



FIRST COMMITTEE
37th meeting
held on
22 November 1983
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 37TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 43 TO 63, 139, 141, 143 and 144 (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/38/PV.37
16 December 1983

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 43 to 63, 139, 141, 143 and 144 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: Before we continue with explanations of vote before the voting on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 3, I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/38/L.36, Maldives; L.38, Uruguay; L.39, Philippines; L.42, Venezuela; L.50, Togo and Democratic Yemen; L.68, Angola; and L.35, Philippines.

Mr. NÚÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation did not think it had to explain its vote on the draft resolutions relating to bilateral negotiations, but after certain statements we heard this morning, which went so far as to even attempt to give us lessons on how we should vote, we have to make some observations and, in particular, to explain our vote against draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.63.

Any delegation's position on bilateral negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces is well known. Ever since four draft resolutions were introduced on the subject, we have been advocating that three of them be withdrawn and that the one submitted by a group of non-aligned countries, which truly reflects my country's views, should be retained. But this has not been possible.

From the outset the bilateral negotiations in November 1981, as can be seen from some of the draft resolutions now before us, there has been one group of countries which has done everything possible to prevent these negotiations from succeeding. They have also utilized the Committee on Disarmament to persuade public opinion that they were interested in negotiating on disarmament, when in reality they continued qualitatively to upgrade their nuclear weapons. In this connection, they have made use of the bilateral negotiations to persuade public opinion that they were in fact negotiating, whereas they were just trying to gain time in order to deploy another 500 nuclear missiles in Europe. That is the reality of these negotiations, which in this month of November have now been going on for two years.

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

Of course we have heard arguments in favour of the deployment of these missiles, but it is ironic that arguments about the SS-20s and so-called Soviet superiority should now be used to justify the deployment of new missiles.

This Committee is not that forgetful. If we look at the record only two years ago, it will be seen that those same arguments about SS-20 missiles and so-called Soviet superiority were then being used in order to justify the decision to begin production of the neutron bomb. It is ironic, but the same arguments are being dished up to us here today.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.63 are trying to hide the fact that from the very beginning of the 1970s, when nobody spoke about SS-20 missiles, the United States Government started to develop its new missiles which are being installed in Europe today, and, in the second place, that the existence of approximate military parity between the United States and the Soviet Union is a definite fact which cannot be denied and which has even been recognized by three successive United States Administrations, those of Presidents Nixon, Ford and Carter.

My delegation is in favour of bilateral negotiations. We support the continuation of bilateral negotiations; but, if we are to take account of the concerns expressed by the European countries because of the enormous accumulation of nuclear weapons on the continent of Europe, it is obvious that these negotiations should lead us to the dismantling of all nuclear weapons in Europe, wherever they come from wherever they are.

Mr. ELFAKI (Sudan): My delegation will vote in favour of all three draft resolutions addressing themselves to the very vital and urgent question of the bilateral negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe, namely, those in documents A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2, L.63, and L.65/Rev.1 respectively.

My delegation is keenly following these negotiations and very much interested in their success. We regret that no progress has so far been reported. This lack of progress in the negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces is, understandably, a source of deep concern and great worry to the international community as a whole; for we are all confident that any failure of these negotiations would lead to a new and extremely serious escalation of the nuclear arms race, with very grave repercussions for the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

Thus, in view of the seriousness of the issue and the common stakes, it was our sincere hope that a single consensus draft resolution would have been submitted for consideration and adoption by this Committee. Such a balanced consensus draft text would have been a good expression of the feelings and concerns expressed all over the world and could have provided a very strong world appeal to the negotiating partners in Geneva to pursue their crucial negotiations with greater vigour, sincerity and determination.

We regret that, after such lengthy and arduous consultations since the beginning of the work of this Committee, this year, no such consensus draft resolution could be agreed upon.

Such being the case, and because of the importance of the issue at hand and the fact that these draft resolutions contain some positive elements coinciding with our goal of substantial reduction of nuclear weapons as the first step towards their total elimination, we have decided to cast a positive vote on all three drafts. Our decision emanates from our conviction that the continuity of negotiations aimed at a successful conclusion is an imperative that demands positive action and deserves support. However, our affirmative vote on these three draft resolutions by no means constitutes total approval of their contents.

Mr. MULONGANDUSU ESUK (Zaire) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Zaire will abstain in the vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.63 and L.65/Rev.1 because, as we understand it, such draft resolutions have overlapped for some time now.

The delegation of Zaire would have even voted against these two draft resolutions if we did not have confidence in the sense of responsibility of the respective sponsors. We are abstaining to show our disquiet at the lack of progress in the disarmament negotiations, which leads only to a tremendous proliferation of resolutions which are exactly like one another except for an occasional period or comma, indicating the views of the sponsors as to who is actually responsible for the bogging down of the negotiations. However, our abstention also expresses our wish that there be no interruption in the present negotiations.

The delegation of Zaire will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2 and A/C.1/38/L.42 because we feel that they contain provisions which could once again lead to a renewal of the negotiations. We request the

(Mr. Mulongandusu Esuk, Zaire)

various parties to find a way to reach an agreement. Whether there should be 800 or 600 warheads does not seem too important to us. We think that all these weapons should disappear anyway, and we are in favour of any efforts that would lead to a reduction, quantitatively or qualitatively, until the total destruction and disappearance of these weapons. We shall never endorse any kind of balance of terror, since this is a balance which will always make us all losers.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I wish to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42, which takes note of the lack of progress in the nuclear arms negotiations in Geneva and urges the two major Powers to seek a way out of the present impasse by combining into a single forum the two series of negotiations and broadening their scope by including also "tactical" or "battlefield" nuclear weapons.

My delegation will vote for it as an effort towards facilitating progress in these important negotiations. We particularly support the request that the parties concerned keep the United Nations informed of the relevant progress as required by the Declaration of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

While reference is made to the Declaration of the Final Document on a matter of procedure, the main substance of the Declaration should not be overlooked. In the third paragraph of the Declaration it is stated:

"Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority".

(resolution S-10/2, part II, para. 13)

Consequently, the concept of balance of deterrence runs counter to the Declaration of the Final Document.

And, the Final Document further states:

"Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the speedy substantial reduction of arms and armed forces". (ibid.)

It is therefore made clear in the Declaration that the process of actual disarmament has to be concurrent with the implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

I would further say that experience has shown that negotiations on disarmament without concurrent efforts for international security in compliance with the Charter provisions and those of the Final Document have yielded no results.

The Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, in its report - named after its Chairman, Olof Palme, Prime Minister of Sweden - takes a decided view on this issue. As stated in its Introduction

"It is ... of paramount importance to replace the doctrine of mutual deterrence. Our alternative is common security." (Common Security: A Blueprint for Survival, p. xiii)

As I have stated we will vote in favour of the aforesaid draft resolution for the reasons already mentioned. We have to be mindful however of the reality that the concept of balance of deterrence as engendering and intensifying the arms race is counter-productive to international peace and security and to the disarmament effort. It should, therefore, be replaced by international collective security as required by the Charter in order that there may be a positive move towards peace and disarmament.

Mr. OBEO (Ivory Coast) (interpretation from French): The Ivory Coast delegation is of the view that excessive mistrust which exists between the two parties to the negotiations on Euromissiles is first and foremost responsible for the lack of progress in those negotiations. This mistrust is evident in the proposals and counterproposals made by both sides and, in particular, in the formulation put forward by one side demanding conditions which they know in advance will not be acceptable to the other side.

No negotiation, whatever it may involve and all the more so one concerning the security of States, has any chance of being successful unless the parties to the negotiations come in good faith without any second thoughts. Therefore, between the two super-Powers involved in the present talks on the Euromissiles, a minimum of trust should be established. Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.63, submitted by Belgium, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, deals precisely with the establishment of this confidence and trust between the two Powers involved in these negotiations, both on strategic weapons and on medium-range missiles, and invites the parties concerned to work actively towards the enhancement of mutual trust in order to create an atmosphere more conducive to disarmament agreements.

(Mr. Obeo, Ivory Coast)

That is why my delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution. However, we shall abstain in the votes on the other three.

Mr. SHARMA (Nepal): My delegation has more than once expressed its satisfaction at the fact that negotiations are going on between the Soviet Union and the United States on the important question of intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe. While this question concerns the interests of all nations, the solution lies ultimately in the hands of those super-Powers. We once again express our hope that they will rise above narrow considerations of bargaining for advantage. Sustained negotiations undertaken in good faith and in conformity with their avowed responsibilities are necessary to open the way to the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons.

The three draft resolutions before this Committee contained in documents A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2, L.63 and L.65/Rev.1 call for continuation of negotiations and express the universal concern over lack of tangible results up to now. Nepal fully shares this concern.

However, each of them contains elements which are related to substantial issues being negotiated at Geneva. While supporting the call for unconditional, sustained and serious negotiations, my delegation does not wish to align itself with any of those positions. Therefore we shall abstain in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2, L.63 and L.65/Rev.1.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.63 because this draft resolution does not meet the genuine danger that impedes the bilateral negotiations on nuclear weapons between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. There is no confirmation yet that the latter will refrain from installing medium-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe, and in the world in general. Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.63 aims at retaining this situation vis-à-vis the negotiations, namely, to maintain them as a pretext to implement the manoeuvres to deploy the United States medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe without bringing about the success of these negotiations.

