the Soviet Union gave little more than one tenth of 1 per cent of its gross national product to economic disbursements to developing nations. Of that aid, about 80 per cent went to its communist allies. In 1981 Soviet economic aid to the third world, excluding aid to the nations of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, totalled an estimated \$700 million gross. In terms of trade, only about 10 to 15 per cent of Soviet exports go to non-communist developing countries and about half of those exports consist of military sales. In contrast, the United States purchases over 50 per cent of the industrial exports of the developing nations. In 1981 the United States, according to official development assistance figures, distributed \$5.8 billion in aid, or nearly nine times the Soviet amount last year.

Soviet statements in the past have implicitly acknowledged Moscow's poor record. But the Soviet Union has refused to acknowledge any responsibility for improving the conditions of the developing world.

However, in June this year, at the second regular session of the Economic and Social Council, the Soviet Union felt compelled at least to acknowledge the call of the world community, which was reaffirmed recently



(Mr. Fields, United States)

at the Manila session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, for it to report on its development assistance programme. In characteristically vague terms, the Soviet Mission to the United Nations stated that net Soviet economic assistance actually disbursed to developing countries during the 1976-1980 period totalled 30 billion roubles - equivalent to roughly \$43 billion - and that its average share of Soviet gross national product was roughly 1 per cent during this period. Of course, the best estimates place gross Soviet aid at a fraction of the claimed amount. The secretariat of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, for example, has independently estimated Soviet aid disbursements during the claimed period at some \$5.6 billion net, or nearly one eighth of the Soviet claim. Of this amount, over 90 per cent was directed to Afghanistan, Cuba and Viet Nam. Moreover, this aid in roubles can be spent only on Soviet products and, for this reason, much of the Soviet aid offered is not actually disbursed. In fact, net Soviet aid transfers to non-communist developing countries have been negative for the past few years.

Insecurity and conflict are the great enemies of development; yet, chronic resource-devouring insecurity and prolonged, enervating conflict prevails throughout much of the developing world today. Our deliberations will not bring about an end to insecurity and conflict in the developing world, but, by calling attention to the activities of those who seek to profit from the suffering of others, we can ensure that these activities will not be ignored and will not remain cost free.

We believe that there is much in the study on disarmament and development which deserves commendation, as I said. The study recognizes that progress on disarmament and the consequent release of resources for economic progress to a good degree depends on the international security situation. It recommends that the major Powers prepare assessments of the economic costs of their military preparations, so as to inform their publics. It recommends that there be disclosure of more information about military activities and standardized reporting to the United Nations of national military expenditures. We wholeheartedly agree with this conclusion that excessive secrecy contributes to the arms race.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

We must note, however, that we are not in total agreement with some aspects of the study, as well as this year's draft resolution. As we noted last year, we are disappointed that the report does not adequately reflect consensus. For example, the United States delegation, as well as some others, opposed the direct link between disarmament and development. We doubt, for instance, whether there can be an institutional link between the reallocation and conversion of resources, through disarmament measures, from military to civilian purposes. We also have doubts about the necessity of any further study of the idea of an international disarmament fund for development. Moreover, we believe that other factors, such as legitimate security concerns and the role of international trade, must play a major role in the discussion of disarmament and development questions.

Finally, despite the enormous economic and security problems facing us, we cannot, and must not, despair. As our President said in Cancun, we remain committed in deed, as in principle, to maintaining the co-operative spirit in which practical solutions of the interrelated problems of disarmament and development can move forward.

Mr. KLINGLER (Federal Republic of Germany): The Federal Republic of Germany has from the very outset supported the United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament and development. It was represented on the group of experts which elaborated the study and made its contribution to the work of the group in a constructive spirit. The input which my country was able to channel into this study corresponds to the relevance of the subject.

In a world which has to concentrate its efforts on surmounting famine and misery the financial sacrifice for armaments in its present global dimension is a challenge to the political intellect and moral convictions of all States. The report makes clear that real progress can be achieved only on the basis of reliable facts. My country will continue to support all efforts of the United Nations aimed at closing the information gaps which still exist, both in the military realm and in the area of States' contributions for development assistance. In our view, the report itself could have contributed more clearly to closing that gap.

This critical remark is only one of several which could be made on the contents of the report. For instance, conversion of defence industries to civilian production is an important problem. Open-market economies are already quite familiar with the question of how to adjust to changing demands. They adjust constantly in a flexible manner. In order to clarify further the relevant issues, however, we do consider it useful to encourage studies on conversion in specific industrial sectors. Such studies should be carried out by non-governmental organizations, academic institutions, freely-established organizations of employees or employers and by competent international agencies, such as the International Labour Organisation, on their own initiative.

On the question of a disarmament fund, we believe that should eventual in-depth examination prove that such a fund is desirable it should be established within existing United Nations institutions. Any additional organization for the purpose aimed at by a possible disarmament fund seems unnecessary.

(Mr. Klingler, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

Concerning the issue of the relationship between disarmament and development in general, we, of course, endorse the view that resources released through disarmament could be used for development assistance. However, as long as disarmament has not yielded substantial results one has to be careful not to link disarmament too closely to development, otherwise lack of progress in the former field could all too easily become an excuse for lack of effort in the latter. For the time being it appears preferable to concentrate on existing development targets without taking into account resources which would eventually be released by disarmament. It was with that understanding that my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. MUÑOZ HOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): This is a subject about which one could talk for at least 15 minutes, but my delegation will not refer to all the many cogent reasons why Cuba could not be represented at the Cancun Conference.

Let me just say that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.17 is the only one under item 136 of our agenda on the relationship between disarmament and development. We voted in favour of this draft resolution because we must keep this subject pending. We must nevertheless realize that the draft resolution is eminently selective and mentions only a few paragraphs of the report of the group of experts, leaving aside others which are precisely those in which the developing countries are most interested.

Regarding the proposed disarmament fund for development, referred to in the draft resolution, we should like to say once again that this fund would be effective if it were the result of authentic disarmament measures.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee's action on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.17 is now completed.

