



Monday, 13 December 1982,  
at 10.55 a.m.

Official Records

NEW YORK

*President:* Mr. Imre HOLLAI (Hungary).

**AGENDA ITEM 40**

**Reduction of military budgets:**

- (a) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General

**AGENDA ITEM 48**

**Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean**

**AGENDA ITEM 49**

**World Disarmament Conference: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the World Disarmament Conference**

**AGENDA ITEM 54**

**Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons:**

- (a) Report of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General

**AGENDA ITEM 55**

**General and complete disarmament:**

- (a) Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (b) Prevention of an arms race in outer space and prohibition of anti-satellite systems: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (c) Institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament;
- (d) Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (e) Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes: report of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (f) Strategic arms limitation talks

**AGENDA ITEM 133**

**Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly:**

- (a) Report of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (b) Implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade and consideration of initiatives and proposals of Member States;
- (c) United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament: report of the Secretary-General;
- (d) World Disarmament Campaign: report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. ERDENECHULUUN (Mongolia), Rapporteur of the First Committee: At the 98th plenary meeting, on 9 December, I had the honour of presenting to the Assembly 17 out of the 23 reports of the First Committee on disarmament items. Action on the remaining six reports had to be postponed pending the decision of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of some of the draft resolutions contained in those reports. Now that the action of the Fifth Committee has been completed, I have the honour of presenting to the Assembly the reports contained in the following documents: A/37/652 on agenda item 40, A/37/660 on item 48, A/37/661 on item 49, A/37/666 on item 54, A/37/667 on item 55 and A/37/670 on item 133.

2. The above-mentioned reports contain 31 draft resolutions which have been adopted by the First Committee. Out of those 31 draft resolutions the Committee adopted the following eight without a vote: draft resolution A, relating to the reduction of military budgets, in document A/37/652; the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, in document A/37/660; four of the draft resolutions contained in document A/37/667—draft resolution B on the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, draft resolution C on radiological weapons, draft resolution H on the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons on the sea-bed, and draft resolution K on institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament—and, in document A/37/670, draft resolution D on confidence-building measures and draft resolution F on regional disarmament.

3. With that brief outline I have the honour of submitting to the Assembly for its consideration and adoption the draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in these reports.

*Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the First Committee.*

4. The PRESIDENT: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the First Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

5. May I remind representatives that in paragraph 7 of its decision 34/401 the General Assembly decided that when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee. May I also remind representatives that, in

accordance with the same decision, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by representatives from their seats.

6. We shall consider first the report of the First Committee on agenda item 40 [A/37/652]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 12 of its report.

7. Draft resolution A was adopted without a vote by the Committee. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

*Draft resolution A was adopted (resolution 37/95 A).*

8. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution B. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution is contained in document A/37/730. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

*Against:* Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

*Abstaining:* Angola, Argentina, Brazil, China, Congo, Ghana, India, Mozambique, Zambia.

*Draft resolution B was adopted by 96 votes to 13, with 9 abstentions (resolution 37/95 B).<sup>1</sup>*

9. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn its attention to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 48 [A/37/660]. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution is contained in document A/37/731. The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 37/96).*

10. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their delegation's position.

11. Mr. MOHAMMADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran joined in the consensus on the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace with great reluctance, because the resolution only reflects the state of impotence that a small minority of Member States have been able to impose on the Committee by taking advantage of the rule of consensus that the Committee has followed so far. They call for "harmonization of views" before they can join the overwhelming majority of Members in seeking positive achievements. We are not against harmonizing views, but during the past three years we have seen that the members of this minority not only have not taken any step on their own to harmonize views but have even rejected any initiative by others. We are therefore justified in assuming that the harmonization of views is being used only as an excuse for blocking the Committee's work, and that through the misuse of the rule of consensus. This is being achieved.

12. All this is taking place while the tremendous military build-up of the West in the region is going on and while the military presence of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan continues. We believe that, as a result, the rule of consensus in the Committee has perhaps lost its productive necessity. Some Member States have tried to create an atmosphere of blackmail within the Committee by threatening to withdraw if the present *status quo* is threatened. We believe that the participation of any State in the Committee is a privilege for that State, and hence is not to be considered as a favour being done to others.

13. Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation wishes to make the following statement in connection with the resolution which has just been adopted on the question of the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region.

14. The work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean over the past few years has shown clearly that on this big and complex problem related to the maintenance of security in the Indian Ocean two schools of thought exist. One is represented by the desire of the coastal and continental States of the region for the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean, the elimination of military bases and the withdrawal of large foreign fleets, accompanied by a commitment by all States, on the basis of a treaty, to respect this zone of peace. That is the approach of the non-aligned countries, which was reflected in the draft resolution proposed by them in the *Ad Hoc* Committee. That draft contained all the necessary elements for the implementation of the relevant decisions of the General Assembly relating to the holding of the International Conference on the Indian Ocean. It gave the precise date for the opening of the Conference proposed by the Governments of the States that took the initiative in proposing the idea of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. That date was 9 May 1983. Account was taken also of the desire of Western countries to continue work on the harmonization of views on outstanding issues. The *Ad Hoc* Committee was to draw up a preliminary agenda and

work out organizational decisions pertaining to the Conference.

15. The Soviet Union supported the basic elements of that approach and, as is well known, made a number of proposals concerning aspects of security on the oceans, mutual restriction of the activities of naval fleets, the extension of confidence-building measures to the oceans and seas and the non-extension of the spheres of activities of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] and the Warsaw Treaty to Asia, Africa and Latin America. This of course applies fully to the Indian Ocean also.

16. In his address to the General Assembly during the general debate, Mr. Gromyko, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, said in this connection:

“Even now, without waiting for the conference to be convened, we call upon all the States whose ships use the waters of the Indian Ocean to refrain from any steps that could complicate the situation in that region. This means not sending there large naval formations, not conducting military exercises and not expanding or modernizing military bases of those non-coastal States which possess such bases in the Indian Ocean.” [13th meeting, para. 130.]

17. However, the legitimate aspirations of the States of the Indian Ocean region, which are supported by the socialist countries, met with opposition from those following the other school of thought, which reflects the general policy of the NATO countries, primarily the United States, which, essentially, oppose the idea of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. To put it briefly, the policy of the United States is designed to establish American military and political control in that region of the world in order to blackmail the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean and curb and curtail their socio-economic development.

18. We cannot fail to note that the United States is turning the Indian Ocean into another forward-base area of military activity aimed against the Soviet Union. It was precisely the proponents of such a policy that impeded the convening of the Conference, which was to have been held in 1981. They also impeded the adoption of the draft resolution on the convening of the Conference in 1983 proposed by the non-aligned countries, to which I have referred.

19. Any references made by Western countries to events around Afghanistan allegedly impeding the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean are unfounded. The United States has been trying to sabotage the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace since long before the events in Afghanistan occurred. Long before that it undermined the holding of bilateral Soviet-American talks on the restriction of military activity in the Indian Ocean region.

20. The Soviet delegation did not oppose the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution on the Indian Ocean because it confirms the mandate of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and provides for the continuation of its work in preparation for the Conference on the Indian Ocean to take place in the first half of 1984.

21. At the same time we wish to express our regret that, in accordance with that resolution, the date for the convening of the Conference is again being put back and no provision has been made for the duration of the

preparatory work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to be 12 weeks, as advocated by many delegations.

