

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
Official Records*



FIRST COMMITTEE
47th meeting
held on
Monday, 26 November 1984
at 11 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil)

CONTENTS

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF HIS EXCELLENCY MR. ALEKSEY FEDOSSEEVICH VATCHENKO, HEAD OF STATE AND CHAIRMAN OF THE PRESIDUM OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

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

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room 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.1/39/PV.47
28 November 1984

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MR. ALEKSEY FEDOSSEEVICH VATCHENKO, HEAD OF STATE AND CHAIRMAN OF THE PRESIDUM OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

The PRESIDENT: I regret to announce with deep sorrow the passing away of His Excellency Mr. Aleksey Fedosseevich Vatchenko, Head of State and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. May I ask representatives to stand and observe a minute of silence in memory of His Excellency.

The members of the First Committee observed a minute of silence.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Japan, who will speak on behalf of the Asian Group.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): On behalf of the Group of Asian States, I wish to express our sincere sorrow on learning of the untimely passing of His Excellency Mr. Aleksey Fedosseevich Vatchenko, Head of State and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. His Excellency Mr. Vatchenko was an esteemed leader, and his passing is a profound loss to his great country.

At this time of mourning I should like to extend our sincere condolences to the Government and people of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, to the members of the Ukrainian Mission to the United Nations and, in particular, to the bereaved family of Chairman Vatchenko.

The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Poland, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States.

Mr. TURBANSKI (Poland): I wish on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States to convey to the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and, through it, to the Government and the people of the Soviet Ukraine our most sincere and heartfelt condolences on the untimely demise of Comrade Aleksey Fedosseevich Vatchenko, Head of State, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, Vice-Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and Hero of Socialist Labour.

A veteran of the heroic struggle of the Soviet peoples against the Nazi invaders during the Second World War, after the glorious victory in 1945 Comrade Vatchenko occupied various important State and Party posts; since 1976 he had been the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR. In all the posts entrusted to him, Comrade Vatchenko devoted all his energies, knowledge and experience to the development of the Soviet Ukraine, to the consolidation of international peace and security and to the development of friendly relations and co-operation among States and peoples. His valuable contribution in all those fields will be remembered by all of us.

At this painful moment, we share the sadness and sorrow of the fraternal people of the Soviet Ukraine.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Argentina, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Latin American States.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish on behalf of the Group of Latin American States to convey our deep condolences to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic on the passing of Mr. Aleksey Fedosseevich Vatchenko, Head of State and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR. As has already been recalled, Mr. Vatchenko was an important political figure in his country. His career was an impressive one. This explains the sorrow with which the people of the Ukraine heard of his death.

I wish to convey to the Permanent Mission, the Government and the people of the Ukraine the sincere condolences of the Latin American countries on their loss.

The CHAIRMAN: I call next on the representative of Turkey, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Western European and Other States.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): I wish to associate the Group of Western European and Other States with the deep condolences expressed on the occasion of the demise of the Head of State of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on the representative of Cameroon, who will speak on behalf of the Group of African States.

Mr. SOB (Cameroon) (interpretation from French): It was with deep sorrow that the African Group learnt of the passing of His Excellency Mr. Aleksey Vatchenko, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

We wish at this sad time to recall the constant support of the deceased for the African liberation struggle. I therefore wish, on behalf of the African Group, to convey to the Government and the people of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and to the family of the deceased, our heartfelt condolences.

The CHAIRMAN: I call next on the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Mr. LIPATOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR wishes to express its gratitude to you, Sir, and to all representatives who have expressed condolences and sympathy at the passing of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, Aleksey Fedosseevich Vatchenko. We are deeply touched by the warm sentiments and feelings expressed here.

Mr. Vatchenko's life and activities, particularly the period of his Chairmanship of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, were totally devoted to attempting to complete the most important tasks of the political, social and economic development of the Republic. He struggled consistently to strengthen peace, to avert the threat of thermonuclear war and to strengthen and broaden friendly relations and co-operation among peoples.

The shining example set by Mr. Vatchenko will remain always in our hearts. We shall convey to the Government and the people of the Ukrainian SSR and to the members of Mr. Vatchenko's family the condolences which have been expressed.

AGENDA ITEMS 46, 47, 53, 54, 56, 59, 60, 62, 64 and 142 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean to introduce the report of that body.