(The Chairman)

The Committee will now take up the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.29, under agenda item 52: "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 nine sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 38th meeting of the First Committee on 19 November 1982. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.29 are the following: Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Mongolia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution. I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. AL-RUBAIDY (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): First I should like to state for the record that my delegation, inspired by its clear-cut position in supporting disarmament, especially those aspects concerning the security of the third-world countries, goes along with the general thrust and main objective which the draft resolution seeks to realize but we wish to express an opinion on the third preambular paragraph, concerning the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. The wording of that paragraph is in such general terms as to presuppose one narrow formula, which cannot embrace all regions of the world with their different characteristics. That means ignoring an objective reality, namely, the circumstances and special conditions of every region of the world, each of which has its own characteristics which make it difficult to apply one formula to all.

(Mr. Al-Rubaidy, Iraq)

This subject is of great concern to my country as it relates to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East. That is a matter which is brought up in a draft resolution which is to be presented before this Committee. The Middle East, characterized by its complex conditions because of the nuclear armament of Israel and Israel's policy of aggression against the Arab world, makes it incumbent to emphasize the necessity that Israel sign the non-proliferation Treaty and subject its nuclear installations to the inspection of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and to refrain from its well-known aggressive and expansionist policy.

Because of the special circumstances of our region and the developments in it, my delegation would like to place on record its reservations on that particular paragraph.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): The delegation of the Netherlands will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29. It will do so for two reasons. First, we have reservations with respect to the feasibility and desirability of incorporating negative nuclear security assurances in a convention, whereas draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29 emphasizes such a course.

Secondly, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29 is intended to prescribe the result of the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament, where it places the merits of declarations by all States concerning the non-first-use of nuclear weapons in the context of negative security assurances - in the seventeenth through the nineteenth preambular paragraphs - and where it dictates that the contents of an intermediate step be based on the principle of non-stationing.

My delegation, like a few of the sponsors of this draft, fails to see what then is left to the negotiations they want the Committee on Disarmament to engage in if, as they strongly suggest, they have already decided on the outcome of such negotiations and seek to prejudge the views of others.

Since we have an adequate draft resolution on the same subject-matter - draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.13, of course, now adopted by this Committee - the Netherlands strongly recommends against the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29 and shall vote accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN: The voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29 will now begin.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

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



Abstaining: Austria, Burma, Guatemala, India, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Lebanon, Malawi, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Sweden, Uruguay, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29 was adopted by 84 votes to 17, with 19 abstentions.

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

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): Having cast an affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29, my delegation would like to make its position clear on a number of questions related to the subject-matter of the draft resolution.

My delegation stands by the statement of the Group of 21 issued in the Committee on Disarmament, according to which it is up to the nuclear-weapon Powers to re-examine their attitudes on security assurances in order that progress may be achieved on this question. Conditions such as those related to the non-stationing of nuclear weapons in territories where they do not exist at present should not be interpreted as legitimizing in any way the presence of such weapons where they already exist.

Moreover, the nuclear-weapon States have been taking advantage of technological progress to promote the geographical proliferation of nuclear weapons in the oceans and in the airspace, thus increasing the insecurity of non-nuclear-weapon States and of the world at large.

In the view of my delegation, the question of security assurances should not be approached from the narrow point of view of the security perceptions of the nuclear-weapon Powers but, rather, in the wider context of effective measures of nuclear disarmament. Otherwise it would be tantamount to a legitimization of the possession of such weapons by the present nuclear-weapon Powers and a ratification of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in which those Powers are actively engaged, both in its vertical aspect and in its horizontal aspect, taken in a geographical dimension.

Mr. HIMANTEN (Finland): The delegation of Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29. We also did so earlier today on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.13. Both of those draft resolutions deal with the question of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

From the point of view of non-nuclear-weapon States, the question of security assurances being given to them against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is a most legitimate concern. Finland has welcomed the unilateral assurances given by the nuclear-weapon States as expressions of political commitment; they contribute to the further consideration of the question, but they obviously fall short of the goal of effective international arrangements.

Recent developments in the field of nuclear-weapon technology have given a new dimension to that question. Finland believes that all approaches to achieving arrangements for the non-use assurances should continue to be explored, including the further development of unilateral declarations, as well as multilateral agreements. All interested Governments should be involved in the process and have an opportunity to express their particular security concerns.

In this connection, we regret that new elements were introduced into the preambular part of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29 which, in our opinion, do not contribute to the main thrust of the draft.

In view of the basic considerations I have just outlined, my delegation supported both draft resolutions: A/C.1/37/L.13 and L.29.

Mr. CLEISSNER (Austria): The Austrian delegation continues to attach considerable importance to the question of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of nuclear weapons. Such measures, if they are binding and are free of conditions and escape clauses, can, to a certain extent, alleviate the threat perceived by non-nuclear-weapon States and strengthen their commitment to non-proliferation.

(Mr. Cleissner, Austria)

We therefore believe that the Committee on Disarmament should continue its work on this issue and concentrate its efforts on the search for a common approach acceptable to all. The Austrian delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.13, which in general corresponds to our position.

We have abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29 because it appears to prejudge the future course of action on this matter in the direction of the eventual conclusion of a convention. Austria continues to have reservations concerning this approach.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): Last year in explaining our votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.10 and L.17, which later became resolutions 36/94 and 36/95, respectively, we said that, in a spirit of strong commitment to the idea of advancement of security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States provided by the nuclear-weapon States, we had voted in favour of A/C.1/36/L.17 in all sincerity and that we had felt obliged to vote against L.10 simply because the text then contained certain elements directly related to the defence postures of the two major military alliances which, in our view, were alien to the substance of the whole concept of negative security assurances.

This year we find those elements of last year's draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10 intact in the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29. We have therefore voted against that draft and for draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.13, submitted by Pakistan.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina)(interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29 in line with the attitude adopted in previous years with regard to draft resolutions that were very similar, if not identical.