Mr. A. M. ADAN (Somalia): I must confess that my delegation's initial reaction to draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2, L.63 and L.65/Rev.1 is one of disappointment. None of them includes the elements which, in our view, could lead to fruitful negotiations towards nuclear disarmament. In actual fact, they simply reflect the respective known positions of the parties concerned.

(Mr. Adan, Somalia)

My delegation would have preferred a consensus draft resolution which this Committee could recommend to the General Assembly for adoption and thus bring its moral authority to bear on the negotiating parties to work for genuine disarmament. In the absence of such a consensus draft resolution, however, we are faced with the dilemma of either abstaining in the vote on, or voting in favour of, all three draft resolutions. In view of the vital importance of the question of disarmament, we consider it our duty to encourage the continuation of the dialogue on this matter, since the very survival of humankind depends on the achievement of an agreement on nuclear disarmament by the major nuclear-weapon Powers.

My delegation will therefore vote affirmatively on all three draft resolutions, with the understanding that we support their general thrust on the desirability of the continuation of the negotiations on nuclear disarmament rather than their specific provisions, which, as I have already stated, reflect the known positions of the parties to the negotiations.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation has expressed a wish to explain its vote before the voting on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 3, the Committee will now take action on them.

First, we shall take action on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2, as orally amended this morning. It was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 17 November and is sponsored by Romania. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam

Abstaining: Angola, Austria, Burma, Chad, Chile, Denmark, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Nepal, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2, as orally amended, was adopted by 64 votes to 31, with 21 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 17 November and is sponsored by the following countries: Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Sweden, Uruguay, Yugoslavia and Venezuela.

A separate recorded vote has been requested on the preamble as a whole and on each operative paragraph of this draft resolution.

I now put to the vote the preamble as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, 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, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

* Subsequently the delegations of Guyana, Malawi, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago and Zimbabwe advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The preamble was adopted by 107 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42 was adopted by 91 votes to 2, with 33 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42.

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, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Ivory Coast

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42 was adopted by 128 votes to none, with one abstention.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42.

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, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti,

Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42 was adopted by 131 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN: The First Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42.

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, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42 was adopted by 132 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote upon draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Chile, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42, as a whole, was adopted by 104 votes to 1, with 24 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.63. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 17 November and is sponsored by the following countries: Belgium, Canada, the Federal Republic

(The Chairman)

of Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burma, China, Colombia, Comoros, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Lebanon, Nepal, Peru, Senegal, Suriname, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.63 was adopted by 85 votes to 18, with 21 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.65/Rev.1. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Czechoslovakia at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 17 November and is sponsored by the following countries: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burma, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Liberia, Malaysia, Morocco, Nepal, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.65/Rev.1 was adopted by 65 votes to 19, with 40 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes, after the voting on the draft resolution listed in cluster 3.

Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria): The basic expectation of the Nigerian delegation was that it would be possible for the First Committee to adopt a single draft resolution on the subject of bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which would underscore the necessity for the negotiations to continue as well as express profound concern that the current state of those negotiations has failed to meet the demands of the situation and the expectations of the international community. Unfortunately, this has not proved possible. It is of course understandable that each of these delegations should exercise its sovereignty by not agreeing to withdraw its particular draft resolution.

My delegation voted in favour of the three draft resolutions on the bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations - A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2, L.63 and L.65/Rev.1 - though

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

partisan in their positions and specificity, out of an objective conviction that there is an imperative need for the negotiations to continue, and that need is recognized in the three draft resolutions, as is the necessity for the negotiations to result in a meaningful agreement.

Such an agreement would benefit peace and security in Europe and constitute a significant contribution to the disarmament process. However, we retain the view that the actual deployment of new missiles in Europe is unlikely to foster the climate for such negotiations.

By the same token, a disposition towards non-reduction from current levels of nuclear weaponry in Europe would destroy the desirable incentive to conduct productive negotiations on the question.

Mr. ERLANDSEN (Norway): Norway firmly supports the dual-track decision of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Parallel implementation of both elements of this decision offers the best hope for arriving at an equitable agreement based on real reductions and a balanced security situation. With this in mind, it is Norway's view that the Romanian and East European draft resolutions contained elements that would seriously weaken prospects for early and concrete results in the current Geneva negotiations.

Today all major elements for a mutually acceptable compromise seem to be on the table. Consequently, what matters now is that the negotiations be pursued and that the parties do not set preconditions to their further participation in them.

In our view, the Romanian and East European draft resolutions do not meet this requirement and, hence, would not be conducive to progress in Geneva.

Mr. YANG Hushan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation did not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2 and abstained in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.63 and L.65/Rev.1.

However, this does not mean that we are not interested in the negotiations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on long- and medium-range nuclear weapons. As the other peoples of the world, the Chinese people has always viewed them as being of utmost importance. In our view, the achievement, or failure to achieve, satisfactory agreements as an outcome of these negotiations will affect peace and security not only in Europe, but also in Asia and in other regions of the world. These negotiations have been going on for

(Mr. Yang Hushan, China)

almost two years. Both sides have made all kinds of suggestions, none of which has resulted in a reduction in medium- and long-range missiles.

On the contrary, they have aggravated the nuclear-arms race and increased tensions in international relations. At present, the negotiations themselves are in a state of crisis. This is of course most regrettable and disappointing.

The peoples of many of the world's countries, especially in Europe, strongly demand that this state of affairs be changed. These are legitimate aspirations. We can understand them and sympathize with them. It is the opinion of China that the Soviet Union and the United States, which possess the largest nuclear arsenals in the world, should bear special responsibilities in nuclear disarmament, and in view of their responsibilities towards the people in Europe, proceed to negotiations and come forth with results conducive to the peace and security of all countries of the world.

Mr. GLEISSNER (Austria): Austria's position on the subject of the bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations was set out in the appeal by the Austrian Government to the parties to the negotiations in Geneva adopted on 18 October 1983, which was distributed as a document of the General Assembly. Allow me, to quote from that appeal:

"As a result of certain events, and not least because of the stepped-up efforts to increase armaments, international tension has reached a degree which fills the people of Europe with continuously growing fear of the consequences of such a trend. In countries where people are free to express their views, this fear is reflected in the growth of peace movements and in impressive demonstrations for peace.

"Since 1945 there has been no war in Europe, a fact which is not least the result of the balance of military forces. But this balance is felt increasingly to be an unstable balance of terror. The armaments spiral which has been turning faster and faster has not brought greater security. On the contrary, Europe is the most highly armed region in the world, a fact which increases dangerously the risk of escalation of conflicts.

"In view of these trends, the Powers which possess nuclear arms in Europe bear a special responsibility. Those countries which have renounced nuclear weapons must, however, be aware that they too would be among the victims of a

(Mr. Gleissner, Austria)

nuclear conflict. Therefore, no one can deny them the right to make themselves heard.

"The Austrian Federal Government has been following these developments with deep concern. It appeals to the Powers responsible to use all possible means to check the arms race and to reverse the armaments spiral by genuine disarmament measures. The balance of terror must be replaced by a balance of reason. This calls for a new concept of security which is not based on accumulation of military power but on confidence-building measures and on negotiations. This would open the way towards the reduction of armaments to the lowest possible level.

"The Geneva negotiations on an intermediate-range system in Europe are now facing the basic question whether one has to arm first in order to disarm later, or whether it might be possible to follow the direct path to disarmament, the path of reason.

"Lately both sides have put forward proposals which we consider worth examining, although they do not seem to be sufficient for an agreement.

"Realistically seen, it is increasingly doubtful that agreement can be reached in a few weeks' time. But a complete failure to make progress in these negotiations would result in a deterioration of the political situation in Europe.

"Austria, therefore, appeals to the parties of the Geneva negotiations to use the remaining time to reach a political consensus as to the basic elements of an agreement on intermediate-range weapons. The treaty instruments in all their necessary details could be negotiated in the following weeks and months without pressure of time. Such a procedure has been followed before, in Vladivostok, when the Presidents of the United States and of the Soviet Union reached an understanding on the essential elements of SALT 2. The urgency of this question makes it imperative, in our view, to bring about a solution along the lines indicated through meetings at a high or even the highest level." (A/C.1/38/7)

Since the adoption of that appeal, our concern has further increased as the Geneva negotiations entered an extremely critical stage. Today, the danger of a breakdown of these talks appears imminent, although their continuation in one way

(Mr. Gleissner, Austria)

or another seems more important than ever. Such a collapse of negotiations would deal a serious blow to disarmament efforts; it could trigger a new round of the nuclear-arms race and further exacerbate the already tense relations between East and West.

Austria strongly believes that in this situation the international community should remind - with one voice - the United States and the Soviet Union of their special responsibility and urge them to do everything in their power to facilitate the successful conclusion of the Geneva talks.