22. The position of the Soviet Union and that of a number of other socialist countries is reflected in document A/C.1/37/11 of 1 December 1982.

23. In conclusion we would like the records of the present meeting to reflect the expression of our great appreciation for the work of the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean, Mr. Fonseka, who worked very hard to achieve the very difficult compromise, in connection with which many delegations have expressed either satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

24. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 49 [A/37/661]. The draft resolution recommended by the Committee is contained in paragraph 8 of its report. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/37/732. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution without a vote?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 37/97).*

25. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 54 [A/37/666].

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

27. Mr. KOR BUN HENG (Democratic Kampuchea) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on all the draft resolutions contained in the report.

28. My delegation attaches great importance to these draft resolutions. For the past four years the people of Kampuchea have had to deal with a most barbaric war of invasion, a genocidal war aimed at exterminating an entire people and an entire nation and at wiping Kampuchea from the map of the world in a few generations, as happened in the seventeenth century to the Islamic Kingdom of Champa. To that end, the invaders are using conventional weapons, the most sophisticated chemical weapons and the weapon of famine.

29. Since 1979 the Government of Democratic Kampuchea has been alerting the international community to what has been happening. In 1979 and 1980 chemical warfare was already rife in Kampuchea, with a toll of thousands of victims either killed or seriously poisoned by the firing of shells releasing toxic gases, by the spraying of toxic chemical products from aircraft or by the poisoning of water supplies. The regions affected were sparsely inhabited, remote parts of the country, under the control of the Government of Democratic Kampuchea. Today, chemical warfare has increased and spread to the populated regions of the country, even those under the temporary control of the enemy. During the 1981-1982 dry season, our competent services found that 1,214 people had been killed, including 42 entire families, and that 414 people had been seriously poisoned. At the beginning of the present dry season, the invaders have once again resumed chemical warfare in Kampuchea. Towards the end of September 1982, the enemy dispatched to Kampuchea a large quantity of chemical weapons it had stockpiled at Tram Kak, in the province of Takev in south-west Kampuchea. On 31 October last, six local people were killed and 44 others seriously poisoned in the province of

Batdambang by the enemy's use of chemical weapons. On the same day, 110 inhabitants of Sok San village, near the Kampuchea-Thailand frontier, were killed by the firing of shells containing toxic gases that released yellow smoke.

30. These weapons, prohibited by the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva in 1925, and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, cause appalling suffering to the victims before their death and leave residual contamination that affects the physical and mental development of those lucky enough to survive and of their descendants. In addition, because of lasting residual contamination these weapons are a grave danger to the human and ecological environment. My delegation would like to express its sincere appreciation and gratitude to all those countries which, genuinely concerned to ensure respect for the 1925 Geneva Protocol and the Convention, were good enough to sponsor the draft resolutions in this connection or to make a positive contribution in the search for evidence of the use of chemical weapons and toxins in Kampuchea, Laos and Afghanistan and to bring the results of their analyses to the attention of the international community.

31. My delegation feels that the adoption or rejection of the draft resolutions on chemical and bacteriological weapons will have a vital impact on the Kampuchean people, who today are waging a very difficult struggle for national survival, which is also part of the struggle for international peace and security and for the defence of the Charter of the United Nations.

32. Turning to draft resolution A, my delegation welcomes operative paragraph 5, in which the General Assembly reaffirms its call to all States to refrain from stationing chemical weapons on the territory of other States. But, unfortunately, one of the sponsors of this draft resolution is the aggressor against my country, which authorizes the deployment of chemical and bacteriological weapons to wage chemical warfare against the Kampuchean people. In the face of such cynicism, my delegation can only abstain in the voting.

33. My delegation will join in the consensus on draft resolution B, in accordance with our ardent desire for the conclusion as soon as possible of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction. Such a convention can unquestionably make a positive contribution to the process of general and complete disarmament and can, if implemented and respected, save the peoples of the world from becoming victims of these horrible weapons, like the peoples of Kampuchea, Laos and Afghanistan.

34. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution C, because it is a positive response to the appeal made since November 1981 by the Government of Democratic Kampuchea for the urgent convening of an international conference to adopt effective measures to put an end to the chemical and bacteriological warfare waged at the present time not only in Kampuchea but also in Laos and Afghanistan.

35. My delegation will also vote in favour of draft resolution D, which will give the Secretary-General the appropriate means to investigate the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons in violation of the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

36. Finally, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution E. In its second preambular paragraph, the General Assembly would note, quite correctly, the final conclusion of the Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons that, "while it could not state that the allegations had been proven, nevertheless, it could not disregard the circumstantial evidence suggestive of the possible use of some sort of toxic chemical substance in some instances". My delegation takes this opportunity to pay a tribute to the Group of Experts for its work. But that does not mean that my delegation is entirely in agreement with the report of the Group of Experts: on the contrary, it has many reservations and observations on the report. We regret, in particular, that the Group of Experts was unable to go to Democratic Kampuchea and conduct its inquiry on the spot, because of communications problems and the fact that the Group of Experts did not give sufficient advance notice to the Government of Democratic Kampuchea of its intention of visiting territory under the control of that Government. It is essential that such obviously important and serious investigations be prepared for very carefully, in the necessary objective conditions, especially when they take place in a country in a state of war.

37. Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I wish to refer very briefly to agenda item 54, on which quite a number of draft resolutions have been proposed in the report of the First Committee.

38. In the opinion of the Soviet Union and many other States, one of the most relevant current problems of disarmament is the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. Draft resolution B, which had many sponsors, was adopted by consensus in the First Committee. The draft resolution contains constructive provisions. It makes an urgent appeal to the Committee on Disarmament to intensify at its 1983 session, as a matter of high priority, the elaboration of a convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction. This is a very important draft resolution, in our view, and we shall support it.

39. The General Assembly is also invited to take a decision on draft resolution A, which was submitted by the socialist countries and adopted by the First Committee. The aim of this draft resolution is to intensify the activities of States in order to achieve the complete prohibition of chemical weapons and their destruction. It emphasizes the need for the earliest conclusion of an appropriate international convention and appeals to all States to promote that aim in every possible way. The Soviet Union has consistently advocated the complete and effective prohibition of chemical weapons and has frequently made concrete proposals in this regard. At the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, we submitted a draft of the basic provisions of a convention on the prohibition of the development,

production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction. The discussion in the Committee on Disarmament showed that the proposal of the Soviet Union opens up sound prospects for progress in negotiations, and the Soviet Union would be ready to take part in such negotiations. An important element in the position of the socialist countries is that now, while negotiations are going on regarding the prohibition of chemical weapons, States should refrain from the development and production of new types of chemical weapons.

40. It seems to us that there is still time to ban chemical weapons before the chemical arms race gets out of control. Unfortunately, draft resolution D, sponsored by France, takes a different approach, which would undermine and, indeed, do away with the few agreements in this field that it has proved possible to achieve thanks to the efforts of very many States and that have become laws of international life. That draft resolution would set up dubious machinery which would make it possible for anyone to continue to poison the already complicated atmosphere of negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament and thus make those negotiations even more difficult. We invite delegations to oppose that draft resolution and vote against it, as we intend to do.