Mr. WIJEWARDANE (Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean): I wish first of all to associate myself, on behalf of my delegation, with the expressions of sorrow and condolence on the passing of the Head of State of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

(Mr. Wijewardane, Chairman,
Ad Hoc Committee on the
Indian Ocean)

It is now my great pleasure and honour, in my capacity as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, to introduce the report of the Committee, as contained in document A/39/29, prepared pursuant to General Assembly resolution 38/185 of 20 December 1983.

By the terms of that resolution, the Ad Hoc Committee, inter alia, was requested to make decisive efforts in 1984 to complete preparatory work relating to the Conference on the Indian Ocean, in consideration of the political and security climate in the region and with a view to enable the opening of the Conference at Colombo in the first half of 1985, it being understood that such preparatory work would comprise organizational matters, including the provisional agenda for the Conference, rules of procedure, documentation and consideration of appropriate arrangements for any international agreement that might ultimately be reached for the maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, and substantive issues.

At the same time, the Committee was requested also to make determined efforts in 1984 for the necessary harmonization of views on the remaining relevant issues.

(Mr. Wijewardane, Chairman,
Ad Hoc Committee on the
Indian Ocean)

During 1984 the Ad Hoc Committee held three sessions, from 12 to 23 March, from 9 to 20 July and from 20 to 31 August, and one additional meeting on 21 November, when the Committee adopted its report, which is now before the First Committee. In the course of the year, the Ad Hoc Committee held 32 formal meetings as well as a number of informal meetings.

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee as contained in document A/39/29 consists of three parts, namely, part I - Introduction; part II - Work of the Ad Hoc Committee during the year; and part III - Recommendation, which is in the form of a draft resolution to be submitted to the General Assembly.

At its sessions in 1984, the Committee concentrated its efforts on the preparatory work for the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean, as indicated in its agenda item 6, particularly the provisional agenda and the provisional rules of procedure for the Conference. During the course of its deliberations, the Committee also agreed that decisions in matters affecting the Indian Ocean be taken by consensus, a formulation on the decision-making process to guide the Committee's work.

Regarding the question of participation in its work, the Ad Hoc Committee this year was enlarged by the addition of one new member. Following its application for membership in the Ad Hoc Committee, the President of the General Assembly, on the basis of a recommendation of the Committee pursuant to paragraph 1 of resolution 34/80 B, appointed Uganda as the forty-eighth member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

During the latter part of its work this year, the Ad Hoc Committee considered its recommendation to the General Assembly in the form of a draft resolution which was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka on behalf of the non-aligned States members of the Committee and was subsequently amended, through intensive consultations in an informal drafting group, and adopted as reflected in part III of the report of the Committee contained in document A/39/29.

In the preambular part of the draft resolution the General Assembly would, inter alia, call for the renewal of genuinely constructive efforts through the exercise of the political will necessary for the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and is convinced that the continued deterioration of the political and security climate in the Indian Ocean

(Mr. Wijewardane, Chairman,
Ad Hoc Committee on the
Indian Ocean)

area is an important consideration bearing on the question of the urgent convening of the Conference and that the easing of tension in the area would enhance the prospect of success being achieved by the Conference.

In the operative part of the draft resolution, paragraphs 4 and 5, which are the result of a great effort of negotiation among delegations, contain the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee with reference to preparatory work to be attended to by the Committee in 1985:

"4. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee, taking into account the political and security climate in the region, to complete preparatory work relating to the Conference on the Indian Ocean in 1985, in order to enable the opening of the Conference at Colombo thereafter at the earliest date in the first half of 1986 to be decided by the Committee in consultation with the host country;

"5. Decides that preparatory work would comprise organizational matters and substantive issues, including the provisional agenda for the Conference, rules of procedure, participation, stages of conference, level of representation, documentation, consideration of appropriate arrangements for any international agreements that may ultimately be reached for the maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and the preparation of the draft final document of the Conference." (A/39/29, para. 20)

Moreover, the General Assembly, by the draft resolution, would renew the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee as defined in the relevant resolutions and would request the Committee to hold three further preparatory sessions in 1985 of a duration of two weeks each with the possibility of holding a fourth session to be considered as required.