On previous occasions the Argentine delegation had placed on record during the vote that it had reservations about some of the ideas contained in the draft resolutions that were being considered. We would also like to point out here that my delegation maintains these reservations and wishes to reaffirm them as given in its explanations of vote at previous sessions.

Having said that, my delegation would like to state that we also supported the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.13 which was voted on a few minutes ago. In this context, we should like to point out that we have growing doubts about the advisability of this Committee continuing to adopt two draft resolutions on the same subject which in their general outlines are similar, although of course there are some differences. My delegation believes that the time has come to make a new and serious effort to see if it is possible to combine these draft resolutions, and in the future we hope it will be possible for this Committee to adopt, if not by consensus, at least by a broad majority, a single resolution on a subject as important as negative security guarantees.

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

I should therefore like to point out that in future sessions of the General Assembly the Argentine delegation will take a position on this subject in the light of efforts made to bring about a combination of both draft resolutions, and we shall then decide whether it is advisable to support only one of them.

Mr. TANAKA (Japan): In draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29 some new preambular paragraphs have been added to those of last year's resolution on the same subject. I should like to point out that my Government has different views on these new paragraphs. My delegation also has reservations about the reference in operative paragraphs 2, 4 and 5 to a particular procedure of negative security assurances, since it will prejudge the work of the Committee on Disarmament on this matter. For those reasons, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): Ireland abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29. I should like to stress that my Government wishes to see progress in the important field of security assurances. Ireland would therefore have preferred to be in a position to support that draft resolution. However, in my Government's view it does not take into account the possibility of different approaches to the achievement of international arrangements in this matter. Furthermore, the draft resolution clearly favours the idea of an international convention, which would seem to imply further obligations for non-nuclear-weapon States. It is our view that States which have already acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or to the Treaty of Tlatelolco should not be required to enter into such further obligations. Therefore we have doubts about the approach adopted in this draft resolution. For those reasons my delegation had regretfully to abstain in the vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has completed its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.29.

We shall now pass on to the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1 under agenda item 42, entitled "Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons". This draft resolution has 12 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 38th meeting on 19 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the names of the sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors are Bangladesh, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ireland, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

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

Mr. de SOUZE E SILVA (Brazil): The importance that Brazil attaches to the urgent achievement of a treaty banning all nuclear-weapon tests for all time is well known to the General Assembly. My delegation has repeatedly called on the nuclear-weapon Powers to co-operate fully with the Committee on Disarmament in carrying out its responsibility in this regard. The commitment undertaken by those Powers in the solemn declarations of the United Nations and in binding international obligations should be strictly respected. We believe that operative paragraph 5 adequately reflects the grave concerns caused by recent attitudes which do not conform to the letter or spirit of the partial test-ban Treaty. Brazil hopes that the support of the international community for this resolution for which my delegation will vote will be instrumental in securing the full participation and co-operation of the nuclear-weapon Powers in the Committee on Disarmament on the negotiation of a treaty to prohibit the further testing of nuclear weapons.

Mr. THIELICKE (German Democratic Republic): Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1, entitled, "Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons", is aimed at the speedy conclusion of a comprehensive test ban. It is a measure to which my country attaches the highest priority and urgency. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic will therefore vote in favour of this draft.

In so doing, we are guided by the following considerations. First, the draft proceeds from the correct premise that the existing means of verification are sufficient to ensure compliance with the comprehensive test ban and that there are no valid reasons for delaying the conclusion of a corresponding treaty by stressing a so-called verification question.

Secondly, the draft resolution urges the Committee on Disarmament to embark on real negotiations and provide its ad hoc working group on a nuclear test ban with a corresponding negotiating mandate. A continuation of the work of the group under its present limited mandate may give rise to the danger

(Mr. Thielicke, German  
Democratic Republic)

of a deadlock in its work through general academic discussion on verification and therefore the objective - a complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests - will be lost sight of.

Thirdly, the draft stresses the special responsibility of the three depositaries of the partial test ban Treaty and the Non-Proliferation Treaty. By submitting its basic provisions of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests to the current session of the United Nations General Assembly, the Soviet Union again complied with this responsibility. The other nuclear-weapon States are called upon to follow this example.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1 provides for a moratorium on the nuclear-weapon test explosions of the three States mentioned previously. That would be a first step. It can only become fully effective if the remaining nuclear-weapon States were to join in such a measure.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1. That is consistent with the known position of the French Government on nuclear tests. The French Government considers that a test ban should be part of an effective nuclear disarmament process, as set out in paragraph 51 of the 1978 Final Document. It should not be a prerequisite for carrying out this process.

As the French Government has frequently said, it cannot join in measures to reduce nuclear weapons unless the two principal nuclear Powers have created, because of the scope for reductions in their own arsenals, conditions making it possible for France in turn to enter into commitments on limiting its nuclear means. In the absence of these conditions, France is not in a position to take part in the work that has been undertaken to prepare a test-ban treaty. France could not sign such a treaty.

A few moments ago, the French delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.6 because it contained an appeal to all the nuclear Powers for a moratorium on tests. The French Government could not agree to that moratorium, for the same reasons that prevent it from concluding an agreement on their prohibition.



(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

In addition, because of the number of tests carried out by the two principal nuclear Powers and because of the resulting nuclear advantages they enjoy, a moratorium on tests would have the primary effect of consolidating the qualitative and quantitative advantages that these two Powers have gained for themselves.

Finally, the French delegation cannot join in the recommendations contained in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1. It considers that the consensus rule prescribed in the Final Document is fundamental to all decisions of the Committee on Disarmament. It does not believe that a return to the majority rule for the creation of subsidiary bodies of the Committee and for the definition of their mandate can contribute in any way to progress in substantive negotiations.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1, entitled "Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru,

Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda,  
 Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,  
 Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan,  
 Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago,  
 Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic,  
 Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab  
 Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic  
 of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen,  
 Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

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

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1 was adopted by 104 votes to 2,  
 with 19 abstentions.\*

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

Mr. SARAN (India): India voted in favour of the draft resolution  
 contained in document A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1. However, it has been our  
 consistent position that the appeal for the suspension of nuclear-weapon  
 tests should be addressed to all nuclear-weapon States without exception,  
 and not merely to the original parties to the partial test ban Treaty of  
 1963.