41. Mr. MOUSSAOUI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Algeria has always been in favour of banning the use of chemical weapons and their production and stockpiling. That is why we shall vote in favour of draft resolutions A, B and C. We shall abstain on draft resolution D for reasons already explained in the First Committee. My delegation also wishes to state that it cannot vote in favour of draft resolution E, for reasons explained at the 35th meeting of the Committee. Because of the polemical nature of the discussions during the consideration of this question, we shall abstain in the voting on draft resolution E.

42. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take decisions on the five draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 21 of its report [*ibid.*].

43. I shall first put draft resolution A entitled "Prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons" to the vote, a recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India,<sup>2</sup> Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

sia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:* United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malawi, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

*Draft resolution A was adopted by 95 votes to 1, with 46 abstentions (resolution 37/98 A).<sup>2</sup>*

44. The PRESIDENT: The First Committee adopted draft resolution B, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons", without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to do so?

*Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 37/98 B).*

45. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to draft resolution C, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India,<sup>2</sup> Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:* Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

*Abstaining:* Guinea.

*Draft resolution C was adopted by 124 votes to 15, with 1 abstention (resolution 37/98 C).<sup>2</sup>*

46. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to draft resolution D, entitled "Provisional procedures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that resolution is contained in document A/37/733. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India,<sup>2</sup> Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:* Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

*Abstaining:* Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cyprus, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

*Draft resolution D was adopted by 86 votes to 19, with 33 abstentions (resolution 37/98 D).<sup>2</sup>*

47. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution E, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands,

New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

*Abstaining:* Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cyprus, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Sri Lanka, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

*Draft resolution E was adopted by 83 votes to 22, with 33 abstentions (resolution 37/98 E).<sup>3</sup>*

48. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Sudan, in explanation of vote.

49. Mr. ABDELWAHAB (Sudan): The delegation of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan is a consistent believer in the fact that the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons, and their destruction represents one of the most urgent measures of disarmament.

50. We abstained in the vote on draft resolution A because of the serious difficulty posed by the tenth preambular paragraph. We abstained because we cannot subscribe to the legitimization of the possession of chemical weapons or to the linking of such possession of chemical weapons with geographical considerations.

51. For my delegation, peace is indivisible and so is comprehensive disarmament. Had the tenth preambular paragraph been voted on separately, my delegation would have cast a negative vote.

52. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 55 [A/37/667]. The Assembly will take decisions on the 11 draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 40 of its report.

53. Draft resolution A is entitled "Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indo-

nesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

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

*Abstaining:* Algeria, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, El Salvador, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Lebanon, Liberia, Malawi, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

*Draft resolution A was adopted by 70 votes to 18, with 51 abstentions (resolution 37/99 A).*

54. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution B is entitled "Report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues". The First Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

*Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 37/99 B).*

55. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution C, entitled "Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons". The First Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

*Draft resolution C was adopted (resolution 37/99 C).*

56. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution D is entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space and prohibition of anti-satellite systems". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia,<sup>4</sup> Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mau-

ritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Panama, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam.

*Draft resolution D was adopted by 112 votes to none, with 29 abstentions (resolution 37/99 D).<sup>4</sup>*

57. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution E, which is entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba,<sup>5</sup> Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, 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, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, 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 E was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 22 abstentions (resolution 37/99 E).<sup>5</sup>*

58. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution F is entitled "Review and supplement of the *Comprehensive study on the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects*". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/37/734. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, 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, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* India.

*Abstaining:* Guyana, United States of America.

*Draft resolution F was adopted by 141 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions (resolution 37/99 F).<sup>3</sup>*

59. The PRESIDENT: We now take up draft resolution G, entitled "Measures to provide objective information on military capabilities". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica,

Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman; Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, Zambia.

*Draft resolution G was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 17 abstentions (resolution 37/99 G).<sup>3</sup>*

60. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution H is entitled "Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof". In the Committee, this draft resolution was adopted without a vote. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to do the same?

*Draft resolution H was adopted (resolution 37/99 H).*

61. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution I is entitled "Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi,



Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, 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, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru, Venezuela.

*Draft resolution I was adopted by 135 votes to none, with 7 abstentions (resolution 37/99 I).<sup>3</sup>*

62. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution J is entitled "Military research and development". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/37/734. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, 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, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Draft resolution J was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 8 abstentions (resolution 37/99 J).<sup>3</sup>*

63. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution K is entitled "Institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/37/734. The First Committee adopted draft resolution K without a vote. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to do the same?

*Draft resolution K was adopted (resolution 37/99 K).*

64. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Italy, who wishes to explain his vote after the vote.

65. Mr. ECONOMIDES (Italy): In connection with the resolution entitled "Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons" that the Assembly adopted a few minutes ago under agenda item 55, I wish to stress the following. As regards paragraph 2, it is the understanding of my delegation that the term "nuclear facilities" refers to peaceful nuclear installations, and that it is for such peaceful nuclear installations that it is meaningful to look for improved protection against military attacks.

66. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 133 [A/37/670]. The Assembly will now take decisions on the 10 draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 44 of its report.

67. Draft resolution A is entitled "Freeze on nuclear weapons". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* Australia, 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:* China, Denmark, Guatemala, Iceland, Japan, Somalia.

*Draft resolution A was adopted by 122 votes to 16, with 6 abstentions (resolution 37/100 A).<sup>3</sup>*

68. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution B is entitled "Nuclear arms freeze". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

*Abstaining:* Denmark, Guatemala, Iceland, Philippines, Somalia.

*Draft resolution B was adopted by 119 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions (resolution 37/100 B).<sup>3</sup>*

69. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution C, entitled "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central

African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

*Abstaining:* Austria, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Paraguay.

*Draft resolution C was adopted by 117 votes to 17, with 8 abstentions (resolution 37/100 C).<sup>3</sup>*

70. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution D is entitled "Confidence-building measures". The First Committee adopted draft resolution D without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

*Draft resolution D was adopted (resolution 37/100 D).*

71. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution E is entitled "Disarmament and international security". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, 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, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Afghanistan, Belgium, Brazil,<sup>6</sup> Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Hungary, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, 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 E was adopted by 115 votes to none, with 28 abstentions (resolution 37/100 E).<sup>6</sup>*

72. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution F is entitled "Regional disarmament". The First Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

*Draft resolution F was adopted (resolution 37/100 F).*

73. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution G is entitled "United Nations Programme of fellowships on disarmament". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution is contained in document A/37/735. The First Committee adopted draft resolution G without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution G without a vote?

*Draft resolution G was adopted (resolution 37/100 G).*

74. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution H is entitled "World Disarmament Campaign". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, 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, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

*Draft resolution H was adopted by 108 votes to none, with 33 abstentions (resolution 37/100 H).<sup>3</sup>*

75. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution I is also entitled "World Disarmament Campaign". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it without a vote?

*Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 37/100 I).*

76. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution J is entitled "World Disarmament Campaign: peace and disarmament movements". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft resolution also without a vote?

*Draft resolution J was adopted (resolution 37/100 J).*

77. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions.

78. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands): I should like to explain the vote of the Netherlands on draft resolution B in document A/37/670, originally submitted by the delegations of Mexico and Sweden. Between the vote in the First Committee and that just taken in the plenary meeting, an intensive and thorough debate has been held in the Second Chamber of our Parliament on the concept of a nuclear arms freeze at this particular time. In that lively debate in our most important democratic institution, the fear was expressed that our vote against that draft resolution concerning a freeze could be misinterpreted. The Government of the Netherlands would therefore like to make the following statement, additional to the explanation of vote given by the Netherlands delegation at the 40th meeting of the First Committee on 23 November.