I wish to make a few remarks regarding the work of the Ad Hoc Committee during 1984 in a general assessment. The Committee took the step of charging a small but representative group to negotiate on the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.159/L.63. That decision was taken at the end of our third formal session in August. This small group assisted me in negotiating the draft resolution which appears in part III of the report before you. I am happy to inform the First Committee that at its 262nd meeting, held on 21 November 1984, the draft resolution was adopted by the Ad Hoc Committee by consensus.

The second part of the report deals with the work of the Ad Hoc Committee in the year 1984. In our work during the year, we took a decision to accept a

(Mr. Wijewardane, Chairman,
Ad Hoc Committee on the
Indian Ocean)

formulation concerning the decision-making process in the Ad Hoc Committee which I will quote in extenso:

"The procedure of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in the matter of making decisions has recently received the attention of the Committee.

"On the basis of consultations held by the Chairman with delegations and groups of delegations in the Committee, there is general recognition among delegations of the importance and desirability of securing the widest acceptance of decisions affecting the Indian Ocean. It is the understanding of the Chairman that the Committee shall continue to function on the basis of its normal methods of work and all delegations have agreed that decisions in matters affecting the Indian Ocean are taken by consensus, it being understood that consensus means the absence of any formal objection submitted by a delegation against taking a decision." (A/39/29, para. 12)

This formulation on decision making has guided us in our work in the Ad Hoc Committee and we have applied it to the decisions affecting the Indian Ocean.

Part III of the report contains our recommendation to the General Assembly for the adoption of the draft resolution. As I have stated earlier, the document was accepted by consensus at the Ad Hoc Committee at its 262nd meeting, held on 21 November. I have much pleasure in presenting this report to you.

Since the report has been accepted by consensus by the Ad Hoc Committee and has the support of its membership, I hope that it will also meet with the acceptance of the entire membership of the First Committee so that we can adopt the report along with the draft resolution by consensus.

At the same time, permit me to express my sincere gratitude to all members of the Ad Hoc Committee for their co-operation and spirit of accommodation and compromise, particularly those Friends of the Chairman for their hard work and friendship, which enabled the Committee to adopt its report, in particular the draft resolution contained therein, by consensus. On behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee, I wish also to express our thanks to the members of the Secretariat for their invaluable assistance to me in the work of the Committee. I would in particular recall here with appreciation Mr. Kheradi's assistance to me in my work as Chairman.

Let me convey to you, Mr. Chairman, the gratitude of both the members of the Ad Hoc Committee and myself for your courtesy in giving us time after the scheduled

(Mr. Wijewardane, Chairman,
Ad Hoc Committee on the
Indian Ocean)

date for presentation of draft resolutions. Your gesture has been deeply appreciated by us in the Ad Hoc Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we embark on the business scheduled for this morning, I shall call on the representative of Sri Lanka to introduce an amendment to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.1.

Mr. DHANAPALA (Sri Lanka): On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/39/L.37, I have to introduce certain amendments which will be reflected in a new document, A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2, which the Secretariat has kindly indicated to me they will process in due form this afternoon. I am conscious of the fact that document A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.1 has already appeared this morning and there may be some confusion as a consequence of the amendments that I am going to suggest.

(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

I would recall that at the beginning my delegation expressed the wish that this Committee work towards a single draft resolution on the subject of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We achieved that objective last year, and, in the light of developments this year, my delegation was encouraged to believe that the same achievement would be repeated. I am happy to report that we have been successful in that endeavour.

Our desire for a single draft resolution on this critically important subject arises not from an idle desire to prevent the proliferation of resolutions for its own sake. It is based rather on a deep conviction that at this crucial juncture it is necessary for the international community to speak with one voice on the subject of preventing an arms race in outer space. A single resolution would represent an undisputed and universal commitment to the basic principles underlying the prevention of an arms race in outer space. These principles reside in the United Nations Charter and treaties such as the 1967 Treaty on Outer Space. They have been reaffirmed, amplified and supplemented in the draft resolution which will be placed before the Committee.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.1, L.3 and L.61 for their co-operation and assistance in negotiating a revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37 which accommodates as far as possible the views of their delegations. The flexibility and the desire for compromise on the part of the sponsors of all these draft resolutions have resulted in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2.

It is not necessary for me to comment in detail on the changes made to the original draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37 in the proposed draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2. However, I wish to state that we have introduced a new fourth preambular paragraph, which will read as follows:

"Reaffirming further the will of all States that the exploration and use of outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, shall be for peaceful purposes".