We should have wished that the deliberations on this item in this Committee would further the negotiations in question and facilitate their future course. However, to our regret, the basic political antagonisms between the two sides overshadowed the business of drafting resolutions. In such a situation we have decided to abstain in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2, L.63 and L.65/Rev.1 and to make our position clear by an explanation of vote.

We supported, however, draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42, on which I wish to say the following. We share the view that combining the START and the intermediate-range nuclear forces negotiations into a single forum may be a useful and necessary step. But we are, not sufficiently informed about the details of the negotiations to be in a position to determine the precise timing of the usefulness of such a move. The recommended extension of the scope of these talks, regarding the inclusion of medium-range weapons of a shorter range and "battlefield" nuclear weapons, corresponds to Austria's consistent belief in the necessity of a comprehensive approach to disarmament problems.

Mr. LACLAUSTRA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): During its statement in the general debate in this Committee, on 31 October, my delegation had the opportunity to point out the special attention Spain attaches to the evolution of the START and intermediate-range nuclear forces negotiations.

With respect to the Geneva negotiations on intermediate-range missiles, the Spanish delegation stated that imaginative and flexible formulas should be sought until positive results are obtained. Guided by these considerations, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.63. Paragraph 1 of that draft resolution is for us the best expression of the desire, shared by all, for a satisfactory agreement in Geneva.

(Mr. Laclaustra, Spain)

Furthermore, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2 and L.65/Rev.1, since we have doubts on the suitability of setting forth guidelines at the United Nations for the negotiating parties to behave in a particular manner

Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): My delegation would like to offer a brief explanation of its positive vote on the four draft resolutions pertaining to the bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations.

In view of the grave danger of the nuclear threat that confronts the world community today, Pakistan considers it a matter of fundamental importance that serious negotiations aimed at the control and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons must be conducted with determination and perseverance. For this purpose, all efforts aimed at promoting this process enjoy our support.

The Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly states that the principal goals of disarmament are to ensure the survival of mankind, to eliminate the danger of war, in particular nuclear war, to ensure that war is no longer an instrument for settling international disputes and that the use and the threat of force are eliminated from international life, as provided for in the Charter of the United Nations. Progress towards this objective requires the conclusion and implementation of agreements on the cessation of the arms race and on genuine measures of disarmament taking into account the need of States to protect their security.

In view of these considerations, my delegation felt it appropriate to cast positive votes on all four draft resolutions submitted on this subject. However, I should like to clarify that our positive votes on those draft resolutions do not signify our partiality towards or preference for any particular approach in this regard. In voting in favour, we are simply expressing our support for a principle, namely, that bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, which we consider to be vital, must continue and that no effort must be spared or approach left unexplored in order to arrive at positive results.

Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation wishes to explain why it voted against draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2 entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations". In principle, the Netherlands welcomes any initiative which could contribute to a successful outcome of the negotiations currently being

(Mr. Ramaker, Netherlands)

held in Geneva. At an earlier stage, the Netherlands had hoped that the Romanian draft resolution as then circulated could be seen as an effort towards that end. Much to the regret of my delegation subsequent events have shown otherwise.

The draft resolution that was put to the vote today contains certain elements which are unacceptable to the Netherlands. In this respect may I refer in particular to operative paragraph 1, which contains the unacceptable idea of a postponement of the deployment on the Western side while the existing Soviet SS-20 missiles would continue to be pointed at their targets. Such a formula can only be seen as acceptance of the existing Soviet monopoly in the field of land-based medium-range nuclear-weapon systems.

The contents of operative paragraph 1, even as orally amended by the Romanian delegation this morning, contrasts sharply with our own policy aims. Our aim remains the complete elimination of land-based medium-range nuclear missiles - zero on both sides. Should it prove impossible to reach that goal in one step, then an interim solution should be sought providing for equal ceilings at the lowest possible level.

May I add that similar reasons led my delegation to cast a negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.65/Rev.1. The Netherlands hopes and trusts that the Geneva negotiations will continue and, with this purpose in mind, that they will be crowned with success.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like briefly to set explanations of its votes on the four draft resolutions on which the Committee took decisions this afternoon.

I shall dwell at greater length on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42, because it adequately reflects the views of my delegation. The recommendation contained in operative paragraph 1, regarding the possibility of combining the two Geneva negotiating forums into one represents an initiative deserving of full consideration as soon as possible by the parties to the negotiation, since, in our view, it could constitute an appropriate manner of enabling these negotiations to make further progress.

In examining draft resolutions in A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2, L.63 and L.65/Rev.1, my delegation noted that they have two common characteristics. One is the emphasis on the urgent need for the continuation of the Geneva negotiations and, at the same

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

time, the interest of the international community in the substance of the problems being discussed in these forums and in their successful solution. The other common characteristic in the three draft resolutions is the fact that each one reflects a given point of view with regard to the substantive aspects directly related to the negotiations.

Therefore, the Argentine delegation, like most of the other delegations taking part in the work of this Committee, was confronted with the dilemma of how to express our support for this common element of the three draft resolutions, with regard to the need for fostering as much as possible the continuation of the Geneva negotiations, while at the same time expressing this support without taking a stand with regard to the differing points of view reflected in the three draft resolutions.

Possibly, one method of overcoming this problem would have been to take a passive or negative stand with regard to the three draft resolutions. But in that case we would not have reflected the concern of the international community as voiced in the General Assembly with regard to the progress of the Geneva negotiations. Therefore, the Argentine delegation, like many others, decided to vote in favour of the three draft resolutions, and place on record the fact that we do so without taking a position with regard to any of the specific stands in the three draft resolutions on the substance of the Geneva negotiations.

What we should like to emphasize in particular is the need for the Geneva negotiations to continue as urgently as possible and with sincere and genuine efforts being made to bring them to a successful conclusion, to the benefit not only of Europe but also of the whole world.

My delegation is fully aware of the fact that the manner of voting I have just outlined is perhaps not the most desirable in normal circumstances and that it would have been preferable to adopt one single draft resolution by consensus on bilateral negotiations on nuclear weapons. However, given the existing procedural problem, in our view there was no other alternative open to us but to give our support to all of the draft resolutions put to the vote.

Finally, I should like to suggest the advisability of the four draft resolutions voted upon today - which in fact should be seen as a whole - being grouped under a single resolution number, obviously with the usual practice of

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

bearing different capital letters. I think they should appear together under one resolution number.

Miss DA SILVA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): The Venezuelan delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2, sponsored by the delegation of Romania. That draft resolution, as finally amended, is the one which most objectively takes into consideration the security interests of all parties concerned.

For similar reasons, the delegation of Venezuela decided to abstain in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.63 and L.65/Rev.1.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): In explanation of the votes of the Swedish delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2, L.63 and L.65/Rev.1, as orally amended, on the question of the bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations, I should like to make the following statement.

Sweden voted in favour of all three draft resolutions in order to underscore our belief in the necessity of keeping negotiations going on the question of reduction of nuclear arms in Europe as well as in other parts of the world.

It is the fervent hope of the Swedish Government that the Geneva bilateral negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear missiles will soon yield positive results. The best way to improve the security situation in Europe is to have fewer and not more nuclear weapons and a constructive dialogue between East and West.

The Swedish Government holds the view that no further deployment of nuclear weapons should take place and that a substantial reduction should be made of the nuclear-weapon systems already in place. In this context a balance in conventional forces must also be achieved at a lower level.

Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania): The Albanian delegation did not participate in the vote just taken on the four draft resolutions on bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations. However, our non-participation in the vote must in no way be construed as a sign of lack of interest in what is going on in this Committee regarding the issue of the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe by the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the Albanian people follows with great concern and vigilance the feverish arms race taking place between the super-Powers, which is an expression of their policy of war and aggression which may lead the world to a global conflagration.

(Mr. Kapllani, Albania)

However, the Albanian delegation cannot fail to say that the issue of the deployment of missiles in Europe has clearly polarized the forces in this hall too. This can be seen also from the fact that four draft resolutions have been introduced and voted on regarding the same issue. There is a tendency to proliferate the number of resolutions on disarmament issues, as if they were to offer any solution to disarmament problems. During this session also, in the disarmament debates in this Committee, the super-Powers have shown great zeal in speaking pompously about their alleged concern over disarmament. But the peoples of the world cannot be deceived by their propaganda and demagoguery, for they know that it is deeds that matter and not words, and they can clearly see that the more the super-Powers talk about disarmament the more they engage in a spiralling arms race. This applies also to their nuclear arms negotiations. That is why hundreds of thousands of people have taken to the streets in Europe and elsewhere to show their firm opposition to the adventuristic policy of the super-Powers.

In view of all the foregoing considerations, the Albanian delegation chose to express its position on those draft resolutions by not participating in the vote.

Mr. DUBEY (India): Of the four draft resolutions adopted by the Committee, India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42 and abstained in the voting on the remaining three draft resolutions. We have done so because, in our view, in pronouncing itself on such an important subject, the General Assembly is expected to be clear and unambiguous. Unfortunately, the adoption of all three new draft resolutions on the subject does not make for such clarity.

Moreover, while underscoring the desirability of making progress in these important negotiations, my delegation does not intend to be a party to endorsing a particular approach in preference to the others in the negotiations.