79. Voting against a draft resolution on a freeze could convey the wrong impression that my Government and the people of the Netherlands as a whole are not of the opinion that there are more than enough nuclear weapons, or that we are not worried about the ongoing nuclear arms race. On the contrary, we are absolutely convinced that substantial reductions in the number of nuclear weapons, resulting in a more stable balance at much lower levels of nuclear armaments, must be realized. This is essential also for an effective long-term non-proliferation policy. We are strongly in favour of a nuclear-test ban and a cut-off in the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. My Government has been a co-sponsor of draft resolutions to that end.

80. The Netherlands Government is against the deployment of so-called neutron weapons in Europe.

The draft resolution before us, however, ignores the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) and the intermediate-range nuclear-forces negotiations that are currently taking place at Geneva. Those talks are aimed at substantially reducing certain categories of nuclear weapons and removing other categories of weapons altogether. Of special interest to us is the disproportion that exists in the European situation with regard to intermediate-range nuclear forces. This imbalance would be perpetuated if a freeze were to be proclaimed now. All our endeavours are therefore concentrated at present on promoting a successful outcome of START and the intermediate-range nuclear-forces negotiations. Although an agreed freeze could at a later stage in the disarmament process contribute to curbing the nuclear arms race, at this moment it is neither the boldest nor the quickest way of tackling the nuclear threat.

81. Mr. LUCE (United States of America): My delegation will make two statements in explanation of vote on two draft resolutions under agenda item 133. My Government abstained in the voting on draft resolution H on the World Disarmament Campaign, sponsored by the Governments of Bulgaria, Mongolia, Romania and Viet Nam, because we believe that it fails to advance the broader objectives of such a campaign. The resolution is selective in its presentation of the lofty objectives of the Campaign and accents but a few, in our view highly dubious, actions which would be required for its successful implementation.

82. The Secretary-General's report of 17 September 1981 on the World Disarmament Campaign<sup>7</sup> envisages a world-wide discussion, under the aegis of the United Nations, to increase understanding of the growing threat of an arms build-up to international peace and security. It confers upon the Campaign the special objectives of informing publics, through the dissemination of relevant information, educating them on the issues of disarmament and peace and generating widespread public understanding of the dangers of the present situation and support for disarmament.

83. The consensus document<sup>8</sup> produced by the Group of Experts on the Organization and Financing of a World Disarmament Campaign under the Auspices of the United Nations provided clear and explicit guidelines for such a campaign. These stipulate that the Campaign should be universal, involve the participation of all States, be balanced, factual and objective, deal with both disarmament and security issues, involve the broadest possible discussion and access to information by all sectors of the public, and reflect all points of view.

84. Resolution 37/100 H, on the other hand, is designed more to limit than to advance a truly universal discussion. While the preambular sections support some of the noble guiding principles of the Campaign, the key operative paragraphs are inconsistent with its manifest intent. For example, paragraph 1 refers to the launching of world-wide action for the collection of signatures supporting measures to prevent nuclear war, curb the arms race and promote disarmament. The collection by rote of signatures by Member States can make no real contribution to increased understanding of the current arms build-up or of the complexities of the arms control and security issues facing the world today.

85. As we demonstrated when we exercised our right of reply at the 25th meeting of the First Committee on 4 November, the Soviet Union and other communist and totalitarian countries maintain an elaborate official propaganda apparatus which permeates every segment of domestic society and has as its sole aim the generating of support for the régime's policies and the combating of undesirable or "alien" viewpoints. This control mechanism can easily enough manufacture impressive numbers of signatures in support of official policy, but it makes no real contribution to free expression, nor can it lead to the kind of balanced, factual and objective debate on disarmament and security issues which the Disarmament Campaign explicitly espouses.

86. In addition, paragraph 2 of resolution 37/100 H regrettably puts special emphasis not on the freest possible flow of discussion but rather on the need to "avoid dissemination of false and tendentious information". What is false and tendentious may be a matter of subjective opinion and we cannot endorse negative formulations which can be used to justify repression.

87. At the same meeting we provided the First Committee with a detailed factual account of the harsh treatment which has been accorded to the authentic, independent peace movement in the Soviet Union and in various Eastern European countries. There is therefore no need to repeat that record here today. I would note, however, that the Soviet Union has not ceased to use its enormous propaganda mechanism to provide all kinds of support to peace movements beyond its borders, nor has there been the slightest let-up in repression in the Soviet Union itself.

88. Since we addressed the First Committee a few short weeks ago the members of the fledgling, independent Soviet disarmament movement called the "Group to establish trust between the United States and the Soviet Union", whose case we raised in the First Committee, have received a written warning by the KGB Security Police in Moscow threatening prosecution if they continue their peace activities. The KGB warning stated that the Group's activities were "provocative" and that continuing participation in these peace activities would lead to a criminal trial. Indeed, members of the Group were warned that punishment resulting from such a trial would be especially tough, since previous warnings by the authorities had gone unheeded. Further, the Associated Press reported on 26 November that the official Soviet Press agency TASS—which we all know to be an instrument of the Soviet authorities—had denounced this independent peace group as "anti-sovieters, renegades and criminals".

89. Regrettably we must thus conclude that our discussions on the need for a universal disarmament campaign have yet to moderate the harsh realities faced by would-be independent peace movements in the East.

90. We thus abstained on draft resolution H, because we believe that it does not go far enough in reflecting the will of the Assembly for a truly universal, comprehensive and objective discussion of disarmament and security issues in all their aspects and in all regions of the world. We welcome the actions which have been

taken to organize and define such a discussion and the First Committee's overwhelming support for draft resolution J in document A/37/670, which calls for its implementation.

91. We believe these actions represent important positive steps forward, but they will only be effective if they are applied. We intend, therefore, to continue to monitor developments in this area carefully over the next year to determine the extent to which the letter and spirit of the approved programme for the Campaign are fulfilled. If the record shows that real progress has been made we shall be among the first to welcome it, but if there is no compliance with or only superficial and cosmetic application of the resolution we shall note that fact as well and return to this matter at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly next year.

92. In short, this is a fundamental issue which my Government believes the General Assembly must continue actively to address. If we now get on with the task of practising what we preach it could have momentous consequences indeed. For Governments confident enough to allow genuine peace movements to exist may be both sensible enough to listen to the more reasonable of those voices and confident enough to cease the costly and unproductive build-up of military weaponry. Such is our profound wish and hope.

93. I now turn to the resolution on disarmament fellowships. While my delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution G, we are concerned about the financial implications of an extended fellowship programme. We of course support the noble objectives of educating a group of internationally selected individuals about the vital issues of disarmament and security. We are also aware that the draft resolution now includes the language "bearing in mind the savings that can be made within existing budgetary appropriations". Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the financial implications of increasing the programme from 20 to 25 fellows. We would have preferred that any increase in the budget for this programme would have been financed by offsetting reductions within existing resources.

94. However, as the statement on the administrative and financial implications [A/C.5/37/79] of the resolution on the United Nations programme on fellowships on disarmament makes clear, total additional costs for 1983 amount to over \$134,000. This amount is excessive and in our view does not adequately represent and take into account the savings possible within existing resources. In this regard we would note that the special review of the ongoing work programme of the United Nations [A/36/658] contains a list of activities that have been included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983 "but which might be considered of low priority" [*ibid.*, annex II]. Annex II to that report includes the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament on that list and suggests a reduction in the number of fellowships from 20 to 10 each year. This report was prepared by an *ad hoc* group of high-level United Nations officials, composed of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, the Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management, the Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services and the Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination.