The ninth preambular paragraph would be amended to read as follows:

"Gravely concerned at the danger posed to all mankind by an arms race in outer space, in particular the impending danger of exacerbating the current state of insecurity by developments which could further undermine international peace and security".

(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

The fourteenth preambular paragraph would be amended to read as follows:

"Deeply regretting that bilateral negotiations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the prevention of an arms race in outer space have not taken place".

The seventeenth and final preambular paragraph would now read as follows:

"Expressing its deep concern and disappointment that, although there was no objection, in principle, to the establishment without delay of such an ad hoc committee, the Conference on Disarmament has not thus far been able to reach agreement on a mandate for the ad hoc committee during its 1984 session".

Those are all the amendments as far as the preambular part is concerned.

With regard to the operative part of the draft resolution, we have a new paragraph 1, which reads:

"Recalls the obligation of all States to refrain from the threat or use of force in their space activities".

Operative paragraph 3 will now be worded as follows:

"Emphasizes that further measures, with appropriate and effective provisions for verification, to prevent an arms race in outer space should be adopted by the international community".

Operative paragraph 4 would now read:

"Calls upon all States, in particular those with major space capabilities, to contribute actively to the objective of the peaceful use of outer space and to take immediate measures to prevent an arms race in outer space in the interest of maintaining international peace and security and promoting international co-operation and understanding".

Operative paragraph 5 also has a minor amendment and would now read:

"Reiterates that the Conference on Disarmament, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has the primary role in the negotiation of a multilateral agreement or agreements, as appropriate, on the prevention of an arms race in all its aspects in outer space".

Operative paragraph 7 would now read:

"Also requests the Conference on Disarmament to intensify its consideration of the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space in all its aspects, taking into account all relevant proposals, including those presented at the thirty-ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly".

(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

Finally, operative paragraph 9 would read as follows:

"Urges the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to initiate immediately and in a constructive spirit negotiations aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space and to advise the Conference on Disarmament regularly of the progress of their bilateral negotiations so as to facilitate its work".

Those are the amendments that will be incorporated in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.37/Rev.2, which I hope will appear this afternoon, and they constitute the changes that have been negotiated with the sponsors of the other draft resolutions so that there would now be a single draft resolution on this subject which will be placed before the Committee for action.

(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

May I once again take this opportunity of thanking the participants in the negotiations for their patience and co-operation in the task that we have just completed. I have no grand claims for the draft resolution we shall adopt. It is a modest achievement against the background of the giant leaps in the arms race that threatens to engulf outer space. We must reflect somberly on this situation and redouble our efforts to implement the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Mexico to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22/Rev.1 follows draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22. In this a few slight changes have been introduced, to which I shall now refer. First of all, the title was formerly simply "Nuclear Winter"; now it is "Climatic effects of nuclear war: Nuclear Winter".

We have introduced a second preambular paragraph which reads as follows:

"Noting that in spite of recent scientific endeavours, the environmental and other climatic consequences of a nuclear war still pose a major challenge to science".

This is something which was expressed in the original draft resolution in the last preambular paragraph, which continues to exist here as the last preambular paragraph of the revised text and which reads:

"Conscious of the urgent need to continue and develop scientific studies to increase the knowledge and understanding of the various elements and consequences on climate, including Nuclear Winter".

We have left out the third preambular paragraph from the original draft, which specifically referred to the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment of the International Council of Scientific Associations, because some delegations considered that if we mentioned one of the bodies dealing with these studies we should also have to mention others. We have no objection to deleting that paragraph.

With regard to the operative paragraphs, the changes are very minor and, of course, in no way do they change the meaning of the original draft. In the original draft, the first operative paragraph referred to the "essential parts" of all studies. Here we use the term "appropriate excerpts".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The date we had included in the original draft was 30 April 1985. Some delegations considered that it would be better to extend the date, and since the only concern we had in that regard was, and continues to be, that the Secretariat should have whatever time is necessary after the deadline for receiving communications from Member States and intergovernmental organizations, we asked the Secretariat for a deadline and that is the one now included in the draft resolution - 31 July 1985.

Finally, we also asked the Secretariat whether, in its view, this compilation could be made within existing financial resources and the answer was categorically "yes".

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take up the draft resolutions scheduled to be decided upon this morning, which are in cluster 6: draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.18, L.33 and L.71.

