



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 42ND MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

CONTENTS

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MR. ULF ERICSSON OF SWEDEN, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE AD HOC
GROUP OF SCIENTIFIC EXPERTS TO CONSIDER INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATIVE MEASURES TO DETECT
AND IDENTIFY SEISMIC EVENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3850, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/37/PV.42
6 December 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MR. ULF ERICSSON OF SWEDEN, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE
AD HOC GROUP OF SCIENTIFIC EXPERTS TO CONSIDER INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATIVE
MEASURES TO DETECT AND IDENTIFY SEISMIC EVENTS

The CHAIRMAN: I regret to inform the Committee of the death of Mr. Ulf Ericsson of Sweden, who was associated with disarmament efforts for many years. His outstanding personal and professional qualities were of the greatest value to the Committee on Disarmament.

In August 1976 Mr. Ericsson was unanimously elected Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, set up under the auspices of the Committee on Disarmament. He carried out his functions as Chairman for more than six years with distinction, leading the Group successfully through many difficult times. His sudden passing is a great loss to the Committee on Disarmament.

May I therefore request the Swedish delegation, on behalf of all the members of the First Committee and of myself, to convey to its Government and to Mr. Ericsson's family our deeply felt condolences.

Mr. C. LIDGARD (Sweden): Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the Swedish delegation is deeply moved by your kind and warm words on the untimely passing away of Dr. Ulf Ericsson. His death means a great loss for us in the Swedish delegation in our disarmament efforts because of his profound knowledge of the subject. Because of his - as you phrased it, Mr. Chairman - outstanding personal qualities, we also miss in him a very stimulating colleague and a close friend. The Swedish delegation will certainly not fail to convey to the Swedish Government and to Dr. Ericsson's family the condolences that you have expressed.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 41, 43 TO 45, 47 TO 50, 54 TO 57, 133 AND 139 (continued)

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

Mr. SARAN (India): On 22 November 1982 my delegation introduced before this Committee a revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.2, on behalf of the sponsors - Ecuador, India, Liberia and Mexico. Our purpose in presenting the revised draft was to enable Member States to have more time to reflect on the proposal for the appointment by the Secretary-General of a representative group of public persons of great eminence for the purpose of advising on special measures and procedures for the prevention of nuclear war.

Since then we have been approached by a number of delegations which have requested more intensive consultations with the sponsors with a view to grasping fully the implications of this proposal. In view of these consultations, the sponsors have decided not to press draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.2/Rev.1 to a vote at this session. It is our view that the proposal, in order to lead to fruitful results, should preserve a consensus character.

The CHAIRMAN: For the purpose of further clarifying this matter to me, will the representative of India please explain what he means by not pressing the draft resolution to a vote at this session.

Mr. SARAN (India): We do not wish draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.2/Rev.1 to be put to the vote at this particular session. With respect to further consideration of this item, we will perhaps at the next session take a decision after consultations with interested delegations.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): At the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly the Soviet Union proposed that efforts be redoubled to remove the threat of nuclear war and to ensure the safe development of nuclear energy. The discussion at this session has indicated that many delegations share our conviction that it is important not to allow any actions that would lead the deliberate destruction of peaceful nuclear sites.

A reflection of this was the General Assembly's adoption of resolution 37/18, whose operative part contains an appeal that steps be taken that would prohibit "armed attacks against nuclear facilities and threats thereof" as a contribution to promoting the safe development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, as well as the adoption of resolution 37/19 on the item entitled "Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency", which also contains language that is consonant in its thinking with the ideas expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.7. The fundamental ideas in this draft have also been reflected in the draft resolutions already adopted by the First Committee - A/C.1/37/L.33 on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons; A/C.1/37/L.1/Rev.1 and A/C.1/37/L.3/Rev.2 on the question of freezing nuclear weapons.

This being the case, the Soviet delegation regards that it is not necessary to put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.7. It is our understanding that further consideration of this entire issue and also the proposals and documents that have been submitted by delegations will be continued in the Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. C. LIDGARD (Sweden): On behalf of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.22/Rev.1 on the reduction of military budgets, I have the honour to introduce an amendment to that draft resolution. The amendment is intended to fill a gap in the draft resolution. In draft resolutions of this character there is routinely a clause or paragraph concerning the publication and distribution of reports which have been prepared by the Secretary-General at the request of the General Assembly. This clause had inadvertently been omitted in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.22/Rev.1. I will read out the additional operative paragraph, which will then be contained in a revised draft resolution which will be issued as document A/C.1/37/L.22/Rev.2. The text reads as follows:

(Mr. C. Lidgard, Sweden)

"Requests the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for the report on the reduction of military budgets (A/S-12/7) to be issued as a United Nations publication and widely distributed".