95. As we have made clear during the session, we shall be closely monitoring the financial implications of various resolutions in the future, especially those concerning subjects deemed of low priority by the United Nations itself.

96. Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to explain our votes on the resolutions adopted in connection with item 133, which deal with the World Disarmament Campaign.

97. The work of the United Nations is carried out against a background of active participation on the part of the world community. The second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament proved extremely significant in this respect. We share the opinion voiced by many delegations concerning the great importance of the World Disarmament Campaign and we consider it an important means of intensifying the action of all the peace-loving forces in the world. This is particularly significant in today's international situation. This was noted recently by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Andropov, at a plenary meeting of the Central Committee, when he said:

"At the present time, as never before, the peoples of the world are coming to the forefront of history. They have acquired the right to speak in a voice which no one can suppress. They are capable, by their purposeful action, of eliminating the threat of nuclear war and preserving peace and life on earth."

98. It is to be noted with satisfaction that the growing involvement of world public opinion in the adoption of specific disarmament measures is a significant factor in the creation of the necessary conditions for States to take practical action to avert the threat of nuclear war and halt and reverse the arms race.

99. In the Soviet Union the peace and disarmament movement has today acquired a truly universal nature. Numerous Soviet civic organizations, such as the Soviet committee for the defence of peace, the Soviet peace fund, the Soviet committee for solidarity with the countries of Africa and Asia, the alliance of Soviet friendship societies and the Soviet committee of war veterans, and many others, have been taking an active part in the struggle to curb the arms race and bring about disarmament. This year alone in my country more than 20,000 demonstrations have been held, with the participation of more than 60 million Soviet citizens. Numerous international meetings, conferences and gatherings, as well as peace marches, have taken place. Representatives of public opinion from more than 100 countries and from all continents have participated in these events.

100. The Soviet delegation supported all three draft resolutions on the question of the World Disarmament Campaign. We agree with the proposals contained in those draft resolutions, which indicate a considerable number of ways in which the World Disarmament Campaign can proceed. On some of them, action has already started, while on others practical steps still have to be taken. One of the important positive directions which the World Disarmament Campaign could take is indicated in draft resolution H, submitted by the People's Republic of Bulgaria and a number of other sponsors, which calls for the collection, within the frame-

work of the Campaign, of signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, curb the arms race and bring about disarmament. This form of expression of the will of the people could give the World Campaign a very definite boost and could involve the broad masses of the population in many countries more fully in the struggle to curb the arms race and bring about disarmament.

101. The Soviet delegation supported draft resolution J, which was submitted by the United States of America and other sponsors, amended by the Soviet Union and adopted by the First Committee. In this connection, we would like to emphasize that not only do we not oppose the dissemination of information concerning disarmament, but in fact we have always advocated the need for such information to be disseminated as broadly as possible. The need is self-evident to us. If there is anyone who has only now realized the necessity of acting in this way, it is to be regretted that the realization did not come earlier.

102. However, and this is very important, the information that is disseminated must be truthful. Otherwise, no good, but only harm, will come of it. The provision concerning the truthfulness of information will morally bind Governments and various agencies and institutions not to allow the dissemination of tendentious, fallacious information designed to deceive public opinion, instead of truthful information.

### AGENDA ITEM 32

#### Question of Namibia:

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
- (b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;
- (c) Reports of the Secretary-General

103. The PRESIDENT: In connection with this item, the General Assembly has before it a report of the Fourth Committee relating to the hearing of representatives of organizations concerned [A/37/619]. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of that report?

*It was so decided (decision 37/426).*

104. The PRESIDENT: I propose that the list of speakers on this item be closed at 5 o'clock this afternoon. May I take it that there is no objection to that proposal?

*It was so decided.*

105. The PRESIDENT: I call on the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, who wishes to introduce the report of the Council [A/37/24].

106. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I should like, first, Sir, to express to you our warm congratulations on your election to the presidency of the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, and, secondly, to thank you for the outstanding and effective manner in which you have guided the deliberations of the session.

107. I should also like to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for his keen awareness of the problems facing the United Nations, his continued effort towards their solution and his determination to strengthen the role and effectiveness of the Organization.

108. Since my address at the 64th meeting of the thirty-sixth session, the question of Namibia has remained unresolved. Sixteen years after the United Nations terminated the Mandate over Namibia of the *apartheid* régime in Pretoria, that régime is still occupying the Territory illegally. During these years, the General Assembly, the Security Council, the United Nations Council for Namibia and several international conferences have acknowledged the responsibility of the international community towards the people of Namibia and have demanded the unconditional withdrawal of the racist South African régime from the Territory. South Africa has reacted to these just demands by tightening its grip on Namibia, by perpetrating massive and unprovoked acts of aggression against the neighbouring independent African States, which have supported the people of Namibia in their legitimate struggle for self-determination, justice and independence, by assassinating the leaders of the Namibian people and by arbitrarily arresting and detaining those suspected of belonging to the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. Within the past week, Amnesty International was forced to address a letter to the Pretoria régime urging it to desist from using torture and detaining the Namibian people without trial, and criticizing the sweeping powers of arrest given to its police and troops.

109. The intransigent and belligerent positions of the racist Pretoria régime continue to be aided and abetted by certain States in Western Europe and North America whose political, economic and military relations with the *apartheid* régime undermine the concerted global effort aimed at expediting the elimination of *apartheid* and the withdrawal of South Africa's occupation forces from Namibia.

110. Early last month, a major United States news source reported that, as a result of Washington's current policy of "constructive engagement" towards the *apartheid* régime, a sizeable number of American corporations and banks had expanded their operations in South Africa. According to the source, United States investment in South Africa—which had accounted for 20 per cent of total foreign investment—increased by 13.3 per cent in 1981. Reportedly, some 250 American companies are heavily represented in high-technology industries and in such industries as motors, pharmaceuticals, oil, chemicals and mining, including uranium and construction equipment.

111. On 3 November 1982, despite a widely supported General Assembly resolution [resolution 37/2] urging it to reject a South African loan application, the IMF—in which a handful of South Africa's friends control a disproportionately high share of the votes—approved a US \$1.1 billion loan to the *apartheid* régime in Pretoria. South Africa's friends stressed that their decision to support the racist régime's loan application was based solely on technical grounds. They said that their decision expressed their concern regarding the status of

the specialized agencies which, they argued, were non-political technical agencies governed by their own articles of agreement that limited any politically motivated decisions. Behind such a façade of strict legal interpretation, South Africa's friends have continued their sabotage of General Assembly decisions aimed at weakening the *apartheid* régime and pressuring South Africa to withdraw from Namibia. Despite these expedient legal arguments, the record shows that these same States have violated the very same legal principles they recite in a number of other cases for reasons much less worthy than the elimination of *apartheid* and the liberation of Namibia.

112. It is a known fact that the United States provides roughly 20 per cent of the subscription payments of IMF.

113. Reporting on the IMF action on that huge loan to South Africa, *Time* magazine stated, in its 15 November 1982 issue, that: "the US \$1.1 billion loan from the IMF more than covers the increase in South Africa's 1981-1982 military expenditures, in effect subsidizes Pretoria's stepped-up intervention in Namibia and Angola".