I shall now call upon those delegations which wish to make statements of position concerning those three draft resolutions or to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The First Committee is now about to take a decision on three draft resolutions which relate to a nuclear-weapons ban. Since my delegation is a sponsor of one of those draft resolutions - A/C.1/39/L.18 - it will restrict its comments to draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.33 and L.71.

For many years now the Soviet Union has been making practical and sustained efforts in order to achieve agreements on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. In particular we have more than once proposed to the United States that we should resume and complete the tripartite talks which had been held previously with the United Kingdom on this matter. The Soviet Union also believes that the Geneva Disarmament Conference should make its own contribution to tackling this problem and that that Conference should set up a working body - a special committee, in other words - to get down to the actual drafting of such a treaty. Until that treaty has been concluded the Soviet Union, as the Committee will know, has proposed that a moratorium be declared on all nuclear explosions. We believe that a treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests would help to further the success of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to be held in 1985. That is our fundamental position of principle, according to which we shall support, on the whole, the draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.33, proposed by the Mexican and other delegations.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

In connection with operative paragraph 1, the Soviet delegation believes that it should particularly emphasize the following points. Responsibility for continuing tests does not lie with the Soviet Union but with those nuclear States which have refused to draw up a treaty on the prohibition of such tests and rejected the proposal that a moratorium on nuclear explosions should be declared.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

We cannot agree with draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71 precisely because if it were to be adopted, not only would it fail to promote the inception of specific work on the text of a treaty but, on the other hand, it might be utilized by the United States and those who support it to block further talks on the drafting of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. If the language in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71 concerning the establishment of an international seismic monitoring network were to be isolated from the whole question of drawing up a nuclear-test-ban treaty, it also could serve no purpose, because the whole purport of its establishment might be simply to serve as a element for verifying the performance of the treaty; in other words, draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71, specifically its operative paragraph 4, is essentially aimed at perpetuating the abnormal situation which has arisen in connection with the whole test-ban question. When the negotiations were started they were blocked and instead of that a system of verification concerning nuclear explosions is proposed. Like many other delegations, we cannot go along with such an idea.

In this connection, we request that a separate vote should be taken on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71 and when this is done we shall vote against it. However, the Soviet delegation will abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. TELLALOV (Bulgaria): My delegation wishes to make a few brief remarks in connection with the three draft resolutions on the issue of a comprehensive test-ban.

The Bulgarian delegation fully supports the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.18, since it reflects fully and in clear-cut terms our well-known position of principle on the priority issue of the elaboration and conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests by all States.

Our delegation will also support draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.33, which contains a number of important conclusions. The draft resolution appropriately deplores the fact that, owing to the persistent obstruction of a very small number of its members, the Conference on Disarmament has been unable to initiate multilateral negotiation of a treaty. Who exactly those few members are is well known; it is precisely they who are to be blamed for the unabated continuation of nuclear-weapon tests. The draft resolution draws attention to the fact that all technical and scientific aspects, as well as the issue of verification, have been fully explored and could not serve as a pretext for further delay. The draft

(Mr. Tellalov, Bulgaria)

resolution acknowledges the important role such a treaty could play towards the implementation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and, we may add, towards the success of the Third Review Conference on that Treaty. Equally urgent are the provisions for a moratorium on nuclear-weapons testing, although we feel that such a measure should involve the participation of all nuclear-weapon States.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71 fails to meet our basic concerns and requirements. It seems to be designed to allow for the continuation of testing on the part of those States which are in practice blocking the work of the Conference on Disarmament on this issue. It continues to overemphasize, in a prejudicial manner, the issue of verification and it puts into a wrong perspective the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to consider international co-operative measures to detect and identify seismic events. For these reasons my delegation cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): I should like to speak on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.18, L.33 and L.71.

Like many other delegations in this Committee, particularly those belonging to the group of non-aligned nations, my own delegation gave very serious consideration to the three draft resolutions before us on the question of a nuclear-test ban. We understand the preoccupation of those who would like to avoid the confusing situation deriving from conflicting directions being given by the General Assembly to the Conference on Disarmament. Ultimately, the First Committee must find a way of discontinuing such a practice in general.