I may add that this proposal has no financial implications since the measure envisaged is already contained in the programme of the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1 under agenda item 54, prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons. This draft resolution has 11 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 11 November 1982. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1 are: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam.

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

Mr. LIN Cheng (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The prohibition of chemical weapons is an important and urgent task we face. The Chinese Government consistently stands for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all chemical weapons and has made efforts towards this purpose.

The Chinese delegation would like to make the following explanations with regard to a number of draft resolutions on the prohibition of chemical weapons we are about to vote upon.

First, China sincerely hopes that a convention for the complete prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons can be concluded as early as possible so as to save the world's peoples from again becoming victims to chemical weapons. We hold that this future convention should be comprehensive and sound and should not have loopholes. Therefore we should include among its contents the prohibition of use.

Secondly, the United Nations should attach importance to reports and allegations concerning the use of chemical weapons and should conduct investigation and verification, drawing the necessary conclusions. Appropriate measures should be taken on the basis of such conclusions. This is not only the obligation it owes to the victim country and people, but also its responsibility towards the people of the world. Therefore it should receive the support and help of all parties.

(Mr. Lin Cheng, China)

Thirdly, all draft resolutions on the question of chemical weapons adopted by the United Nations and actions taken on chemical weapons should be genuinely in the interest of prohibition of these weapons; it should not be the reverse, which will only divert attention and cover up the development and use of such weapons.

On the basis of this position we have just stated, the Chinese delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1 and vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.44 and L.54. However, we take this opportunity to explain that as to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, mentioned in draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.44 and L.54, China is not a party to this Convention for reasons already stated in the past.

Mr. SARAN (India): India fully supports the efforts of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1 to achieve an early ban on all chemical weapons. However, it is our conviction that issues of disarmament must be dealt with in the framework of a global approach. For this reason we are unable to endorse the idea of setting up chemical-weapon-free zones, even as an interim measure. In our view, all efforts must be directed towards bringing to an early and successful conclusion the multilateral negotiations on chemical weapons currently in progress in the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, so that the entire world will become free of chemical weapons.

For this reason of principle, India will be forced to abstain on the draft resolution.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1. Our support for the negotiation of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and on their destruction is well known. The negotiations cover all chemical weapons, including the so-called binary weapons and my delegation does not believe it serves any useful purpose at this stage of the negotiations to single out one specific type of chemical weapon.

(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

Two other reasons also explain our decision. First, the concept of non-stationing of chemical weapons in territories of other States would seem to imply the legitimacy of their possession by the States that continue to stockpile and improve their arsenals of such weapons. By the same token, the concept of zones free from chemical weapons brings to mind the situation obtaining in the field of nuclear weapons, which is that non-nuclear-weapon States are insistently asked to forego the nuclear military option while the nuclear-weapon Powers consider themselves free from any constraints and continue to engage in the proliferation of nuclear weapons in both numbers and quality as well as in the geographical dimension.

The Brazilian delegation considers that the introduction of those concepts, as applied to chemical weapons, is a consequence of the logic of confrontation between the two super-Powers. The effect of their acceptance would be to take us further away from, and not closer to, the conclusion of an effective convention on chemical weapons.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation fully shares the views expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1, and therefore we shall vote in favour of it, because, among other reasons, it recognizes the need for all States to abstain from adopting measures which will delay or complicate the negotiations on the question of chemical weapons. In the Committee on Disarmament, particularly in recent sessions, we have witnessed a situation in which the qualitative development of new chemical weapon systems has greatly complicated the process of negotiation, particularly with regard to verification and the determination of toxicity. We must draw attention to this situation, and oppose it, as is done in the draft resolution.

Furthermore, the draft resolution recognizes the new terms of reference which were given to the appropriate ad hoc working group of the Committee on Disarmament, and asks it to speed up its negotiations within that context.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): Chemical weapons are among the most horrifying weapons of mass destruction known to mankind. They were the first to be used on the battlefield, and extensively so.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

In spite of widespread abhorrence of such weapons felt by public opinion and in military circles, chemical weapons continue to be produced and probably used. The Netherlands strives with great resolve to eradicate the chemical weapon threat through the adoption of a corresponding political attitude here and elsewhere and by using to the full its political and legal resources in the negotiations currently going on in the Committee on Disarmament.