114. Such blatant support by a United Nations specialized agency for the forces that work continuously to undermine the international system of law, order and justice is simply incredible. It calls for a full assessment of this dangerous contradiction within the United Nations system. And how could the Western Powers, especially the five members of the contact group, escape the stigma of their own contradictions when they assume the role of an honest broker in the negotiations on Namibia and yet vote for the IMF's grant of that loan, which is in effect a vote endorsing *apartheid*, a vote endorsing the continued illegal occupation and oppression of Namibia and the increasing destabilization in southern Africa?

115. In conformity with its mandate as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until independence, the United Nations Council for Namibia held extraordinary plenary meetings at Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, from 10 to 14 May 1982, and adopted, on 13 May, the Arusha Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia [see A/37/24, para. 767]. By that Declaration, the Council drew attention to the critical situation obtaining in and around Namibia as a result of the *apartheid* régime's oppressive and aggressive policies, and it articulated ways of intensifying practical action by the international community in support of the struggle of the people of Namibia for self-determination under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. By the same Declaration, the United Nations Council for Namibia also underscored the solidarity of the international community with the front-line States and Nigeria, and took note with appreciation of the various resolutions adopted on Namibia.

116. As is well known, more than four years ago the global efforts to seek a negotiated settlement for the independence of Namibia crystallized with the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Since then, the United Nations Council for Namibia, and also the Organization of African Unity [OAU], the front-line States, Nigeria and SWAPO, have remained committed to the implementation of the settlement

plan for Namibia's independence endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978).

117. However, *apartheid* South Africa and its allies have continued their attempts to treat the question of Namibia as something other than an act of colonial domination in violation of the principles and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Injecting discredited cold-war rhetoric and machinations, efforts are still afoot to link the independence of Namibia with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, an issue unrelated to the United Nations settlement plan endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978) and one that falls within the exclusive competence and the sovereign rights of the Government of the People's Republic of Angola. This development highlights the continuation of an unrelenting strategy by South Africa and its allies to contain the global effort for Namibia's independence within the framework of an anachronistic and destabilizing cold-war division of spheres of influence and power. The international community has rejected these devious attempts, which are designed solely to justify South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and to delay the independence of the Territory.

118. The only parties to the conflict in Namibia are South Africa, as the illegal occupation Power, on the one hand, and the people of Namibia, as represented by SWAPO, on the other. Any linkage between Namibian liberation and other issues outside the United Nations plan for Namibian independence is support for injustice and oppression. Any quid pro quo for Namibia's independence is a form of extortion. Namibia is a hostage that must be freed without ransom, without conditions and, indeed, without any diktat. The United Nations Council for Namibia categorically rejects any linkage between Namibian independence and extortion, and we hope that this rejection will be reflected in the decisions taken at the current session of the General Assembly.

119. As the struggle for Namibia's independence goes on, let us keep certain basic facts in mind. Namibia is and will remain until independence the responsibility of the United Nations. All the business about a contact group of Western Powers has now come to a halt as a consequence of the injection by the United States of extraneous issues resulting in a stalemate. In any case, the efforts of the contact group of five could not supplant the United Nations responsibility for the Namibia question. In fact, as the struggle for Namibia's independence goes forward to its logical conclusion—victory—the United Nations responsibility for Namibia broadens. The essential feature of the broadening of that responsibility has materialized since the late 1970s, when the Security Council began to be involved as the Namibia question evolved into one of international peace and security. So, even as they continued their consultations with the *apartheid* régime in Pretoria and with the front-line States, Nigeria and SWAPO, the five Western countries—Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America—which comprise the contact group were bound by the provisions of Article 24 of the United Nations Charter, which states, *inter alia*, that: ". . . Members confer on the Security

Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf'.

120. The United Nations Council for Namibia will continue to intensify its efforts for the total and expeditious liberation of Namibia by mobilizing international public opinion; by exposing the exploitative and oppressive political, military and economic activities of the racist Pretoria régime and its allies in Namibia; and by taking suitable measures to preserve the territorial integrity of Namibia and to protect its natural resources. To that end, and in accordance with resolution 36/121 C, by which the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, after consulting with the United Nations Council for Namibia regarding its assessment of the situation pertaining to the Territory, to carry out preparatory work with a view to organizing an international conference in support of the struggle of the Namibian people for independence, the Council, pursuant to its decision taken during its extraordinary plenary meetings in Arusha, will be holding such a conference at UNESCO House in Paris in April 1983. The United Nations Council for Namibia looks forward with hope to co-operation from the international community in that conference.

121. As the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, the United Nations Council for Namibia is fully cognizant of the importance of representing Namibia within the membership of the United Nations family of organizations. That representation, which has been called for by the General Assembly, although adding substantially to the burden of responsibilities which are being shouldered by the Council, has one primary strategic objective—namely, that the inherent rights of the Namibian people are both recognized and exercised to the full within the community of nations. In consequence, Namibia, as represented by the Council, has now joined several United Nations specialized agencies—most recently the IAEA and the ITU. Furthermore, and in line with this active and visible participation by Namibia in the work of the international community, the Council has acceded to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination [resolution 2106 A (XX), annex]. Three days ago I had the rare privilege and honour, in my capacity as President of the Council, to sign on behalf of Namibia, at Montego Bay (Jamaica), the Final Act of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea<sup>9</sup> and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.<sup>10</sup>

122. Evidence is piling up before our eyes to show that the ordeal of Namibia threatens to be long and arduous. The early euphoria about a settlement being just around the corner has evaporated. That euphoria had no life of its own; it had no roots of its own; it had no *raison d'être* of its own. Today we are confronted by linkage as a form of extortion for independence for Namibia; today we are confronted by an IMF loan to South Africa as a confirmation of the suspicion that the IMF is a rich man's club that takes care of its own; today we are confronted by the *apartheid* régime's feverish attempts to separate Walvis Bay from the rest of Namibia, as evidenced by the so-called elections recently conducted there by the illegal

occupation authorities; and today we are confronted by the plans which are being laid down now by the Pretoria régime to legitimize the present farce of internal rule in Namibia.

123. It was only five days ago that the military forces of the racist South African régime invaded neighbouring Lesotho, attacking homes, killing many innocent men, women and children, terrorizing defenceless civilians, destroying private property, committing all types of heinous crimes in a peaceful and sovereign African country. South Africa has also carried out military incursions into Mozambique. My question is, in the name of what is all this being done? The racist régime says that it is in the name of peace and against the African National Congress. But we, together with the entire civilized world, have different names for it. We call it not the arrogance of power but the shame of power. We call it the criminal sword of the *apartheid* régime. We call it the terror of Pretoria, which aims at an imperial domain in southern Africa. We call it the total freedom of the outlaws in South Africa to disregard all that the United Nations Charter stands for, whether in Namibia or in other parts of southern Africa. That is what we are up against. That is what Lesotho is up against. That is what Mozambique is up against. That is what the Namibian people are up against. That is what free men and women everywhere, including the black majority in South Africa, are up against. That is what the Assembly and all other United Nations bodies are up against.

124. Only this morning, Anthony Lewis wrote in an article on Namibia in *The New York Times* that: "there can be no further movement on Namibia, and no effective spotlight on South African intentions, unless and until Angola makes a concrete proposal for Cuban withdrawal". It is ironic that the article is entitled "Namibia: No Dead End". No better definition of a dead end could be found.