In explaining our vote on the draft resolution that has  
 just been adopted, I should also like to recall our consistent position  
 on the question of a nuclear-test ban, which has already been clarified  
 in our explanation of vote after the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.6,  
 which was adopted this morning.

---

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

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First of all I should like to announce that I do not propose to follow the bad example of the delegation of the United States, whose representative a few moments ago used his statement in explanation of vote to set forth views on questions that are unrelated to the draft resolution adopted. And to what have we had to listen during that so-called speech? Nostalgic memories and all kinds of statements about the prosperity of the West and repetitive statements about the Soviet "build-up". This Soviet "build-up" has moreover become a kind of sauce or seasoning for all the dishes served up here by the representative of the United States. Let us say something else: if I were a primary school teacher, that statement, that distortion of the facts, that tiresome repetition of false theses, that speech that was out of order or beside the point - as we might say in school - and that out of place self-tribute would have earned a poor grade and I would have asked the student to prepare himself better for the next lesson.

And now I should like to turn to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1. The Soviet delegation supported this draft resolution on the cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons, presented by Mexico and a number of other countries, because the Soviet Union believes that this draft will have the effect of intensifying the efforts of States to resolve a problem that has awaited solution long enough, that is, the immediate cessation of and a ban on all nuclear-test explosions. In the text adopted there appear a number of important and useful provisions which the Soviet Union fully supports. This text says that the conclusion of an appropriate treaty is a matter of the primary importance and a vital element for the success of efforts to limit the nuclear-arms race and to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and also represents a contribution to nuclear disarmament.

The Committee on Disarmament plans to continue multilateral negotiations to prepare a draft treaty. In our opinion, the authors of the draft in the most legitimate manner raise the question of verification of compliance with the test ban, recalling the words of the Secretary-General that all the technical and scientific aspects of the problem have been so fully explored that only a political decision is now necessary to achieve final agreement.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Now, when attempts are made to camouflage, with talk about verification, the absence of the necessary political will to ban test explosions of nuclear weapons - as evidenced by today's vote and the two red lights that we see on the voting board - this reminder is more appropriate than ever before. The views of the sponsors of the draft on the question of a nuclear-test ban are very close to those of the Soviet Union. As regards the moratorium on nuclear tests, we might say that we have no objections in principle to the provision of the draft resolution, that a moratorium on nuclear tests should be declared in the first place, by the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom alone. However, it is obvious that this must be a first step towards a complete cessation of tests. That is why the Soviet Union starts from the idea that an act of this kind, a trilateral moratorium, should be linked to a specific time table, the possible extension of which would depend on the conduct of the other nuclear Powers. This is how we interpret the contents of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1.

We should like also to note that we support the appeal contained in operative paragraph 4 which is in line with the provisions of the seventh preambular paragraph, namely, that the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom should strictly respect the obligations assumed under the Moscow Treaty of 1963 to seek

"to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time" and "to continue negotiations to this end".

As is known, the Soviet Union is in favour of an immediate cessation of and a ban on nuclear tests. The Soviet Union is in favour of renewing and continuing, until positive results are achieved, the trilateral negotiations on the subject, and of beginning real multilateral negotiations to prepare a treaty in the Committee on Disarmament.

In conclusion, I take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the delegations of nearly 100 countries which supported draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.6.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Very briefly I should like to say that my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1 because, first of all, it calls for the beginning of concrete negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament to ban nuclear tests starting in 1983 and because it does not accept the dilatory tactics which some have tried to introduce in these negotiations regarding the technical aspects of verification. The reports of the Groups of Experts have already said that such attempts are no longer relevant.

Let me say this about the moratorium to which operative paragraph 6 refers. My delegation believes that this moratorium will be effective only if all nuclear-weapon States join in.

Finally, I should like to state for the record that the favourable vote that my delegation cast regarding draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1 cannot be taken to mean that my country has changed its attitude regarding our accession to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and under Water.

Mr. MEGALOKONOMOS (Greece): The delegation of Greece abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1, entitled "Cessation of all text explosions of nuclear weapons", despite the fact that this draft resolution contains many positive aspects.

(Mr. Megalokonomos, Greece)

We took this position because it appeared to my delegation that it contained several unbalanced elements concerning the doctrines and intentions of the nuclear-weapon States, as for example the element of verification. What is more, we think that operative paragraph 5 (a) introduces an idea which we think could undermine the consensus rule in the Committee on Disarmament. In our opinion this could create a precedent and whatever the inconveniences of the consensus, this precedent could endanger a rule which, although uncomfortable, does not cease to be indispensable if we want to have any real and frank progress in the disarmament process.

Mr. BEESLEY (Canada): I wish to address briefly the manner in which the question of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban has been dealt with in this Committee and to make some comments on the draft resolutions before us.

There are of course three draft resolutions on a comprehensive test ban in this Committee: A/C.1/37/L.6, the draft resolution submitted by the USSR; A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1, sponsored by a group of neutral, non-aligned countries and Ireland; and A/C.1/37/L.40, a draft resolution submitted by a number of States including Canada.

Last week I referred to the problem of the proliferation of proposals on certain subjects and we have here a classic example. The realization of a verifiable, multilateral comprehensive test-ban treaty to end all nuclear testing in all environments for all time is a fundamental Canadian objective. It is integral to the strategy of suffocation; our determination to achieve a comprehensive test-ban treaty has been reaffirmed at the two special sessions on disarmament and is being pursued in the Committee on Disarmament.