-At the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, my delegation voted in favour of resolution 38/63, which is the predecessor of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L/71, although that resolution last year contained several aspects about which we continue to hold serious reservations. We said then in our explanation of vote that the trend expressed by the resolution as a whole was a positive one and deserved to be encouraged. It is to be regretted that the two delegations which have so far prevented progress in the Conference on Disarmament towards the negotiation of a treaty banning nuclear-weapons tests did not avail themselves of the opportunity provided by the results of the discussion of the matter at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly. The report of the Conference on Disarmament is clear and unambiguous as to where the responsibility for the absence of multilateral negotiations on the subject lies.

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

My delegation respects the intentions and the good faith of the authors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71. Despite our differences regarding the substance of the matter, we continue to view their efforts as basically constructive and worth pursuing at this stage. We hope that those at whom such efforts are directed will also respect the good faith of delegations that go out of their way to lend their support to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71 as a means of demonstrating their own interest in the immediate start of serious multilateral negotiations on a draft treaty on a nuclear-test ban. Those are the reasons for which my delegation will once again support that draft resolution.

As at past sessions of the General Assembly, draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.33 presents several positive elements, such as the appeal for the immediate initiation of multilateral negotiations on a treaty for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests. My delegation cannot, however, accept the linkages and conclusions established by that draft resolution with respect to an instrument such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which, in our view, is designed to perpetuate imbalance and to sanction discrimination among nations. The experience of the past 16 years has abundantly shown that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons can hardly be taken as an adequate framework to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, since it has been under its discriminatory régime that the nuclear-weapon Powers have engaged in the most frightful escalation of the nuclear-arms race, condoned and promoted by that Treaty. We shall therefore abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.33.

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

Finally, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.18, which is in keeping with the positions my Government has advocated in the General Assembly and other international forums on the question of the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests and which clearly and unequivocally calls on the Conference on Disarmament to proceed promptly to negotiations on a multilateral treaty on the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests by all States and for that purpose to establish an ad hoc committee.

Mr. LIGAIRI (Fiji): Fiji will support the three draft resolutions in cluster 6 on a comprehensive test ban, as it has done on similar resolutions in past years. However, our affirmative votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.18 and A/C.1/39/L.33 are to be viewed in conjunction with the reservation which we have long held and which we explained last year - namely, that the approach to the question of a comprehensive test ban and a treaty to be agreed upon cannot and should not be limited in its scope to only its nuclear-weapon aspects. In our view, so long as other forms of nuclear testing are permitted, we shall continue to provide a loophole for some to engage in activities that are not or may not necessarily be consonant with the overall objectives of a comprehensive test ban. It is our belief that, for any treaty to be effective and at the same time contribute effectively to our disarmament efforts, it should be all-encompassing in character and in scope.

That is why we have continued to support and co-sponsor draft resolutions such as the one in document A/C.1/39/L.71. Although curbing any form of nuclear testing is the most ideal solution and one that we should all strive for, we realize that the alternative of the prohibition of nuclear-weapons testing offers another approach that may, in a roundabout way, achieve the same result.

It is in the belief that any and every avenue should be explored as a means of furthering the cause of general and complete disarmament that my Government will lend its hesitant support to draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.18 and A/C.1/39/L.33, while fully endorsing the concept of a comprehensive test ban, as contained in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Since my delegation is a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.33, I shall of course not refer to that text.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.18, although we regard its formulation as less complete than that of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.33, we shall vote in favour of it because its essential part - that is, the part which urges the Conference on Disarmament to proceed promptly to negotiations with a view to elaborating a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon test - is fully in keeping with draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.33.

I turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71. Both its preamble and its operative part contain praiseworthy provisions with which we fully agree. For example, operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 read as follows:

"1. Reiterates its profound concern that, despite the express wishes of the majority of Member States, nuclear testing continues;

"2. Reaffirms its conviction that a treaty to achieve the prohibition of all nuclear-test explosions by all States in all environments for all time is a matter of greatest importance;

"3. Expresses the conviction that such a treaty would constitute a vital element for the success of efforts to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race and the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, and to prevent the expansion of existing nuclear arsenals and the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries". (A/C.1/39/L.71)

My delegation fully agrees with those categorical statements. But, after those statements, we are most discouraged by paragraph 4, which refers to the mechanism for initiating their implementation.

We should like to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71 and, had the Soviet Union delegation not already done so, we should have requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 4. If that paragraph were omitted or radically changed in order to bring it into line with what is said in paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.33 - that is, an appeal to all States members of the Conference on Disarmament to initiate immediately the multilateral negotiation of a treaty for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests - we should most gladly vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71.