125. Now that all this is confronting us, where do we go from here? Namibia is going through an extremely difficult stage in the struggle for its future, indeed for its independence.

126. The United Nations Council for Namibia remains convinced that the heroic and exemplary struggle of the people of Namibia for independence, under the leadership of SWAPO, aided by the sustained support of the international community, will soon bear the fruits of victory. We in the Council will continue to support and assist in that just struggle until the people of Namibia achieve genuine independence and territorial integrity in a united Namibia, secure in its freedom and sovereignty.

127. I should now like briefly to introduce the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the General Assembly [A/37/24]. The report is divided into four parts. Part one outlines the work of the Council as a policy-making organ of the United Nations. Part two deals with the work of the Council as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia. Part three deals with the organization and decisions of the Council. Part four covers recommendations and activities involving financial implications.

128. In part four there are five draft resolutions—A, B, C, D, E—which take into account decisions contained in resolutions previously adopted by the Gen-



eral Assembly on the question of Namibia, as well as developments in the Territory's struggle for independence. The world has recently witnessed the open support by IMF for South Africa's oppressive policies, in its granting to the racist régime of a credit of \$1.1 billion in special drawing rights. The Council has not failed to express its indignation at the blatant collaboration of IMF with the Pretoria régime; this is reflected in draft resolution A, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa".

129. Recent months had been devoted to resumed consultations by members of the international community concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Obstructionist and dilatory tactics by the racist South African régime and the injection of irrelevant issues by the United States Government brought the negotiations to an impasse. The Council took cognizance of these facts in a new text which is contained in draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)", to replace the previous draft resolution B, which was entitled "Action by Member States in support of Namibia" and was introduced at the thirty-sixth session of the Assembly.

130. Draft resolution C is devoted to the Council's work programme. That programme has been augmented by Namibia's recent admission, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, to full membership of the IAEA and its election by the Economic and Social Council as a member of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Mention is also made of the Council's work in connection with preparations for the forthcoming International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence.

131. Draft resolution D underscores the importance of the dissemination of information on the question of Namibia and the necessity of mobilizing international public opinion for the achievement of Namibia's independence.

132. Finally, while expressing appreciation to the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations for the support they have given and financial contributions they have made to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, draft resolution E reiterates the request to those bodies to extend their efforts in view of the increase of Namibian refugees.

133. In general, the draft resolutions, as in previous years, appeal to the international community for its continued implementation of all initiatives aimed at bringing pressure to bear on the South African régime to cease its illegal occupation of Namibia and to enable the Territory to realize true independence within the framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

134. On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I express the strong hope that the General Assembly will find no objection to adopting the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia.

135. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Mr. Farouk Adhami, of the Syrian Arab

Republic, who will introduce chapter VIII of the Committee's report [A/37/23/Rev.1].

136. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic), Rapporteur, Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: As Rapporteur of the Special Committee, I have the honour of introducing to the General Assembly chapter VIII of the report of the Special Committee covering its work during 1982 concerning the question of Namibia.

137. This chapter, which relates to item 32 of the agenda, is submitted pursuant to paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 36/68 on the implementation of the Declaration, by which the General Assembly requested the Special Committee to continue to seek suitable means for the immediate and full implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in all Territories that have not yet attained independence and, in particular, to formulate specific proposals for the elimination of the remaining manifestations of colonialism.

138. In continuing to perform these tasks in relation to the question of Namibia, the Special Committee took into consideration the various relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, particularly resolution 36/121 A to F, as well as the relevant decisions of the Security Council and the United Nations Council for Namibia.

139. As will be noted from the report, during 1982 the Special Committee once again examined in depth developments relating to the question of Namibia with the active participation of the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the representatives of SWAPO.

140. As reflected in paragraph 1 of the consensus, the text of which is reproduced in paragraph 13 of chapter VIII of the report:

"The Special Committee notes with great concern that the situation in and relating to Namibia has continued to deteriorate as a consequence of the non-compliance by South Africa with the relevant decisions and resolutions of the United Nations and, in particular, as a result of the tactics and manoeuvres employed by South Africa to perpetuate its illegal domination of that Territory and to impose an 'internal settlement' on the Namibian people. The *apartheid* régime of South Africa thus bears a grave responsibility for the creation of a situation which seriously threatens international peace and security."

141. Owing to the intransigence of South Africa, its dilatory tactics in respect of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), its massive military build-up in Namibia and its repeated acts of armed aggression against the Namibian people, the Special Committee observed that it was more than ever imperative for the United Nations to reassert its responsibility in the matter and take urgent steps to bring about faithful and unqualified compliance by the minority régime with the decisions of the United Nations, in order to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence without further delay.

142. In reaffirming once again that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations, the Special Committee condemned South Africa's continued illegal occupation of the Territory, its brutal repression of the Namibian people and its persistent violation of their human rights, as well as its efforts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

143. The Special Committee reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of the Territory to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia and the legitimacy of their struggle by all means at their disposal against the illegal occupation of their country.

144. The Special Committee rejected and denounced all manoeuvres by South Africa designed to bring about a sham independence in Namibia under a puppet régime by transferring power to illegitimate groups subservient to South Africa's own vested interests. In declaring that all illegal acts taken to that end were null and void, the Special Committee called upon all States to deny any recognition to and refuse all co-operation with any illegal entity which South Africa might impose upon the Namibian people in disregard of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

145. In condemning South Africa for its intensified military build-up in Namibia, its recruitment of Namibians into a so-called South West Africa/Namibia Territorial Force, its use of mercenaries to reinforce its illegal occupation of the Territory, its illegal use of Namibian territory for acts of aggression against independent African countries, its continued forcible removal of Namibians from the northern border of the Territory for military purposes and the continued establishment of new military bases, the Special Committee called upon all States to take effective measures to prevent the recruitment, training and transit of mercenaries for service in Namibia and condemned the continued military collaboration between South Africa and certain Western and other States.

146. In reiterating that the only political solution for Namibia should be one based on the termination of South Africa's illegal occupation, the withdrawal of its armed forces and the free and unfettered exercise by all the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence within a united Namibia, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the Special Committee reaffirmed that all the natural resources of Namibia were the inviolable and uncontested heritage of the Namibian people, and it condemned South Africa's illegal exploitation of such resources, including its illegal extension of the territorial sea, its proclamation of an economic zone off the coast of Namibia and its illegal exploitation of the Territory's marine resources.

147. Finally, the Special Committee recommended that the Security Council act decisively against any dilatory manoeuvres and fraudulent schemes of the illegal occupation régime aimed at frustrating the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, and recommended that the Security Council, in the light of the serious threat to international peace and security posed by South Africa, respond positively to the overwhelming demand of the international community by imposing forthwith comprehensive mandatory sanc-

tions against that country under the terms of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

148. On behalf of the Special Committee, I commend the report to the serious attention of the General Assembly.

149. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Mr. Frank Abdulah, of Trinidad and Tobago.

150. Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago), Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: As the Assembly turns its attention to the question of Namibia, this most intransigent of problems, it is profoundly disquieting to have to admit once again that the efforts of the international community to bring about genuine independence in Namibia continue to be obstructed by the defiant attitude of the minority régime of South Africa.