We were hoping that there would be an agreement among the sponsors of the three draft resolutions. Since that has not been possible, despite strenuous efforts by so many delegations for so long, we do not think our associating ourselves with all three draft resolutions would have served any constructive purpose. Therefore we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42 and abstained in the votes on the other three.

Mr. KARUHIJE (Rwanda) (interpretation from French): The debates here on the draft resolutions we have just adopted on the question of bilateral negotiations on nuclear weapons demonstrate that this session was devoted to the matter of intermediate-range nuclear weapons. The debate on disarmament has mainly dealt with this burning problem, which involves, first of all, the security of Europe but also that of the rest of the world. For that reason, the present negotiations on this subject between the United States and the Soviet Union are of capital importance, and we hope that they will reach a successful conclusion.

However, to limit those negotiations to a relatively short time in conditions that could hardly be met was somewhat unrealistic and bordered on premeditated bad faith. That is why the international community was duty bound to draw the attention of the parties to the negotiations to that fundamental aspect of the question, since each party seemed more concerned about having its own thesis prevail at the expense of the other.

The three draft resolutions, A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2, L.63 and L.65/Rev.1 - draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42 being irrelevant - attempt to emphasize the importance of continuing the dialogue but unfortunately, in a somewhat unequal albeit doubtless sincere manner.

My delegation would have simply abstained in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.63 and L.65/Rev.1, but, because of my country's interest in the question, and in order to respond to the appeal being made, my delegation supported all three draft resolutions and voted in favour. However, it should be clearly understood that my delegation does not support any of the particular theses enunciated therein and, above all, it does not support the status quo. We hope the situation will evolve in the direction desired by the international community.

My delegation would like to congratulate the delegation of Romania, which was the first to raise this question clearly in our Committee, on the efforts it made to narrow the gap between various viewpoints. Even though these efforts were not successful that does not in any way detract from their merits.

Mr. WASIUDDIN (Bangladesh): In the voting just concluded the delegation of Bangladesh voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2, L.63 and L.65/Rev.1 regarding bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations.

(Mr. Wasiuddin, Bangladesh)

While, admittedly, some of the paragraphs of these draft resolutions contain positions that are one-sided and contradictory, we believe their underlying spirit is in conformity with the common aspiration of mankind, that is, to achieve disarmament and to promote negotiations to achieve this objective. This underlying spirit needs to be encouraged for the common good of humanity. The position of Bangladesh, which is unequivocally against all armaments and in support of effective measures for the promotion of peace and stability, has been the fundamental motivating force for us to encourage the effective and vigorous conduct of bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations with a view to achieving positive results without undue delay.

We voted in favour of these draft resolutions in this spirit and our positive vote does not imply endorsement of any negotiated position of the principal contenders. The delegation of Bangladesh also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.42, because it fully shares and subscribes to the view that at stake in the bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations are not only the national interests but also the vital interests of all peoples of the world. We join our voice in appealing to the contending parties in the negotiations on nuclear armaments to keep this aspect constantly in perspective.

Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago): Had my delegation been present, we would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.3/Rev.2. This would have been in keeping with our policy to support all the draft resolutions in this cluster on bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations.

My delegation believes all Member States bear collective responsibility and have a legitimate interest in disarmament negotiations. We are further convinced that the parties involved in the Geneva bilateral negotiations must be aware of, and take into account, those interests. There can be no doubt that a breakdown of the negotiations would impede efforts to strengthen international peace and security and to achieve progress towards disarmament.

Speaking in this Committee on 26 October, my delegation noted that

"The outcome of those negotiations is vital not only to the two interlocutors but also to all citizens of this world; it is, therefore, imperative that our legitimate interests be protected." (A/C.1/38/PV.15, p. 4)

We also noted that what we needed was "not more resolutions but a more meaningful resolution to disarm". (ibid., p. 6-10)

(Mr. Murray, Trinidad and Tobago)

My delegation is most disappointed that each draft resolution in this cluster promised much but, unfortunately, each contained elements which to my delegation gave rise to reservations. It is unfortunate that we, the non-military States, were placed in a situation where we may appear to be taking sides. It is unfortunate that this body could not itself have engaged in serious negotiations to arrive at some meaningful consensus text. We urge this course be pursued when next we meet to consider these items.

Our positive vote on each of these draft resolutions is therefore aimed at emphasizing the importance we place on the need for the Geneva talks to reach meaningful agreements and directed at the general purport of the draft resolutions. If it is construed that we are taking sides, the side we take is that of mankind - the future survival of mankind and our basic desire to make progress in the field of disarmament through the bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations under consideration.

Mr. LALEYE (Benin) (interpretation from French): In voting in favour of the draft resolutions on bilateral negotiations on nuclear weapons, my delegation wanted to show that the People's Republic of Benin was not indifferent either to the agonizing problem of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, nor to the present impasse in the Geneva negotiations. My delegation wanted by its votes to express its desire to associate itself with the primary message the United Nations by these resolutions has the right to send to the negotiators in Geneva, namely, that they should as speedily as possible reach positive and constructive agreements in the interests of all States and peoples and also for the preservation of international peace and security.

Without prejudging or favouring the position of either party to the Geneva negotiations, the People's Republic of Benin wanted to remain faithful to its status and to the principles and the resolutions of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded our consideration and action upon the draft resolutions listed under cluster 3.

The Committee will now take up the draft resolutions listed under cluster 5: A/C.1/38/L.29, L.35, L.37 and L.48.

The Committee has now heard statements and explanations of vote from more than 50 delegations. That, together with the four weeks of general debate we have had, should, I hope, have given delegations ample opportunity to state their views on

(The Chairman)

the very important and difficult issues before us. Unless any delegation feels compelled to speak on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 5, I intend now to call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. MIDDLETON (United Kingdom): I wish to make an explanation of vote in connection with draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.29 and L.48, both of which deal with the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests.

The British Government is fully sensitive to the wishes of many Member States to see early negotiations on a comprehensive test ban. We supported the setting up of a Working Group in the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva and my delegation has participated actively in its work. We do not consider that the present mandate is exhausted. We believe that an essential preliminary to the beginning of negotiations is the reaching of some agreement on how to solve the outstanding and serious problems of verification which for over 20 years have presented a major obstacle to the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban.

The British delegation was profoundly disappointed at the attitude of certain delegations which refused to enter into any serious examination of the issues involved in the Working Group in the Committee on Disarmament because, they claimed, the Group was not empowered to negotiate. The British delegation made clear at every stage that it was prepared to interpret the mandate in the most flexible manner possible and that it would not refuse to discuss any relevant issue.

In the view of the British delegation, the issue at stake is not the precise wording of a mandate but whether other delegations are prepared to enter into a serious examination of the issues involved. The British Government has shown its willingness to do this by presenting two substantial working papers, one of which dealing with verification has yet to be discussed.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.29 and L.48 are also objectionable in that they refer only to the question of nuclear-weapon tests and avoid the issue of how the question of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes should be dealt with in a comprehensive test ban. Discussions in Geneva have shown that there are fundamental differences of view on this point among delegations which must be resolved if there is to be a successful negotiation on a comprehensive test ban. Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.48 also contains a proposal for a moratorium, which we have consistently rejected.

For the reasons I have just put forward, my delegation will vote against both those draft resolutions.

Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic): Like numerous other delegations, we hold the view that a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty would constitute an important instrument to lessen the dangers of nuclear war and to bring the nuclear arms race to an end.

The current situation is well known. The United States has broken the consensus achieved at the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament and placed itself in opposition to obligations undertaken under international law. Its intention is to have a free hand to test new nuclear weapons. Consequently, the United States rejects the conducting of negotiations and attempts to impose on the Committee on Disarmament endless discussions on technical details which, in our eyes, are irrelevant and for the solution of which draft agreements have already been presented.

The German Democratic Republic endorses all those draft resolutions on the subject which clearly and unambiguously call for negotiations to be conducted within the framework of the Geneva Committee on Disarmament and for a relevant mandate to the Ad Hoc Working Group.

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.35, however, does not meet those requirements. The request contained in operative paragraph 6 (a) to the Committee on Disarmament "To resume its examination of issues relating to a comprehensive test ban, with a view to the negotiation of a treaty on the subject..." is completely insufficient. It must be stated that the wording of this paragraph is even less compelling than the already unsatisfactory formulations in resolution 37/73 adopted last year. That resolution at least says that "steps to initiate substantive negotiations" should be taken.

The fact that reference to the indispensable role of the Committee on Disarmament has been omitted must cause astonishment.

All that indicates that the draft resolution is an attempt to achieve the "squaring of the circle", that is, to bring the demand for a nuclear test ban in line with the present attitude of the United States towards this issue.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.35 and will abstain in the vote on it.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to state the reasons that determine our attitude and votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.35, L.37 and L.48.

In determining our attitude to draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.35 and L.48 we base ourselves on the idea that the total prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests is a task of primary importance. The most rapid possible conclusion of an agreement on this would constitute a reliable obstacle to the growing danger of nuclear war owing to the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons. The Soviet delegation shares the appeal contained in A/C.1/38/L.48 to all States Members of the Conference on Disarmament to initiate immediately negotiation on this issue.