The comprehensive test ban has ranked high on the United Nations agenda for more than a quarter of a century, a reflection of both its importance and its complexity. Yet despite the concern that this Committee as a whole clearly shares over a comprehensive test ban, there has been a falling off of the will to achieve consensus. Consequently there are before this Committee three draft resolutions. In some places these draft resolutions are mutually reinforcing; in many instances they are not. The consequence is that the United Nations will not be giving this year a clear signal from the world community as a whole on this vital matter. Competing draft resolutions on the same subject are of course all the more cause for regret given the critical nature in this case of what is at stake.

(Mr. Beesley, Canada)

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.40, which lists Canada as a sponsor, sought in our view the highest common denominator of agreement. That that agreement was not completed is a measure of the issues which divide this Committee as well of the lack of political will to achieve consensus.

We abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.6 because it contained a number of troubling elements. The useful language from the latest trilateral comprehensive test-ban report has been reinterpreted in a way not shared by all. At the same time draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.6 does not come to grips with the critical area of verification, agreement on which is essential for any effective comprehensive test-ban treaty. Finally, its reference to a test-ban moratorium ruled out the possibility of full agreement in this Committee.

On the draft resolution now under discussion we abstained. Many in this Committee consider that the issue of verification and compliance is an impediment to the conclusion of a test-ban treaty and indeed so it is. We should, however, seek to remove this impediment by reaching agreement on this fundamental matter, not by ignoring it. Surely it is in our collective interest that the work begun in the Committee on Disarmament last year in the working group on a comprehensive test ban to seek to resolve those issues should be continued. There is no doubt that a debate, whether here or in Geneva, on the mandate of the working group on a comprehensive test ban would not be fruitful and indeed a call for a moratorium, if issued in a vacuum, is unlikely to produce the results we all seek.

Mr. TANAKA (Japan): In spite of Japan's well-known position in favour of the early achievement of a comprehensive test ban, my delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1, entitled cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons, for the following reasons.

First, this draft resolution, in its operative paragraph 5 (a), challenges the basic procedural principle in the Committee on Disarmament, namely, the consensus rule. 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 by the first special session of disarmament and which is reflected in paragraph 18 of the Committee's rules of procedure.

The second reason for our abstention is that while my delegation has been in favour of all States refraining from all nuclear tests in the period prior to the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban, the language of paragraph 6 is not sufficient in this respect, since it calls upon only three nuclear-weapon States to bring to a halt their nuclear tests.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now completed its action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1.

The Committee will now turn its attention to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.43, under agenda item 47, prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. This draft resolution has 26 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic at the 36th meeting of the First Committee, on 18 November 1982. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.43 are; Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Niger, Poland, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam and Yemen.



The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.43.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.43 was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 26 abstentions.

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

Mr. TAVARES NUNES (Portugal) (interpretation from French): My delegation abstained last year, for reasons which it explained at the time, when the General Assembly voted on what became resolution 36/89 on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.43 presented the same problems as those which prompted my country to abstain in the past. In particular, I refer to the absence of any reference to the problems of verification, the draft resolution's comprehensive nature and the ambiguity of the concept of weapons of mass destruction. Consequently, my delegation was compelled to abstain once again.

Mr. MICHAELSEN (Denmark): On behalf of the Ten member States of the European Community, I should like to make the following comments on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.43, entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons".

As in previous years, the Ten abstained on the draft resolution, and we still hold the view that the approach presented in it is not realistic. The Ten hold the opinion, on which there should be no disagreement within the Committee, that there is a need to prohibit any and all new weapons of mass destruction which can be identified as such. The point at issue is simply the choice of means in seeking most efficiently to pursue that objective. Like many other States in the Committee, the Ten believe that new weapons of mass destruction and their technologies can be effectively and permanently prohibited only if they are subject to concrete, verifiable controls. In the view of the Ten, this fundamental consideration has not received adequate emphasis in the draft resolution, where special importance is given to a single blanket prohibition on the development and manufacture of new weapons of mass destruction.

In our view, a comprehensive agreement, as referred to in operative paragraph 1, could not adequately distinguish between peaceful research - that is, without any military implications - and areas of research which could eventually be given military applications.

(Mr. Michaelsen, Denmark)

In addition, it is not clear how a blanket agreement could be verified - in particular, in view of the need which would arise for international supervision of civil research activities. Clearly, those engaged in peaceful academic or industrial research could expect their efforts not to be hampered. Since it is generally agreed that a comprehensive prohibition would not be verifiable, it follows that it would not contribute to strengthening confidence and certainty in this area.

While not believing in the approach offered in draft resolution L.43, the Ten fully recognize the continued need for international discussions with a view to identifying potentially dangerous developments in science and technology so that early necessary control can be introduced. In this context the Ten note with satisfaction the continuing efforts in the Committee on Disarmament towards the prohibition of radiological weapons.

Mr. SARAN (India): India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.43, in line with its consistent support for efforts towards the prohibition of the development of new weapons of mass destruction. However, our affirmative vote should not be construed as an endorsement of the proposed setting up of an ad hoc group of governmental experts under the aegis of the Committee on Disarmament. It is our view that it is up to the Committee itself to decide on the best means to deal with this question.

We also have reservations about the interim measure in operative paragraph 3, since we are convinced that the Committee on Disarmament, as a multilateral negotiating body, should negotiate practically and mutually binding measures on this item. We should avoid being sidetracked into interim steps of dubious value.

Mr. TANAKA (Japan): My delegation repeats its view that it is not appropriate for the Committee on Disarmament, as requested in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.43, to negotiate with a view to preparing a draft comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, because the scope of such an agreement, including the weapons that it would encompass, is far from clear, and it would present difficulties in, for example, ensuring effective verification.

(Mr. Tanaka, Japan)

Furthermore, in my delegation's view, the approach in operative paragraph 3, which calls upon the States permanent members of the Security Council as well as upon other militarily significant States to make declarations, identical in substance, concerning their refusal to create new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, seems to be unrealistic, for the reasons that I have just mentioned.

We still consider it more appropriate at this stage to keep the question under review in the Committee on Disarmament, so that negotiations can be started whenever specific new weapons of mass destruction which can be identified come into the picture.