151. Almost 16 years after the General Assembly's historic decision to declare Namibia an international Territory under its jurisdiction, South Africa is the one and only country that has refused to accept the legality of that decision, in spite of the ruling of the International Court of Justice confirming it. Thus, the minority régime of South Africa continues to resort to force and political stratagems in order to prolong its illegal occupation of the Territory and to deny the oppressed people of Namibia their most basic rights and fundamental freedoms. The latest demands of the Pretoria régime and its constant delaying tactics amply demonstrate what we already know, that is, that South Africa will not willingly permit the fulfilment of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to true independence and liberation. On the contrary, it has with calculated cunning exploited the efforts of the international community to achieve a negotiated settlement, in order to consolidate its hold and its domination over Namibia. We have all been witness to South Africa's dilatory manoeuvres and to the deceitful manner in which, while delaying the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), it has presented us with a succession of *faits accomplis*, including the creation of the so-called National Assembly, through which it has illegally sought to lay the groundwork for an internal settlement and a unilateral declaration of independence for Namibia.

152. These developments and the unequivocal demonstration of the arrogance and intransigence of South Africa led the Special Committee once again this year to adopt unanimously a consensus on the question of Namibia. Since the Special Committee's Rapporteur has just given an account of the content of that consensus, I shall not elaborate on it further.

153. Our consideration of the question of Namibia is a demonstration of the serious concern shared by the international community as a whole at the current turn of events with regard to Namibia. We cannot deny the fact that the situation is steadily deteriorating or that there is open conflict and repression in the Territory as South Africa seeks to maintain its illegal occupation through force and the presence in the Territory of tens

of thousands of South African troops. Moreover, in desperation at the hot winds of change blowing throughout the region, South Africa has committed countless acts of aggression against its neighbouring sovereign States, in which brutal attacks have been perpetrated, often against unarmed civilians. The most recent attack against the Kingdom of Lesotho provides clear evidence of Pretoria's ability to defy the United Nations by acting in a manner which is in direct contravention of the spirit and letter of the Charter. We cannot ignore the serious threat to international peace and security in the region which such blatant defiance brings; nor can we, except at our own peril, continue to remain inactive in the face of the grave injustice and human suffering inflicted upon the majority of the peoples in southern Africa. We must be mindful that the open defiance by South Africa of the will of the international community is a damaging affront to the United Nations, since it calls into question the very principles on which the Organization was founded. We must realize, too, that the Organization is further weakened by the frustration, disillusionment and mistrust which this engenders.

154. South Africa's continued obstruction of the plan for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian question envisaged under Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is made possible through the support that régime enjoys in certain quarters of the world. In this context, we cannot but view with dismay the policy of constructive engagement pursued by one of the principal allies of the Pretoria régime. Such a policy has not brought a solution to the Namibian question any nearer. Indeed, the only visible benefit seems to be greater support and friendship for South Africa and the introduction of conditions which are totally unacceptable to the international community and which fall entirely outside the framework of resolution 435 (1978).

155. At the same time, during the long-drawn-out negotiations, the leadership of SWAPO has demonstrated a sense of statesmanship in its willingness to co-operate fully and immediately in the implementation of the United Nations plan endorsed in resolution 435 (1978). The spirit of accommodation, patience and responsiveness shown by the leaders of SWAPO stands in sharp contrast to the devious, dilatory and obstructionist attitude of the illegal administrators of Pretoria. In the same context, I wish to pay special tribute to the leaders of the front-line States for the crucial role they have played and are continuing to play in support of the cause of the Namibian people.

156. It is the firm conviction of the Special Committee that the only political solution for Namibia is one based, in the first instance, on the termination of South Africa's illegal occupation and the withdrawal of its forces and, secondly, on the free and unfettered exercise by all Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence within a united Namibia, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). To that end, it is imperative that elections be held without further delay, under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in the whole of Namibia as one political entity, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Any attempt to undermine the international consensus embodied in resolution 435 (1978) must be strongly resisted, for that

consensus represents the only acceptable basis for a peaceful transition of Namibia to independence.

157. In this connection, the Special Committee has consistently taken the position that, in the light of the continuing defiance by South Africa of its Charter obligations and its persistent use of force to perpetuate its illegal domination of the Territory, as well as its repeated and increasing savage acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States, the full and effective application of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter remains the key by which the United Nations can obtain South Africa's compliance with the decisions of the Security Council. Equally, the Special Committee holds the view that it is through Chapter VII measures that peace, justice and freedom can be speedily restored to the Namibian people.

158. Speaking from the General Assembly rostrum a year ago, I observed that the liberation of Namibia would not be achieved merely by appealing to the South African Government, nor would that Government be induced to change its policies by the application of half-hearted measures. This view, I submit, remains as valid today as it was a year ago. We, the members of the international community, have the means to solve the problem of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the South Africa authorities. All that is required of us is that we summon the will to address ourselves to the problem squarely and that we persevere in the only course open to us—that of support for the people whose future we have taken in our hands and whose cause we would betray should we further hesitate in bringing full and effective pressure to bear on its oppressors.

159. At this stage, no less crucial is the pressing need to give an increasing level of support to the struggling people of Namibia and their sole and authentic national liberation movement, SWAPO. The international community has a particular responsibility to ensure that, through the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia, all possible steps are taken to offer the maximum training opportunities for the people of Namibia so that they may prepare themselves for the establishment of an independent sovereign Namibia.

160. I wish to express my sincere hope that the appeals for assistance addressed to all Member States, the specialized agencies and other organizations, both within and outside the United Nations, will meet with a positive response, so that various programmes of assistance can be undertaken to meet the ever-expanding requirements in this regard.

161. Before concluding, I should like, on behalf of the Special Committee, to acknowledge with appreciation the important work carried out by the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the outstanding leadership of my friend and colleague, Mr. Lusaka, of Zambia, in the discharge of the mandate entrusted to it. The role of the Council as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence cannot be over-emphasized. At the present stage of the struggle of the Namibian people it is essential that the Council be given the maximum co-operation by all Member States so that it can continue to discharge its responsibilities with even greater effectiveness.

162. Mr. President, I am confident that under the leadership and guidance which you have so amply

demonstrated throughout this session and with your skill, wisdom and diplomacy, the work of the Assembly will make a further positive contribution towards ending the situation in Namibia.

#### *Organization of work*

163. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to a draft resolution which has just been circulated [A/37/L.54], entitled "Invasion of Lesotho by South Africa".

164. The sponsors of the draft resolution, on behalf of the Group of African States, have requested that, in view of the urgency of the situation, the draft resolution should be considered as the first item tomorrow morning, and it is my intention that the Assembly should do so.

*The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.*

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The delegations of Chad, Egypt, Mauritius and Samoa subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution and the delegation of Czechoslovakia that it had intended to vote against.

<sup>2</sup> The delegation of India subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution and the delegations of Mauritius and Samoa that they had intended to vote in favour.

<sup>3</sup> The delegation of Samoa subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

<sup>4</sup> The delegation of Indonesia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution and the delegation of Samoa that it had intended to vote in favour.

<sup>5</sup> The delegation of Cuba subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution and the delegation of Samoa that it had intended to vote in favour.

<sup>6</sup> The delegations of the Bahamas, Brazil and Samoa subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

<sup>7</sup> A/36/458.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, annex.

<sup>9</sup> *Official Records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea*, vol. XVII (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.84.V.3), document A/CONF.62/121.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, document A/CONF.62/122.