Aware of its responsibility for the limitation of nuclear weapons and also that it is a depositary State for a number of agreements in this area, the Soviet Union is doing everything incumbent upon it to attribute priority to giving impulse to such negotiations. This goal is served by the Soviet Union's submission of fundamental provisions for such an agreement, considering the degree of agreement achieved in our previous examination of this issue. We are willing to examine constructively also the proposals put forward by other States the purpose of which is to further the conclusion of an agreement prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests. Until the conclusion of such an agreement, the USSR is proposing a moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

More than once, including at the present session of the United Nations General Assembly, the USSR has confirmed its readiness to bring into effect - of course if the United States of America agrees to it - a Soviet-American agreement on limiting underground nuclear-weapon tests, concluded in 1974, and the agreement on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes of 1976.

Guided by those considerations, the Soviet delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.48.

However, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.35, and in particular operative paragraph 6 (a), my delegation feels that it does not direct the Conference towards disarmament on the basis of practical negotiations for the purpose of reaching agreement but only requests it to resume its examination of issues relating to a comprehensive test ban. Operative paragraph 6 (c) also gives rise to objections, for it clearly demonstrates that here, as in the past, the primary purpose is to study the problem of verification. Such an approach is in contradiction to the will of a clear majority of States that are anxious for a rapid resumption of practical negotiations, as has been brought out during the

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

course of the debates of the General Assembly at its present session. The Soviet Union will therefore abstain in the voting on draft resolution L.35.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.37 on the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes, the Soviet delegation will also abstain in the voting. As we have frequently stressed, the Soviet Union favours a businesslike approach to the elaboration, adoption and stage-by-stage implementation of a programme of nuclear disarmament leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. As one of the first steps in such a process it would be feasible to examine the question of prohibiting the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. Such a measure could also be part of a freeze on nuclear weapons, as is proposed in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union on this subject. The draft resolution in L.37, however, prohibits the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes and, as in the past, begs the question of the solution of the problem of ending and reversing the nuclear arms race. We are convinced that such an approach does not work in the interests of progress in this area.

Mr. HARLAND (New Zealand): New Zealand is opposed to nuclear testing. We want to see it stopped. On 11 November I introduced in this Committee the draft resolution in document A/C.1/38/L.35 stressing the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. My delegation is also a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.37 calling for a prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

We would like to be able to support all the draft resolutions on this subject, and we are disappointed to find that two of them present some difficulties. Draft resolution in L.29, on the immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, has two serious deficiencies. First, the treaty it envisages would prohibit the testing of nuclear weapons only. As I pointed out in my earlier statement, any nuclear device that causes an explosion can be used for warlike purposes. A ban that is limited to the testing of nuclear weapons will not necessarily be completely effective. Secondly, this draft resolution says nothing about the need for verification, which is generally recognized to be an essential requirement for a test-ban treaty.

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/38/L.48 on the cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons to some extent parallels our own, but it has some of the same deficiencies as L.29. Although it recognizes the need to prohibit all

(Mr. Harland, New Zealand)

nuclear test explosions, the treaty it envisages being negotiated within a year is limited to the testing of nuclear weapons. The moratorium it calls for as an interim measure is likewise limited to the testing of nuclear weapons, and that moratorium is also limited to the three original parties to the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963 - the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union - which are no longer the only nuclear Powers.

We have a further and more general reservation that relates to both of the draft resolutions I am commenting on. As I pointed out in my earlier statement, nuclear testing cannot, in practice, be ended without the agreement of all the countries that have a nuclear capability. To have any practical effect a draft resolution on this subject must hold out some prospect for actual progress in the work of the Conference on Disarmament. In our view neither the draft resolution in L.29 nor that in L.48 meets this requirement.

Draft resolution in A/C.1/38/35, which is now sponsored by 20 delegations, represents the highest level of agreement that can be reached at the present time and holds out the best prospect for practical progress towards the accepted goal of ending all nuclear tests. New Zealand will vote in favour of that draft resolution, as well as in favour of L.37, on the cut-off of fissionable material. We shall abstain in the voting on the two draft resolutions in A/C.1/38/L.29 and L.48, respectively.

The CHAIRMAN: In connection with the statement by the delegation of New Zealand, I would like to remind that delegation and other delegations that they should not explain their votes on draft resolutions of which they are co-sponsors.

Mr. JITOKO (Fiji): While we are in general support of the thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.48, my delegation nevertheless maintains its long-held view that that draft resolution, like its predecessors, is handicapped by its inability to take into account all the necessary elements and concerns of all delegations, including our own. For the draft resolution to have a truly all-embracing scope and be fully reflective of the United Nations efforts in this area it would have been preferable for it to include the total prohibition of all nuclear tests in all environments for all time.

However, given my Government's policy of general support - evident from our positions with regard to other disarmament items - for all initiatives, including

(Mr. Jitoko, Fiji)

those addressing only partial solutions but having as their ultimate objective the attainment of the over-all goal of general and complete disarmament, my delegation will nevertheless vote in favour of draft resolution L.48, our reservations as to its limit in scope and application notwithstanding.

The same is true of our position with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.29. Shed of its unnecessary, politically motivated coating, its central concern does embody the essential consideration of my delegation with regard to the urgency of the problem to which the draft resolution is addressed, namely, the immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. Again our support, as for last year's draft resolution, is to be seen in the light of the reservation we have just expressed with regard to L.48.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The vote of the French delegation on the draft resolutions before us reflect the position that has often been reiterated by the French Government on nuclear testing.

The ban in our view should be placed within the framework of an effective nuclear disarmament process as noted in paragraph 51 of the 1978 Final Document.

The French Government could therefore associate itself with measures to reduce nuclear weapons unless they were supervised and because only when the two main nuclear Powers have themselves, by the size of the reduction in their own nuclear arsenals, created the conditions permitting France in turn to enter into commitments affecting the limitation of its nuclear means and, within this framework, commitments related to its own nuclear testing.

In the absence of these conditions, France is not in a position to take part in the work under way towards the elaboration of a nuclear-test-ban treaty. This is why the French delegation cannot vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.29, L.35 and L.48 which would involve France in the elaboration of such a treaty.

Mr. DUBEY (India): The Indian delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.29 and abstain in the votes on draft resolutions L.35, L.37 and L.48.

I should like to explain our votes on the last three draft resolutions.

It is the considered view of the Indian delegation that a treaty on a nuclear test ban should aim at a genuine and complete ban on the testing of nuclear weapons by all States in all environments for all time. Although draft resolution

(Mr. Dubey, India)

A/C.1/38/L.35 recalls this scope of a test-ban treaty in its preamble, its operative paragraph 2 is at variance with this generally accepted scope of a treaty on a nuclear test ban. In its operative paragraph 6 (c) it stresses the monitoring of atmospheric radioactivity within the context of such a treaty, which in the view of our delegation is not necessary. By asking the Committee on Disarmament to clutter up the agenda of its Ad Hoc Working Group on a Nuclear-Test-Ban with such issues, this draft resolution, we fear, would only serve to impede progress in the work of the Committee on Disarmament towards the negotiation of a treaty on a nuclear test ban.

It is also our firm conviction that the first necessary step for achieving progress in negotiating a nuclear-test-ban treaty is to revise the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group so as to enable it actually to negotiate the articles of a treaty rather than remaining bogged down in a discussion of the peripheral issue of further refining and perfecting the already adequate means of verification available at present.

For that reason India will abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.37, paragraph 50 the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has set forth the various stages of the process of nuclear disarmament. One of the stages in that process consists of

"Cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, and of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes." (S-10/2, para. 50 (b))

India has consistently abstained on proposals seeking to separate the question of cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapon purposes, precisely because such a one-sided and partial approach is inconsistent with the approach agreed upon by consensus in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament.

In our view there ought to be a simultaneous stoppage of the production of nuclear weapons and of all fissionable material for weapons purposes. In that event, all States, including the nuclear-weapon States, would have no valid reasons for not accepting the same system of equitable and non-discriminatory safeguards on all their nuclear facilities.

India will continue to abstain on such proposals and will accordingly abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.37.

(Mr. Dubey, India)

Finally on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.44, India will abstain in the voting since we cannot accept the linkage that has been suggested in it between a comprehensive ban on the testing of nuclear weapons and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The international community has solemnly and repeatedly declared the objective of a comprehensive test-ban as a matter of highest priority on its own intrinsic merits and has consistently called for the immediate cessation of all explosions of nuclear weapons by all nuclear-weapon States in all environments pending the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We cannot therefore go along with any provision which might have the effect of diluting or eroding such an unequivocal declaration of the international community.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil): I should like to explain the vote of the Brazilian delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.35 and L.48.

My delegation will vote for draft resolution L.35, having in mind especially the procedural recommendations contained in its operative paragraph 6. We believe that the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Nuclear-Test Ban in the Committee on Disarmament should be given a clear negotiating mandate and start forthwith the elaboration of a draft treaty. The trend towards that development expressed in the draft resolution is a positive one and deserves to be encouraged. Our affirmative vote, however, should not be understood as in any way endorsing its sections dealing with the scope of the future ban. Brazil remains convinced that the prohibition should encompass all tests of all nuclear weapons in all environments for all time to come.

My delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.48, in spite of its positive elements, such as the provisions leading to immediate negotiations of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, or those requiring nuclear-weapon States not to violate their obligations undertaken under the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty.

Unfortunately, draft resolution L.48 draws conclusions and establishes some linkages which are of doubtful relevance to the issue at hand. The delegation of Brazil does not accept, for example, the assertion in operative paragraph 3, according to which the prohibition of all nuclear-test explosions is indispensable for the success of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, an instrument that sanctions discrimination and perpetuates imbalances. Furthermore, the Non-Proliferation

(Mr. Souza e Silva, Brazil)

Treaty is not an adequate framework for the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects, as experience has abundantly proved.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish very briefly to explain my delegation's vote on the draft resolutions in cluster 5.

As is well known, the Argentine Republic has been and continues to be firmly in favour of the complete prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests - and I stress nuclear-weapon. At the same time, it is also well known that my delegation disagrees with any attempt to limit the possible peaceful uses of nuclear energy. On the basis of these two elements, my delegation has determined its position in relation to the draft resolutions on which we are about to vote.

My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.29 precisely because it refers specifically and in satisfactory wording to the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

However, we shall not be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/38/L.35 because its scope is far more general. We shall therefore abstain in the vote on that draft resolution, but not without commending the efforts made by its sponsors to mitigate some objectionable elements that in our view were contained in similar draft resolutions in past years.

Similar reasons are behind our abstention on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/38/L.37.

Finally, in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.48, which refers to the cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons, my delegation has supported similar draft resolutions submitted by the same sponsors in previous sessions. This year - unfortunately, in our view - a sort of direct link has been introduced between this item and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, with regard to which the position of my Government is very well known and it is unnecessary for me to reiterate it. Therefore, although I regret it very much, it will not be possible for us to support this draft resolution this year, as we would have wished, and we shall abstain on it.

Mr. NÚÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation will abstain in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.35 and L.37 and vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.29 and L.48.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.48, I should like to point out that the favourable vote of my delegation does not constitute a change in my

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

Government's position on the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, referred to in paragraph 5 of this draft resolution.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): As a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.29, I should like to take this opportunity to comment only on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.35 and A/C.1/38/L.37.

The Mongolian delegation has set out its position on more than one occasion on the questions dealt with by these draft resolutions. I shall not therefore reiterate our position at this stage now that we have come to the voting, in the course of which we shall abstain on them.

As far as draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.48 is concerned, the Mongolian delegation will vote in favour. We should simply like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to paragraph 5, which urges all States that have not yet done so to adhere to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water and, meanwhile, to refrain from testing in the environments covered by that Treaty. After having referred to that very important paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.48, let me say that because of that paragraph we believe the situation prevailing in the Committee on Disarmament is unsatisfactory, particularly as regards the activities of the Ad Hoc Working Group. We are ready to take part in the work of the subsidiary body. We are in favour of broadening the mandate of that Group and we hope that its work will be directed towards a generally acceptable agreement concerning a general and complete prohibition of all nuclear-weapon testing. However, our delegation is concerned at the fact that in that subsidiary body, all the nuclear Powers are not represented. The Mongolian delegation, representing as it does a country located in that part of Asia near one of the major Powers which has not adhered to the Treaty and which therefore does not take part in the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group, hopes that all the nuclear Powers members of the Committee on Disarmament will take an active part in the negotiations concerning this issue in the Committee on Disarmament. As we have already indicated, we shall vote in favour of this draft resolution.

Mr. KUNDA (Zambia): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.48 on the cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Kunda, Zambia)

My delegation supports the cessation of all explosions of nuclear weapons and therefore supports the thrust of this draft resolution. But what it finds objectionable is the fact that in paragraphs 4 and 7 draft resolution L.48 refers to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). These particular references are of tremendous concern to my delegation because we do not subscribe to the NPT and, consequently, my delegation will have to abstain in the voting on that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other delegation wishes to explain its vote before the voting, the Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 5.

We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.29. It was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee on 15 November and is sponsored by the following countries: Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam.

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, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Turkey, Venezuela

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.29 was adopted by 98 votes to 4, with 26 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.35. It is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Bahamas, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, Japan, Kenya, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, and Uruguay.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, India, Israel, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.35 was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 31 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.37. It was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 17 November and is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Romania, Singapore, Sweden, and Uruguay.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.37 was adopted by 106 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.48. It was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee on 15 November and is sponsored by the following countries: Bangladesh, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, Kenya, Mali, Mexico, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, 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, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, 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, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Turkey, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.48 was adopted by 100 votes to 2, with 28 abstentions.

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

Mr. MOUSSAOUI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): The Algerian delegation voted in favour of the four draft resolutions, A/C.1/38/L.29, L.35, L.37 and L.48, on which the Committee has just voted. However, despite our affirmative votes, we do not necessarily support each and every element in all of them. Draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.29 and L.48, despite certain elements which we feel are not completely satisfactory, nevertheless reflect a whole series of traditional concerns on the part of the Algerian delegation on the subject.

(Mr. Moussaoui, Algeria)

That is not the case with regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.35 and L.37, my delegation has clearer reservations. The position of my delegation with regard to a nuclear-test-ban treaty is the same as that of the Group of 21, in conformity with the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament. Clearly, draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.35 and L.37 are not really in conformity with the consensus established in the Final Document. Therefore our support for these two draft resolutions is limited to those aspects which are in keeping with the provisions of the Final Document. We have given our support to a very large extent because of the element concerning the urgent need for negotiations on the specific goal of disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, precisely at a time when international dialogue is being affected more closely than ever. This is all the more true of the multilateral negotiating process, and it seems to us very important that all opportunities for dialogue and negotiation should be encouraged.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): Ireland voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.48, on the cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons, L.29, on the immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, and L.35, on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. That we have done so is in line with our long-held view that a halt to nuclear testing is an essential step if we are to make any real progress towards nuclear disarmament. Over the years we have also called on the nuclear Powers to institute a moratorium on testing pending the negotiation of an agreement.

To underline the concern Ireland feels and the importance it attaches to agreement on a test ban, we have in recent years been a sponsor of draft resolutions on this question. This year, however, we decided, much to our regret, that we should not sponsor any of the draft resolutions before us. Ireland can support the general thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.48 and it also associates itself fully with the sense of urgency it clearly conveyed. We have great sympathy for the concern that inspired the sentiments set out in operative paragraph 3. We have frequently recorded our sense of frustration at the failure of the nuclear Powers parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to honour their commitments under the treaty. We have done so most recently in our statement in the general debate in this Committee. However, we would not draw the conclusions contained in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. That

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

paragraph, as it is drafted, in the view of my delegation detracts unfairly from the value of the non-proliferation Treaty.

I wish now to turn to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.35, on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. In our statement in the general debate in the First Committee, we expressed the view that at one time the political will to negotiate seriously a comprehensive test ban existed but that this commitment is no longer present. We have further expressed the view that the international community is now offered little more than a debate on the subject in the Committee on Disarmament. In this context, while we voted in favour of draft resolution L.35, we regret the fact that its language does not convey a greater sense of urgency.

We also supported draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.29 but we did so with some hesitation in view of the restricted nature of the scope of the proposals contained in it.

Ms. MAUALA (Samoa): My delegation co-sponsored and voted for draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.35 and abstained in the vote on draft resolutions L.48 and L.29, because we are convinced that what is essential is the total prohibition of all nuclear tests in all environments for all time, and that is the only position acceptable to us.

Mr. WISNOEMOERTI (Indonesia): In accordance with the long-held position of Indonesia on the question of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban treaty, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution on the subject contained in document A/C.1/38/L.35. We regret, however, that it falls short of the general expectations of the majority of States. The draft resolution merely requests, in operative paragraph 6 (a) that the Committee on Disarmament examine

"issues relating to a comprehensive test ban, with a view to the negotiation of a treaty on the subject".

In the view of my delegation, this would constitute a retrogression from the previous stance of the General Assembly. We are of the opinion that, after having adequately discussed the subject, the Committee on Disarmament should be requested to embark immediately on a serious negotiation for the elaboration of a treaty on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban and that for that purpose the Committee should revise the mandate of the Working Group on a Comprehensive Test Ban.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes our consideration of the draft resolutions in cluster 5.

We shall now turn to the draft resolutions listed in cluster 6: A/C.1/38/L.2, L.34 and L.43. As I stated when we took up cluster 5, I hope that delegations have had ample opportunity to state their views of a more general character during the general debate and that we can proceed immediately to explanations of vote before the voting on these three draft resolutions. If that is acceptable, I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes before the voting on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 6.

Mr. SKOGMO (Norway): Norway will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.43, on a nuclear arms freeze, while we shall vote against draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.2 and L.34, which also deal with the question of a nuclear-weapons freeze. Through our votes we wish to demonstrate that Norway is not opposed to the idea of a freeze as a measure in international arms control efforts. In fact a freeze might at one stage be entered into as a natural element in the arms control process. However, Norway does not consider that a freeze is an appropriate instrument if its application results in the preservation of serious military imbalances. Since this is clearly implied in several provisions of these draft resolutions, Norway can support neither of them.