Our position on the urgent need to ban chemical weapons is crystal clear. I should like to quote what the then Prime Minister of the Netherlands, Mr. Andreas van Agt, said on the subject when he addressed a plenary meeting of the General Assembly during its twelfth special session, on Tuesday, 15 June 1982:

"In the Committee on Disarmament the Netherlands has actively contributed to the elaboration of such a treaty and will continue to do so.

"Supported by the unanimous opinion of the Netherlands Parliament, I should like to reiterate from this rostrum that the Netherlands armed forces do not possess chemical weapons, that my Government does not consider introducing those weapons for its armed forces and that my Government also rejects the stationing of stockpiles of chemical weapons on Netherlands territory." (A/S-12/PV.13, p. 46)

It is precisely because of the great importance of the united support of States for the achievement of that goal - to have a negotiated chemical-weapon ban at the shortest possible notice - that we strongly take issue with the unmistakable attempts of a group of States to sow discord by submitting a draft resolution that competes with draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.44, the aim of which was to meet with consensus, and in the preparation of which the same group took part.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1 contains several examples of clearly controversial language, the use of which is counter-productive to reaching the earliest possible achievement of a chemical-weapon convention in the Geneva Committee on Disarmament. The Netherlands will therefore abstain on the draft resolution.

Mr. FINDLAY (Australia): Australia regards the conclusion of a chemical-weapon convention as one disarmament measure which is clearly within reach. Together with other members of the Committee on Disarmament, we are making vigorous efforts towards that end.

However, Australia will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1, because we regard it as gratuitous and in no way helpful to the deliberations on chemical weapons in the Committee on Disarmament. We should have preferred that the sponsors could have given their wholehearted support to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.44, which we note was drafted in consultation with, and is being co-sponsored by Poland, whose representative chaired the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons in Geneva.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted by 79 votes to 1, with 43 abstentions.

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

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1. This attitude is justified by the reference in the draft resolution to notions which do not conform with the concept we uphold with regard to chemical disarmament, which must be of a general character in the prohibition of weapons and of a universal character in its territorial application. The text of the draft resolution departs from those two principles in treating binary weapons in a special way and introducing the idea of non-stationing of chemical weapons on the territory of other States.

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Belgium abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1, which singles out binary weapons in a way that is of little benefit, in our opinion. We regard such weapons as coming within the definition of chemical agents of warfare and, more generally, within that of chemical weapons, and we should like to ban the use of all chemical weapons.

Furthermore, the wording of operative paragraph 4, which calls for the resumption of the American-Soviet talks on chemical weapons, in our opinion is not compatible, as drafted, with the negotiations which we should like the Committee on Disarmament to carry out.

(Mr. Noirfalisse, Belgium)

Finally, the reference to the possibility of establishing zones which are free of chemical weapons puzzles us to some extent. We wonder whether at a time when a process has been designed to achieve the complete prohibition of chemical weapons, it is appropriate to consider measures which seem to be considerably more limited in nature. Such measures might have been considered in appropriate conditions, that is to say, essentially with the agreement of all the States of the region and with appropriate means of verification but only in the absence of any possibility of agreement on a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. We hope that in fact that is far from being the case.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina voted for the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1, although we have reservations with regard to some of the paragraphs, particularly that dealing with the establishment of chemical-weapon-free zones, for reasons which have been explained by other delegations. My delegation has on many occasions expressed its opposition to according special treatment to certain kinds of weapons as against weapons in general, and although in this draft resolution reference is made to binary weapons, no special treatment of them is requested in the negotiations, or a separate convention, and that is the position adopted by my delegation on other occasions. The draft resolution is a considerable improvement on the original version, and, had it been voted on without the revision, my delegation would have been compelled to abstain from voting.

Mr. BEESLEY (Canada): Canada's position on chemical weapons is sufficiently well known to make it unnecessary for me to reiterate it at this time. I wish merely to explain that in abstaining in the vote on this draft resolution we did so because of our continued belief that we should work by consensus wherever possible, and it is our belief that the draft resolution which we have co-sponsored with the delegation of Poland (A/C.1/37/L.44) is such a consensus draft resolution.

Mr. GARCIA MORENO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): We share the views expressed by the delegations of India, Brazil and Australia. For the same reasons as they explained we abstained in the vote on the draft resolution, A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1.

Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Costa Rica did not participate in the vote on the draft resolution, A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1, because although we fully support its underlying principle we find the same principle reflected more satisfactorily in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.44, which deals with the same problems and which, moreover, is a negotiated text. Although it is awkward to vote on the same item in various texts, it does give us the advantage of having an option, and we value the freedom to choose the text we like best.