Thus, in the separate voting on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71, my delegation will vote against. If the paragraph is deleted as a result of that separate voting, operative paragraph 5 would follow very well after paragraph 3, and we shall be able to vote in favour of all the rest of the draft resolution. If, however, operative paragraph 4 is retained, my delegation, much to its regret, will have to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. DUBEY (India): We wish to explain our vote on each of the three draft resolutions in cluster 6. I shall start with draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.33.

India will abstain in the voting on this draft resolution as we cannot accept the linkage that is 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 that a nuclear-weapons-test ban is a measure of the utmost urgency. This it has done because of the fundamental importance of banning nuclear-weapons tests as a crucial step towards halting the nuclear-arms race.

India also considers it important that, pending the conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear-weapons tests, there should be an immediate suspension of the testing of nuclear weapons by all nuclear-weapon States, without exception.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71, the question of a treaty on a nuclear-test ban has been a priority item on the agenda of all multilateral disarmament forums for the past 25 years. The objective of a nuclear-test-ban treaty has been defined in the clearest terms. The objective is complete cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons by all States in all environments for all time.

The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.71 in effect seeks to modify this well-defined objective. In particular, the scope of a treaty on a nuclear-test ban, as envisaged in the preamble and the operative paragraphs of this draft resolution, is at variance with the scope of such a treaty that has been generally accepted for the past quarter of a century.

(Mr. Dubey, India)

Moreover, we believe that it is absolutely essential that the General Assembly give clear and unambiguous guidance to the Conference on Disarmament as to how it should proceed with regard to negotiations on the first item on its agenda, namely, a nuclear test-ban. In view of the work already completed by the Conference on Disarmament and the considerable measure of agreement already reached on this subject in the past, the Conference on Disarmament has an urgent and overriding responsibility not to lose any more time and to begin negotiation on a treaty on a nuclear test-ban in right earnest. Anything less than this would detract from the gravity of the issue at stake and would amount to going back on the accord already reached.

Unfortunately, operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution prescribes for the Conference on Disarmament a course of action which is likely to give only a semblance of activity without coming to grips with the real task of negotiating a nuclear test-ban treaty. The net effect of the mandate for the Conference on Disarmament suggested in this draft resolution will be to relegate the overriding objective of negotiating a treaty on this crucial subject to the status of a long-term goal and not to retain it as the urgent and immediate objective of the international community that it has been deemed to be throughout the past 25 years. We will not, therefore, be able to associate ourselves with draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71.

Finally, our delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.18 because its general thrust is completely in consonance with our position on the subject, and the mandate for the Conference on Disarmament contained in operative paragraph 2 fully reflects the importance we attach to the negotiation of a treaty on the subject by the Conference.

Mr. DOLEJS (Czechoslovakia): Czechoslovakia regards a complete nuclear-weapons-test ban as an effective step towards halting the nuclear-arms race. Such a ban would prevent further sophistication of nuclear weapons and the development of new kinds and types of such weapons, at the same time strengthening the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. We advocate, therefore, the conclusion of a treaty on a complete and universal nuclear-weapon-test ban as soon as possible.

It is our opinion that a favourable atmosphere for the drafting of such a treaty would be created if no tests of nuclear weapons were carried out during the relevant negotiations. We have therefore welcomed the Soviet proposal for a

(Mr. Dolejs, Czechoslovakia)

moratorium on all nuclear explosions, including peaceful ones, during the negotiations and until the conclusion of the aforementioned treaty.

The issue of the prohibition of underground nuclear tests has been on the agenda of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament and its predecessors for many years. It is to be regretted that, so far, the delegations of the United States and its allies have not shown enough political will even for negotiations on a relevant treaty at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. Having spent the past years in inciting fruitless organizational and procedural debates and in overemphasizing the importance of technical aspects of verification, the United States delegation has this year blocked the establishment of a relevant committee with a mandate that would make it possible to consider all the aspects of such a treaty with a view to elaborating it as soon as possible.

The only progress achieved on this issue has been noted in the results of the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts on seismology, which has adopted its third report. The results achieved so far confirm the possibility of locating most seismic phenomena through national centres which have access to the data from the global network. The issue of verification thus does not constitute any problem.