In spite of these shortcomings, we have found some positive elements in draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.43 in contrast to the other two draft resolutions. We appreciate the fact that this draft resolution has at least some reference to verification, although somewhat insufficient, whereas the other two are totally lacking in a meaningful way in this regard. It also contains provisions on a comprehensive test ban which Norway supports. Besides, there are certain new elements which add positively to the proposal.

My Government wishes to stress that the most pressing need today is to attain agreed substantial reductions in nuclear arsenals. Hence, a call for a nuclear freeze must not complicate ongoing efforts to reduce imbalances and eliminate existing stocks of nuclear weapons.

Mr. DEPASSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The draft resolutions calling for a freeze on nuclear weapons indicate the concern on the part of the non-nuclear States that sponsored them - a concern we share - about the anguishing situation resulting from the accumulation of such weapons. But we feel

(Mr. Depasse, Belgium)

that to freeze the weapons at the present level would imply acquiescence in the existing disparity. We cannot accept this especially when countries are arrogating to themselves a monopoly of weapons that threaten my country's security. Negotiations on a freeze would only add to the difficulties in existing negotiations along the lines of the difficulties we have in verifying reductions in nuclear arsenals. Rather, we support negotiations on verifiable reductions of nuclear arsenals, in particular those in progress between the two major nuclear Powers.

Hence Belgium will not be able to support any of the proposals in draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.2, L.34 and L.43, when they are put to a vote.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connection with the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.34 and L.43 the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement.

In the opinion of the Soviet Union, a nuclear-weapon freeze, is an important and urgent task in the struggle to prevent nuclear war and to achieve disarmament. The nuclear-arms race, which has accelerated in recent years, has substantially increased the threat of nuclear war. Of particular concern is the circumstance that the unceasing nuclear-arms race in recent years has given rise to obstacles in the way of negotiations to curb it - obstacles which are leading these negotiations into a blind alley. A nuclear-weapon freeze could prevent this arms race and give additional impetus to efforts to achieve agreement on a radical reduction in nuclear-weapons arsenals.

Last year the General Assembly adopted two resolutions on this item, thus responding to the yearnings of the peoples of the world and the unprecedentedly broad movement of world public opinion on behalf of a nuclear-weapon freeze. In responding to the appeal from the United Nations and the demands of world public opinion, on 21 June the Soviet Government, in accordance with a decree of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of 16 June 1983, proposed to the Governments of other nuclear Powers that all nuclear-weapon States freeze all existing stockpiles of such weapons, qualitatively and quantitatively. Unfortunately our proposal has not yet encountered any positive response, but this does not necessarily mean that we can set aside the question of a freeze. Quite to the contrary, in our opinion it is necessary to strive even more actively for implementation of this important

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

measure, and the United Nations can play a major role in this respect. It is necessary to call on all nuclear-weapon States to proceed to a freeze, under appropriate controls, of all nuclear weapons they possess, both quantitatively and qualitatively - that is ending the growth in all components of nuclear arsenals, including all types of delivery vehicles and all types of nuclear matériel, without developing new types of such weapons, and establishing a moratorium on all nuclear-weapons testing as well as on the testing of new types of delivery vehicles. This calls for an end to the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons.

In this respect we consider that the Soviet Union and the United States, which possess the largest nuclear arsenals, must be the first simultaneously to implement a freeze on their nuclear weapons on a bilateral basis as an example to other nuclear-weapon Powers which the latter should follow by proceeding to a freeze of their own nuclear arsenals as soon as possible. It is also necessary to activate all efforts aimed at the speedy achievement of agreement on substantial limitations - I repeat: substantial limitations - and radical reductions of nuclear weapons, bearing in mind their total ultimate liquidation.

Inasmuch as draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.34 and L.43 on the whole have been included in this cluster along these lines, we shall vote for them. In this respect we should like to state that we consider that the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.34 relates to States possessing nuclear weapons that not only do not undertake any initiatives with respect to a freeze but also speak out against this important measure.

Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic): My delegation, which is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.2 on a nuclear-weapon freeze, supports draft resolutions L.34 and L.43. A freeze on nuclear weapons in both qualitative and quantitative terms by all nuclear-weapon States has become the most comprehensive demand of those forces opposed to nuclear war, be they at the level of Governments or of mass movements. Such a freeze would have the following implications: the cessation of a build-up of all components of nuclear arsenals, including all kinds of nuclear delivery systems and all kinds of nuclear weapons - strategic, medium-range or tactical; the non-deployment of new types of nuclear weapons in any region of the world, including of course Asia and Western Europe; the establishment

(Mr. Krutzsch, German
Democratic Republic)

of a moratorium of all nuclear-weapon tests and on new types and kinds of delivery systems; and the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for the purpose of creating nuclear weapons.

Both draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.2 and L.43 reflect those demands in essentially the same sense.

The progressing consensus on the content of what has to be understood by "nuclear-weapon freeze" will be an important motive force in the further pursuit of efforts aimed at achieving this goal. Such efforts have an important foundation in the firm conviction, as stated in the preamble of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.43,

"... that at present the conditions are most propitious for such a freeze, since the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America are now equivalent in nuclear military power and it seems evident that there exists between them an overall rough parity."

Allegations that there exists a nuclear imbalance to the advantage of the USSR were convincingly refuted in the introductory statement on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.43 as completely unfounded. The same goes for the alleged difficulties as regards the verification of a freeze agreement.

To the arguments put forward in respect of verification, we merely wish to add the following. The current nuclear-weapon modernization programmes concentrate precisely on the development, production and deployment of weapon systems, a verifiable ban on which involves extraordinary difficulties. Those programmes are being pursued by the very nuclear-weapon Power which has made the low-verifiability objection the principal device for preventing any measures for putting an end to the nuclear arms race and achieving nuclear disarmament and is now setting it against the call for a nuclear-arms freeze.

My delegation's positive stance on the whole set of pertinent draft resolutions corresponds with the Warsaw Treaty countries' fundamental position as set out in the Prague Political Declaration of 5 January 1983 and the Joint Statement adopted by their leaders at the Moscow Meeting of 28 June 1983.

As the nuclear-weapon Power among the member countries of that defensive alliance, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has unequivocally expressed its readiness for immediate steps in this field. That is evident not least by its

(Mr. Krutzsch, German
Democratic Republic)

positions and proposals presented at this session of the United Nations General Assembly, especially the Soviet-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.2, as well as its unilateral move in freezing its medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe for the duration of the relevant talks.

The statement in draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.34 that "nuclear-weapon States have not so far taken any action in response to the call made in resolution 37/100 A" must, for the sake of completeness in this matter, be seen in the context of those facts.

Taking into account the basic content and the chief demands of the draft resolutions in question, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic supports all of them and will vote in favour.

Mr. LOEB (United States of America): I welcome this opportunity to discuss draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.2, L.34 and L.43 on a nuclear freeze.

Over the past year the issue of a United States-Soviet nuclear-weapon freeze has attracted widespread attention. Resolutions supporting such a freeze have been submitted to the United States Congress and to this body. Nuclear freeze proposals have been on numerous ballots throughout the United States - and that is as it should be, for in open societies such as that of the United States vital questions of nuclear disarmament are openly and freely debated.

The United States Government recognizes that most nuclear-freeze proposals arise out of a profound concern over nuclear war. We fully share that concern. As President Reagan himself has said, "in such a war there can be no winners". We also know that various nuclear-freeze proposals are supported by many who are deeply committed to arms control, and we too share that commitment.

The debate here is not over ends; it is about means. The issue is how to translate good intentions into effective arms control.

My Government believes that various nuclear-freeze proposals - however well intentioned they may be and however attractive they may seem - would not achieve their stated purpose; on the contrary, we believe a freeze would decrease international stability and ultimately increase, not decrease, the danger of war for the following reasons.

First, a freeze is just not good enough. The United States does not want to cap deployments at current levels. We want significant reductions in nuclear arms

(Mr. Loeb, United States)

on both sides. Our START and intermediate nuclear forces proposals should be familiar to all present here today. They offer an opportunity for substantial and verifiable nuclear arms reductions. Despite continued Soviet deployments while both these negotiations have been under way, we have been committed to real reductions. We will remain flexible in our approach. We will not walk away from the negotiating table. The United States has offered a 50 per cent cut in the number of warheads on both sides; the Soviet Union has countered with an approximate 20 per cent reduction in the number of missiles on each side. Shall we ignore those proposals and go backwards to an agreement which even the optimists tell us would take years to negotiate and which would freeze nuclear arsenals at existing levels?

Secondly, a freeze would make significant arms control more difficult. The Soviet Union would have little or no incentive to agree to reductions in strategic and intermediate-range nuclear arms if they could simply freeze the existing military situation. Unilateral United States restraint during the 1970s - which was tantamount to a freeze on our part - did not produce Soviet restraint; on the contrary, the Soviet Union carried out the most intensive conventional and military build-up in peace-time history. In the area of intermediate-range nuclear forces, the Soviet Union initially refused our offers to negotiate while it steadily deployed hundreds of multi-warhead SS-20 missile systems. The USSR agreed to join us at the negotiating table only when it became clear that we and our allies were prepared - if our much preferred course of substantial arms reductions failed - to take steps to counter the Soviet deployments.