The CHAIRMAN: Our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1 has now been completed.

The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.16, under agenda item 39: Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security. I call on the representative of Romania to make a statement.

Mr. TINCA (Romania): The draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.16 relates to the up-dated report of the Secretary-General concerning the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and military expenditures. As the Committee will certainly recall, the report of the Secretary-General was submitted at this session and distributed to all members of this Committee, so that each of us has the opportunity to express views on the report and to comment on its contents, conclusions and recommendations. In fact many delegations have taken advantage of that opportunity and have expressed views on the report.

Recently, after the draft resolution had been submitted and officially introduced, a few delegations approached us asking for an opportunity for them to express views on the report after the adoption of this draft resolution by the General Assembly. In order to meet that request and to create an opportunity for them to do so, the sponsors have decided to alter slightly the wording of paragraph 4 of document A/C.1/37/L.16.

The text of paragraph 4 will remain as it is, but at the end of the paragraph are added the following words:

"taking also into account the views expressed by Member States on the report not later than 1 March 1983".

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

The new text of the paragraph then reads:

"Requests the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for the reproduction of the report as a United Nations publication and to give it publicity in the framework of the World Disarmament Campaign, taking also into account the views expressed by Member States on the report not later than 1 March 1983;"

Finally, with that addition, the sponsors believe that this draft resolution could be adopted by consensus. As a matter of fact we have added those words in order to make it easier for all delegations to join in a consensus on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.16 has 21 sponsors. It was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee, on 12 November 1983.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of the draft resolution, A/C.1/37/L.16 are: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Colombia, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Ireland, Liberia, Mali, Mexico, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Sweden, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting procedure with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.16 as orally amended, but first I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the statement of financial implications.

Mr. RAPHORLE (Secretary of the Committee): I have been informed by the Centre for Disarmament in the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs that it is its understanding that the expenses involved in producing the requested publications will be met through the existing resources for the publications programme of the Department of Conference Services.

Mr. VILLA (Malta): We have also given notice to the Secretariat that we are a sponsor of this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Due note has been taken of the representative's statement.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.16, as orally amended, without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/17/L.16.

The CHAIRMAN: Action has now been completed on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.16.

The Committee will now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.18, under agenda item 55 (d), "General and complete disarmament", dealing specifically with "Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present". This draft resolution has 17 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 15 November 1962. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORIE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors are Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.13, and I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation will again abstain from voting on a draft resolution that calls for the negotiation of an agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.

Brazil, together with the overwhelming majority of the international community, has consistently called upon the nuclear-weapon States to live up to their international commitment to promote nuclear disarmament, that is, the elimination of nuclear weapons from territories where they actually exist. The nuclear-weapon States instead continue to increase the size and the destructive capacity of their nuclear arsenals, besides engaging in the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the oceans and in the air space on a world-wide scale, which amounts to horizontal proliferation in its geographical dimension. They do so under the explicit protection of their interpretation of a non-proliferation instrument which, because of its inherent discriminatory character and intention, deliberately excluded the nuclear-weapon Powers from any obligation comparable to those which the non-nuclear-weapon States parties to that instrument have accepted.

The concept of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where they do not now exist would seem to confer legality upon their existence on the territories of the States which already possess such weapons. By the same token, the concept of a qualitative freeze on nuclear weapons stationed abroad would seem to indicate that the nuclear-weapon States remain free to improve their arsenals and make them more sophisticated, as they

(Mr. de Souza e Silva Brazil)

continue to do with increasing vigour. The Brazilian delegation would prefer that instead the nuclear-weapon States show real interest and dedication to the cause of carrying out concrete measures of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. TOUWA-ATANGA (United Republic of Cameroon) (interpretation from French): Cameroon is convinced of the need to take urgent steps to prevent the spreading of nuclear weapons. We believe that this is an imperative need dictated by the security requirements of peoples and the grave danger inherent in the stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction, which is carried on by certain countries despite the recommendations and the warnings of the international community.

My delegation understands full well and sympathizes with the main concern of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.10, entitled "Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present". However, my delegation finds it difficult to understand why the ban in operative paragraph 3 is restricted to the purely qualitative aspects and seems to contradict the previous paragraph. We are all aware that the stockpiles of weapons possessed by the nuclear Powers both inside and outside their national borders are quite sufficient to destroy mankind.