In the light of the aforementioned facts, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is going to vote in favour of the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/39/L.18 and L.33 and calls upon all States to follow suit.

As to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71, it contains certain provisions with which we cannot agree, and we intend therefore to abstain in the voting on that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last statement in explanation of vote before the voting. The Committee will therefore now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.18. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the thirty-seventh meeting of the Committee, on 14 November, and is sponsored by Afghanistan, 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, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Turkey, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.18 was adopted by 109 votes to 2, with

24 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.33. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the thirty-eighth meeting on 14 November and is sponsored by Bangladesh, Ecuador, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.33 was adopted by 111 votes to 2, with

24 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71, which was introduced by the representative of Australia at our 40th meeting, held on 15 November. It is sponsored by Australia, Bahamas, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Portugal, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Thailand and Vanuatu.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes briefly to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71. Operative Paragraph 4 of that draft resolution -

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Australia on a point of order.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): I wish to make the point of order that the voting procedure has commenced. It is my understanding that once it has commenced member States are not permitted to speak, other than to speak on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: On previous occasions I have called on delegations wishing to speak on individual draft resolutions before those draft resolutions were put to the vote. This is one of those cases. In any event, the voting procedure proper has not started. I invite the representative of Cuba to continue.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Operative paragraph 4 of this draft resolution urges the Conference on Disarmament to undertake an exercise which has become obsolete. I wish to draw attention to the fact that it urges the Conference to resume immediately its substantive work at the beginning of its 1985 session. That language could be misleading, for it would appear to be difficult to vote against urging the Conference on Disarmament to resume immediately its substantive work. I wish in this connection to refer to the 1984 report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly.

That report makes it clear that, although the vast majority of members of the Conference were willing, in keeping with the wishes of the international community, to initiate in the Conference negotiations with an appropriate mandate, this was not possible because:

"Another delegation speaking as co-ordinator of the Group of Western countries regretted that it had not been possible to unite all delegations in that group behind the mandate contained in document CD/520 which could not therefore join in a consensus on that mandate." (A/39/27, para. 35)

(Mr. Núñez Mosquera, Cuba)

This paragraph shows that a few - specifically, two - delegations have been preventing the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum from undertaking negotiations on this subject. The report goes on to note that:

"The Group of 21 also expressed the hope that the delegations which once again had not been in a position to join in a consensus on the setting up of an ad hoc committee with an appropriate mandate on a nuclear-test ban would take advantage of the period between sessions to ... revise their position so as to bring it into line with the appeals of the international community." (Ibid.) Further on, the report indicates that:

"The Group of 21 further stated that in the absence of agreement on the setting up of an ad hoc committee with a suitable mandate the Conference would once again this year have devoted in all only four plenary meetings to this issue which, however, was included in its agenda with highest priority. Clearly, such treatment was, in the view of that Group, in keeping neither with the importance of the issue and its possible impact on a nuclear disarmament process nor with the urgency of the matter." (para. 38)

As to the substantive work referred to in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71, the report goes on in the following way:

"In 1982, concerned at the continuing lack of negotiations on this agenda item, the Group of 21, in a display of a spirit of compromise, agreed to participate in a consensus on the setting up of an ad hoc working group with a mandate which it nevertheless considered inadequate. In doing so, the Group of 21 was inspired by the will to overcome the impasse and make it possible to set up a working group on a nuclear-test ban. In a further display of flexibility, the Group of 21 did not oppose the renewed setting up of the Working Group with the same mandate in 1983, although it considered that the Working Group had exhausted the consideration of the issues of verification and compliance. In the light of this, the Group of 21 considered that the time had come for the Conference to take a responsible decision and engage without delay in negotiations on a nuclear-test-ban treaty in an ad hoc committee set up for that purpose." (Ibid.)

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

Considering the contents of the report of the Conference on Disarmament, and since this Committee has already adopted draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.18 and L.33, to adopt draft resolution L.71 would be once again to approve paralysis in the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

For these reasons, my delegation will vote against paragraph 4.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71. A separate, recorded, vote has been requested on paragraph 4 of that draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu, Zaire, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Algeria, Burma, Chile, China, Colombia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Gabon, Ghana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Romania, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 71 votes to 18, with 35 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

* Subsequently the delegation of Congo informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

In favour: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, 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.1/39/L.71 was adopted by 109 votes to none, with 26 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.