In view of those considerations, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution L.43.

Mr. C. LIDGARD (Sweden): Sweden is deeply convinced of the importance of preventing at an early stage the use of scientific and technological achievements for the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. My Government is therefore strongly in favour of taking effective steps to ensure that new major scientific discoveries are used solely for peaceful purposes.

However, the Swedish delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.43, and I wish now to explain the reasons.

With respect to operative paragraph 1, I wish to recall the doubts that Sweden has expressed on numerous occasions about the idea of a general prohibition in this field. My delegation notes with satisfaction that the draft resolution requests the Committee on Disarmament to prepare specific agreements on particular types of new weapons of mass destruction. Sweden will continue to support all efforts to reach specific agreements on individual types of new weapons of mass destruction that may be identified, and not least to exert every effort to find practical solutions concerning the disarmament aspects of scientific and technological advances in the military field.

(Mr. C. Lidgard, Sweden)

The Swedish Government considers the problems related to the military exploitation of advances in science and technology so important and serious that it has taken the initiative to draft a resolution - draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.62 - proposing a United Nations study on military research and development. In my Government's view, the most constructive approach to this problem is to start with an in-depth investigation of its many implications, in order to have a factual basis for further measures in this field.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus completed our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.43.

The Committee will now turn its attention to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.47, under agenda item 50 (f), entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session", on "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war". It has four sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 37th meeting of the Committee on 19 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee, who will read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The list of sponsors is as follows: Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Romania and Viet Nam.

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

Mr. KOMIVES (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.47 on non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war, which was introduced by the delegation of the German Democratic Republic. My delegation will do so because it considers it important and very timely. There is no more important and urgent task before us than the elimination of the danger of nuclear war. The solemn declaration made by the Soviet Union, and reiterated by China during the second special session on disarmament, concerning the non-first use of nuclear weapons have been extremely important steps in this direction. It is quite obvious that similar solemn declarations by other nuclear-weapon States which have not yet done so would complement these actions and constitute a serious contribution to the elimination of the danger of nuclear war.

My delegation fully supports the appeal contained in operative paragraph 2 requesting those nuclear-weapon States to consider making similar declarations with respect to not being the first to use nuclear weapons.

Mr. BOLD (Mongolia): The paramount importance of the problem addressed in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.47, on which the Committee is now going to take action, prompted the Mongolian delegation to ask to speak before it is put to the vote.

It is my delegation's considered view that the most effective guarantee against the danger of nuclear war and the use of nuclear weapons is nuclear disarmament and complete elimination of nuclear weapons. However, the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, in bearing in mind that this ultimate goal is not yet within reach, stipulates that all States should actively participate in efforts to bring about conditions in international affairs among States in which a code of peaceful conduct of nations in international affairs could be agreed upon precluding the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. In this context the obligations of nuclear-weapon States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons would, in our view, greatly enhance confidence among States and create the necessary conditions for the adoption of practical measures in the field of nuclear disarmament.

Proceeding from this premise, the Mongolian delegation attaches great importance to the historic obligation undertaken by the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Similarly, we appreciate the commitment assumed by another nuclear-weapon State. We consider that these declarations offer an important avenue to decreasing the danger of nuclear war.

Therefore, it is our hope that other nuclear-weapon States which have not yet done so will seriously consider the question of making similar declarations and assume the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Having said that, my delegation wishes to state that it will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.47.

The CHAIRMAN: The voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.47 will now begin.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, China, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Lebanon, Malawi, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Uruguay, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.47 was adopted by 87 votes to 19, with 18 abstentions.



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

Mr. MICHAELSEN (Denmark): The Danish delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.47 and would like to state the following.

No one in this forum doubts that the global arms race is one of the most serious international problems with which we are faced. No one can disagree that we have to do our utmost to bring this arms race to a halt.

My Government fully shares the concern which must be shown for the consequences of war, in particular, of course, nuclear war, and we stand ready to support all realistic measures which can prevent the use of nuclear and other weapons. It would seem superfluous to recall the binding nature of the commitments flowing from our membership of the United Nations and our signature of the United Nations Charter.

Denmark is at the same time a member of a defensive alliance which has proclaimed time and again that none of its weapons will ever be used except in response to attack. The purpose itself of this defensive alliance to which we belong is to prevent war. It is therefore beyond any doubt that no one has reason to fear first use of any weapons from this alliance.

Of course, we value and respect declarations concerning the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It should not be excluded that, at a given stage of the process of disarmament, solemn declarations not to resort to first use of nuclear weapons may be an important confidence-building measure. But, in our opinion, arms build-ups, weapons arsenals and political conduct must be seen as a whole.

(Mr. Michaelsen, Denmark)

A real step forward in the right direction will not be taken until substantial reductions in the weapons arsenals are being undertaken. That is what we shall strongly call for, that would be the right course in order to ensure that these terrible weapons will not be used.

For these reasons we voted against the present draft resolution.

Mr. LIN Cheng (China) (interpretation from Chinese): On the question of a non-first-use of nuclear weapons during the general debate in the First Committee the Chinese delegation has already clarified the difference between our position and the position of another nuclear State. Here I shall not repeat what has been said. It was for that reason that we abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.47.

Mr. GLEISSNER (Austria): The Austrian delegation shares the alarm expressed in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.47 about the threat of a nuclear holocaust and ascribes the highest importance and priority to effective measures to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war. We have, however, some doubt as to whether declarations by the nuclear-weapon States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, important as they may be from a political point of view as declarations of intent, are at present in themselves able to decrease the nuclear threat.

It seems to us that the most significant contribution of the nuclear-weapon States to international security would be an early agreement on substantial limitations and reductions of their nuclear arsenals.