Thirdly, a freeze at existing levels would back the United States and its allies into a position of destabilizing military vulnerability. The freeze would prevent us from correcting existing dangerous deficiencies in our nuclear forces caused by the sustained Soviet build-up over the past decade and a half. For example, almost 75 per cent of Soviet nuclear systems are under five years old and about 75 per cent of comparable United States systems are over 15 years old. To correct this destabilizing and unsafe balance, the United States has offered the build-down proposals, which would significantly reduce the nuclear arsenals of both sides while replacing old, unsafe weapons systems with fewer and safer systems.

(Mr. Loeb, United States)

Finally, a freeze on all testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons would include important elements which could not be verified. They could not be verified in the absence of special arrangements for that purpose. Unfortunately, given the Soviet attitude towards verification, such arrangements would probably take many years to negotiate. As any policy-maker responsible for his nation's national security can attest, one cannot afford to base national security on trust in his potential adversary.

The United States is committed to equitable and verifiable arms control aimed at substantial reductions in military forces, nuclear and conventional. A nuclear freeze would not promote reductions, equality or verifiability. We can and must do better than a freeze. My delegation will therefore vote against draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.2, L.34 and L.43.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation will have to vote against the draft resolutions on a nuclear-weapon freeze, contained in documents A/C.1/38/L.2, L.34 and L.43. We should like briefly to state our reasons for so doing.

First, a nuclear-weapon freeze would, by definition, freeze the situation as it now exists and, consequently, the existing imbalances and the risks they would entail for the security of the States concerned. A freeze would also be tantamount to conferring upon any State that had made a significant effort at acquiring such weapons a lasting advantage over States that would have limited such efforts. Furthermore, such a freeze would be very difficult to verify, and the negotiations necessary to ensure its verification would be no less lengthy and complex than the negotiations on verification measures with regard to an agreement on the reduction of nuclear weapons.

Finally, a nuclear-weapon freeze, to the extent that a Power might benefit from it, runs the risk of having a negative impact on its readiness to negotiate and its will to enter into serious negotiations on a reduction of nuclear weapons. Thus, progress towards a reduction in nuclear-weapon arsenals would in no way be promoted by a freeze on such weapons. The path to such reductions is that of negotiations between the two major nuclear-weapon Powers, negotiations that should begin with a definition and establishment of a balance satisfactory to both sides.

The CHAIRMAN: The First Committee will now take decisions on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 6.

The first is contained in document A/C.1/38/L.2. It was introduced by the representative of the Soviet Union at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 17 November and is sponsored by the following countries: Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, 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: Australia, Bahamas, Chad, China, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Liberia, Malawi, Morocco, Paraguay, Philippines, Somalia, Swaziland, Sweden, Uruguay, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.2 was adopted by 84 votes to 19, with 17 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.34. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 17 November and is sponsored by the following countries: India and Mali.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, China, Ghana, Iceland, Japan, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.34 was adopted by 101 votes to 15, with 7 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.43. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee on 15 November and is sponsored by the following countries: Colombia, Ecuador, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Sweden and Uruguay.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Denmark, Iceland, Netherlands, Norway, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.43 was adopted by 101 votes to 14, with 7 abstentions.

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

Mr. STEPHANOU (Greece) (interpretation from French): By voting in favour of the draft resolutions on a nuclear weapon freeze, the Greek delegation wishes to emphasize that this stand is in conformity with our position to support any effort aimed at reducing nuclear weapons at the lowest possible level. We also feel that conventional weapons should be dealt with on an equal footing, since today's technology has made them weapons of mass destruction. The stockpiling of conventional weapons is a threat to international peace and security. Furthermore, we believe that the balance of conventional weapons at the lowest possible level is a decisive factor in preventing a nuclear confrontation, towards which all our efforts should be aimed.

Mr. Van der STOEL (Netherlands): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.43, submitted by Mexico and Sweden. We did so in spite of the fact that its text contains a number of serious shortcomings which made our decision to abstain an extremely difficult one.

The first example of these shortcomings is that no account has been taken of the fact that it presupposes a global nuclear balance, when in reality no beginning of a balance exists with regard to the intermediate range nuclear-weapons that cover Europe.

As members undoubtedly know, we are involved in endeavours to redress this imbalance, first and foremost through arms control negotiations within the context of the intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) talks in Geneva. A freeze now would perpetuate the existing gross imbalance which threatens our security.

Secondly, and more generally, we hold the view that a declaratory type of freeze as the one proposed would run the risk of undermining current negotiations not only on INF but also on the strategic arms reduction talks (START). These negotiations are aimed at drastic reductions of nuclear armaments leading to a balance at the lower and more stable level. There is no ground for relinquishing the hope that these negotiations will produce results. A freeze might play a more useful role in nuclear disarmament progress when an appropriate balance has been reached. Moreover, the sponsors of the draft resolution grossly underestimate the verification problems involved with respect to the freeze measures they propose. For some of these measures, it would be nearly impossible to find acceptable verification measures. For others, verification is certainly possible in theory but would need to be worked out in painstaking negotiations. To declare a freeeze without having solved these problems first does not seem the right approach to this vital question.

Finally, I am obliged to state my rejection of the fourth preambular paragraph which contains language about the strategy of nuclear deterrence which is totally unwarranted and out of context. I wish to stress in all clarity that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) strategy of deterrence serves the purpose of deterring a possible aggressor and preventing the outbreak of an armed conflict. We are disappointed that the drafters of this draft resolution found it necessary to add this element to last year's text.

(Mr. Van der Stoel, Netherlands)

Notwithstanding these serious shortcomings, my delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in question. We did so because we considered it important that the world community assembled here in this forum give a clear signal that the nuclear arsenals of both super-Powers are super-abundant and that the nuclear arms race should be brought to an end.

Nuclear issues are deeply felt in my country. The question of how to reduce the numbers and the role of nuclear armaments is very intensely debated both in Parliament and by the public at large. The fact that about 550,000 persons recently demonstrated in the streets of The Hague testifies to this deep emotional commitment. The Netherlands Government has constantly advocated and practised a policy of arms control and restraint. We have, more particularly, sponsored some of the specific measures proposed in this draft resolution, such as a comprehensive test-ban treaty, a cut-off in the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes and, as I have indicated, with regard to a freeze on nuclear weapons under certain conditions as a potentially important step in the process of arms control and reduction.

Those are the considerations that made my Government decide to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.43, although the text itself might well have warranted a negative vote.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.2 on a nuclear-weapon freeze proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics because it offers no guarantees for verification. We believe that this is an extremely important element when a proposal of the nature of a nuclear freeze is made, because it inspires confidence. For the same reason Costa Rica voted in favour of a similar proposal from India, as contained in draft resolution L.34, the second preambular paragraph of which includes the concept of effective international verification or control. Similarly, we supported draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.43, introduced by Mexico and co-sponsored by Ecuador, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Sweden and Uruguay, because, among other things it recalled the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament adopted in 1978, unanimously and categorically reaffirmed in 1982 during the second special session devoted to disarmament. It recognizes:

"that a nuclear arms freeze, while not an end in itself, would constitute the most effective first step for the achievement of the above-mentioned two

(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

objectives, since it would provide a favourable environment for the conduct of the reduction negotiations while, at the same time, preventing the continued increase and qualitative improvement of existing nuclear weaponry during the period when the negotiations would take place."

Operative paragraph 1 proposes practical measures and ideas to achieve the ultimate aim of this draft resolution towards a comprehensive disarmament programme. Its sub-paragraph (b) states that the nuclear-freeze would be subject to:

"all relevant measures and procedures of verification which have already been agreed by the parties in the case of the SALT I and SALT II treaties, as well as those agreed upon in principle by them during the preparatory trilateral negotiations on the comprehensive test ban held at Geneva".

For this reason Costa Rica supported this draft resolution.

Mr. WISNOEMOERTI (Indonesia): My delegation supports the major thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.2. It contains positive elements, including the call for a freeze on all nuclear weapons. It should be emphasized, however, that a freeze is only a means and not an end in itself. For that reason, the importance of a nuclear-weapon freeze should be judged in conjunction with the final paragraph of that draft resolution, which stresses the urgent need to intensify efforts aimed at the speedy achievement of agreements on substantial limitations and radical reductions of nuclear weapons with a view to their complete elimination as the ultimate goal.

Mr. MULONGANDUSU ESUK (Zaire) (interpretation from French): We have been told that existing weapon stocks in the world are enough to destroy our good old Earth 20 or 30 times over. Since I am from a warm country, the word "freeze" makes me think about the cold. But it seems here that a freeze on weapons would consist rather in keeping them ready and warm for use, because there are no measures of effective verification. These considerations led my delegation to abstain in the vote, not because it is uninterested in the question, but to incite all negotiators to provide evidence of greater flexibility in their discussions.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.