In view of these considerations, the Austrian delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. ABDELWAHAB (Sudan): Solemn declarations by nuclear-weapon States that they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons are highly welcomed by my delegation. For that reason we voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.47. However, we should like to state for the record that such a vote should in no way be viewed as a belief that solemn declarations can by themselves constitute effective

(Mr. Abdelwahab, Sudan)

disarmament measures or that such declarations can be viewed in isolation from the Charter principle of the inadmissibility of the use of force in international relations regardless of the military means employed.

Mr. HIMANEN (Finland): The Finnish delegation abstained in the vote just taken on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.47 entitled, "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war". We did so because of our reservations concerning the basic presumptions of the text. We see the present draft resolution as closely linked with General Assembly resolution 36/100 on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe, in the vote on which my delegation abstained last year also.

Both of those texts deal actually with the question of non-first-use of nuclear weapons. The stand of the Finnish Government on nuclear weapons is clear. We are against all nuclear weapons, the spread of those weapons and their introduction into new areas. We are for nuclear disarmament, the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and non-use guarantees by nuclear-weapon States. We have tried to make an active contribution to those aims and we shall continue to do so. Yet, while we strongly oppose the use of nuclear weapons as one aspect of the principle of the non-use of force, as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations, we realize that the question of the non-first-use of nuclear weapons is one of the most controversial problems between the two military alliances. It is directly linked with the most sensitive part of the doctrines guiding the defence policies of many Member States of the United Nations. These controversial elements in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.47 led my delegation to abstain in the vote just taken.

Mr. SARAN (India): India voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.47 because we feel that consideration should be given to all proposals that serve the cause of preventing nuclear war.

(Mr. Saran, India)

However, in our view it should be recalled that, pending the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, the best means of preventing nuclear war is through the complete prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in any circumstances.

This position of my delegation was clearly stated in detail in its explanation of vote before the vote on resolution 36/100, Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe, made in this Committee on 25 November 1981.

Miss NAGA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Egypt voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.47 since it conforms to our position of welcoming any steps taken to prevent the use of nuclear weapons and to prevent nuclear war, with a view to nuclear disarmament. We welcome China's commitment to the non-use of nuclear weapons and the declaration by the delegation of the Soviet Union to the second session of the General Assembly on disarmament that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons. However, we should like to emphasize that while welcoming these statements on the principle of non-first-use of nuclear weapons we are of the view that this must be within the broader context of the non-use of force in international relations.

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): When they met in Bonn on 10 June last the Heads of State or Government of the 16 members of the defensive alliance to which my country belongs recalled in particular that their objective was to prevent war. They reaffirmed that none of their weapons would ever be used except in response to an attack. They also repeated that our countries would respect the sovereignty, equality, independence and territorial integrity of all States.

These commitments fall within the framework of respect for the United Nations Charter, particularly the general commitment of Member States of the United Nations to refrain from any recourse in their international relations to the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of States, or in any other way incompatible with the

(Mr. Noirfalisse, Belgium)

objectives of the United Nations. To single out in this commitment one part of the arsenals, in this particular case, that the nuclear weapons would never be used except in response to an attack, would considerably reduce the purport of the commitment of our countries.

That is why Belgium, like Denmark in particular, whose representative has just spoken, did not think it could support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.47.

Mr. C. LIDGARD (Sweden): Sweden voted in favour of this draft resolution, but I have been instructed to emphasize the link between the balance of forces in the conventional and nuclear fields. My delegation attaches great importance to the establishment of rough parity in both conventional and nuclear forces at lower levels in armaments, in order to facilitate undertakings by all nuclear-weapon States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The ultimate goal is, of course, to achieve the complete renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons and their total elimination. My delegation also attaches great importance to the formulation in the fifth preambular paragraph, according to which a code of conduct of nations in international affairs should be agreed upon, proscribing the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. GUNDERSON (United States of America): Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.47 presents an important challenge to the wisdom and serious purpose of this Committee. Its basic idea is disarmingly simple: unilateral declarations by States that they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons.

At first blush the idea also might strike most as obvious and unassailable: is not nuclear war, after all, a horror, the threat of which all men can agree must be reduced and eliminated?

But the members of this Committee are not addressing a new idea, for although the proposal of unilateral declarations of non-first use of nuclear weapons is of recent vintage, the issue of selective prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons has appeared here in one form or another for many years. The representatives to this Committee thus understand that the superficial appeal of such resolutions is deceptive. The underlying issues are, indeed, complex and troubling, and they cry out not to be ignored.

In the view of the United States, the starting-point for consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.47 should be the United Nations Charter. The essential provisions of the Charter bind all Members to avoid the use or threat of use of force against any State, whether such force be nuclear or conventional. If all Member States fulfilled this binding obligation, there would be no fear of the possible use of nuclear weapons.

The United States, like its North Atlantic Alliance partners and other allies and friends, is dedicated to upholding and strengthening that central provision of the Charter. As the NATO member States declared again in Bonn, Germany, in June of this year:

"None of our weapons will ever be used except in response to attack."

(Mr. Gunderson, United States)

But just as the Charter prohibits all military aggression, so does it recognize the right of self-defence. In an environment of flagrant and unrelenting violations of the Charter, and confronted with large and growing forces, the United States and its allies must insist that the right of self-defence cannot be fettered.

Thus it is clear that in the light of the Charter the proposals for declarations on non-first-use of nuclear weapons are unnecessary and redundant; they divert attention from the need to address the danger of war itself; they also misdirect attention from the threat posed by the massive build-up of the strategic and intermediate-range nuclear forces of one bloc of States, which my Government has repeatedly detailed.

In present circumstances, calls by that side for unenforceable unilateral pledges are hollow. The proper place seriously to address the questions brought up and the threat they pose is in the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) and the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) negotiations. Furthermore, given the present long-standing imbalance, particularly in Europe, of conventional forces, departure by NATO from its established policy of flexible response to any act of aggression would be seriously destabilizing, thus increasing the danger of war.

The solution to that conventional imbalance is a positive Eastern response to proposals for mutual balanced and verifiable force reductions to equal levels in Central Europe.

My Government believes that draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.47 is not only superfluous but mischievous, in that it attempts to direct attention away from the binding character of the provisions of the Charter and from the serious challenge of negotiated agreements that fairly and verifiably reduce the level and instability of both nuclear and conventional military forces.

Therefore, my delegation voted against that draft resolution.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISEN (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish):

Costa Rica voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.47 because we welcome all declarations by States that they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons. If nobody uses them first, then nobody will use them second, and that will certainly be of benefit to the whole world.

In addition, we feel that those countries that make such a declaration must necessarily accompany it by the practical implementation by the parties of the universally accepted principles of the non-use of force in international relations and respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States, whether they be neighbours or not.

Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation gave its full support to the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Viet Nam and Romania in document A/C.1/37/L.47, relating to the non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war.

We are firmly convinced that, pending the achievement of nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, the adoption by all nuclear-weapon States of the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons would, in today's circumstances, be extremely important for the prevention of the danger of nuclear war.

The undeniable fact is that such an obligation would, in practical terms, mean simple and effective prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

It is from that point of view that we have welcomed and supported the assumption of such an obligation by the Soviet Union announced at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, as well as the similar obligation reiterated by the other nuclear-weapon States at the same session.

Such an obligation fully corresponds to the declaration contained in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly that all States should actively participate in efforts to bring about conditions in international relations among States in which a code of peaceful conduct of nations in



(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

international affairs could be agreed and which would preclude the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

As to the arguments adduced here by some delegations that the obligation of non-first use of nuclear weapons leaves out the possibility of using other kinds of weapons, I should like to draw attention once more to the fact that the member States of the Warsaw Treaty have proposed to the NATO member States the conclusion of an agreement not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons against each other - a proposal that is still valid but which, unfortunately, has not elicited any positive response from the NATO member States.

Furthermore, it should be noted that ever since 1976 a concrete proposal to elaborate and conclude a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations has been on the negotiating table. It is very characteristic that the successful outcome of the negotiations concerning that treaty, which would mean the effective elimination of the use or threat of use of any kind of weapons in international relations, has from the very beginning been blocked by those very countries which now express their opposition to the concept of non-first use of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Handl, Czechoslovakia)

Bearing all that in mind, and guided by the fact that in the present circumstances draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.47 provides a simple and very effective way to ward off the danger of a nuclear holocaust - which, as most delegations in this Committee have pointed out, constitutes the most urgent task of our time - the Czechoslovak delegation voted in favour of that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus completed its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.47.

We will now turn our attention to the last draft resolution for the day, that contained in document A/C.1/37/L.59 under agenda item 51, entitled "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".

I call on the representative of Nigeria, who wishes to make a minor oral amendment to that draft resolution.

Mr. IJEWERE (Nigeria): Before the Committee takes a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.59 the sponsors would like to make an oral modification in its operative paragraph 1. Members will recall that following the successful conclusion of the Conference on certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects, the Convention, with its three Protocols, was open for signature in New York on 10 April 1981 for a period of 12 months. Since the 12 months have now elapsed, it is no longer technically correct to speak of signing the Convention in respect of those countries which were unable to meet the deadline. They may, however, become parties to the Convention. Briefly, therefore, we should like to modify operative paragraph 1 to read as follows:

"Urges those States which have not yet done so to exert the best of their endeavours to become parties to the Convention..."

I should like to add that Egypt was inadvertently omitted from the list of sponsors. That was a mistake and I hope that it can be rectified.

The CHAIRMAN: Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.59 has 23 sponsors, and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the Committee's 38th meeting on 19 November 1982.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the names of the sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors are Austria, Belgium, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Mongolia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.59, as orally amended.

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, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea,

Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.59, as orally amended, was adopted by 123 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the USSR, who wishes to explain his vote after the voting.

Mr. BATSANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement in connection with the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.59.

The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the task of preventing or limiting the use of specific forms of conventional weapons which may be considered to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects. It was among the first to sign and ratify the relevant international Convention and its three Protocols, agreed upon in the course of the United Nations Conference on the subject in 1979 and 1980.

We wholeheartedly support the appeal in operative paragraph 1 to all States which have not yet done so to become parties to this Convention and its Protocols. However, the USSR believes that the time has come to raise the question of continuing negotiations on further steps to limit or to prohibit the use of other forms of weapons which may be considered excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects, in order to conclude new additional protocols to this Convention.

(Mr. Batsanov, USSR)

The Soviet delegation has held consultations with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.59 with a view to concluding specific indications to this effect. We note that operative paragraph 2 provides for the possibility of concluding additional protocols to the Convention. At the same time, we should like to express the hope that in the future the General Assembly will be more active and decisive in deciding about further steps in this area.

In the light of the foregoing considerations the Soviet delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.59.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now completed its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.59.

I call on the representative of France.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.55, I wish to inform the Committee that the following paragraph should be added to the operative part of that resolution as a new paragraph 4, to enable the Secretariat to give the Secretary-General's report the widest possible circulation and to have them issued as a United Nations publication. It will read as follows:

"Requests the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps to have the report reproduced as a United Nations publication and to ensure that it is disseminated as widely as possible."

The purpose of this addition is mainly to bring draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.55, dealing with an international satellite monitoring agency, into line with provisions already adopted by the Secretariat, in particular by the Department of Public Information, whose programmes in this connection have already been decided upon.

The adoption of this provision therefore entails no financial implications.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I adjourn the meeting, I have to make one observation. We have a heavy schedule to be concluded by the end of the week. Increasing demand has been made on the time of the Committee for explanations of vote. I have remained flexible on the length of those interventions and I have not imposed any time limit as allowed for in rule 88 of the rules of procedure because of the serious nature of the work undertaken and the co-operation that I have received from every delegation so far. However, I now appeal to all delegations to make their explanations of vote short and to the point. It would be regrettable if I had to impose a time limit, but I assure representatives that if it is necessary I shall do so without hesitation. I hope therefore that this appeal will be heeded by all representatives.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.