Therefore Cameroon believes that any prohibition of the deployment of nuclear weapons should be both quantitative and qualitative. Thus my delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.10.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): Ireland will abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.10, entitled "Non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present". Ireland has no wish to see nuclear weapons spreading more widely or being stationed in countries where they are not now stationed. I believe our general position on disarmament issues and on other draft resolutions in this Committee will have made that quite clear. We are, however, aware that the question of where the weapons of the two major Powers should be stationed and under what kind of control is a matter of contention between the alliances of which those major Powers are members. We note that the sponsors of the present draft resolution

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

are mainly members of one of those alliances and we feel that the draft resolution itself must be seen against the general background to which I have referred.

For that reason, notwithstanding our strong general position on the spreading of nuclear weapons, we feel it necessary to abstain on this draft resolution, since we feel that voting in favour of it could be seen as taking sides in a way which we would consider unacceptable, in this connection, on strategic issues between the two alliances, given that Ireland is not a member of either or of any other military alliance. Ireland in fact abstained on comparable draft resolutions in 1978, 1979, 1980 and 1981.

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): As in previous years, Belgium can only envisage an attitude of opposition to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.10, if only because it could possibly prevent States from exercising their right of collective defence under Article 51 of the Charter.

Other reasons also prompt us to withhold consent for this draft particularly because we consider that the declaration of a qualitative freeze as requested in the text would endorse existing inequalities between the arsenals of the opposing parties. Such declarations are obviously impossible to verify. If perchance negotiations were carried on to verify a freeze, the purpose of such negotiations obviously would seem to be at variance with the purpose of all the negotiations now being carried on, that is, to reduce strategic weapons and eliminate medium-range nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Noirfalisse, Belgium)

I should like to reaffirm in that connection Belgium's profound attachment to the dual decision taken in December 1979 by the North Atlantic Alliance countries. Belgium also fully supports the basic Western proposal for negotiations on the final elimination of medium-range nuclear weapons and the START negotiations which we hope will be concluded shortly.

Mr. C. LIDGARD (Sweden): The Swedish Government attaches great importance to measures aimed at preventing the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. It considers that such measures constitute a significant contribution to the non-proliferation efforts. They would also have favourable effects on the efforts to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race - in particular, with respect to the important negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on the EURO strategic nuclear weapons. In conformity with this view, Sweden strongly supports existing international instruments by which the parties concerned are committed to refrain from actions that would lead to the stationing of nuclear weapons on territories where there are no such weapons at present.

The idea of the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on foreign territories is in general in line with our view that the role of those weapons should be reduced and that all nuclear weapons should be withdrawn from Europe. The question of non-stationing is, however, extremely complex, since it concerns the general military situation in the world, fundamental aspects of existing security arrangements, and the doctrines and force postures of the leading military Powers. It seems to us that progress in that field can be achieved only in the context of real disarmament agreements.

Against that background, the Swedish Government has some doubts and reservations as to the idea of seeking the solution of a complex problem by dealing with only one of its aspects in an international agreement. Sweden will therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.18.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): In the last three years my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolutions regarding the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. On those occasions we explained our reasons in detail for taking such a stand. This time I shall merely recall some of those reasons.

It is beyond doubt that the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States can be an important step forward in the efforts to limit the nuclear arms race geographically and to prevent further vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. Consequently, Yugoslavia has always supported all initiatives and actions aimed at achieving those objectives. It was among the first countries to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the other international instruments in the field of disarmament. It has also endorsed the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones or zones of peace in various parts of the world where the conditions necessary for such zones existed, and it advocates the establishment of a similar zone in the Mediterranean, an area where the incessant stockpiling of nuclear weapons poses an ever more dangerous threat to peace and security in the world.

In operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.18 the Committee on Disarmament is requested to proceed without delay to talks with a view to elaborating an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present. However, we interpret the concept of non-stationing more broadly than is implied in that paragraph. The non-stationing of nuclear weapons cannot be limited only to the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States where there are no nuclear weapons. It should also encompass the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States where there are such weapons at present; otherwise it would mean that we accept the status quo with regard to the stationing or allowing of nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States.

Non-stationing should extend to all other areas and spaces where there are at present no such weapons, such as international air and maritime spaces. Only thus will it be possible to contribute effectively towards achievement of the objectives set out in the draft resolution. Otherwise, precisely those areas which are the object of the most intense nuclear arms race

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

would remain outside the purview of international legal regulation and would be exposed in the future to the constant accumulation of nuclear weapons and their further unhampered geographical proliferation.

Therefore, the framework for non-stationing as laid down in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution calling for the international legal regulation thereof is inadequate and too narrow. The international agreement envisaged should deal with the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States and in other areas and spaces where there are no such weapons at present, as well as the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States where such weapons are stationed at present.

For those reasons, neither is my delegation in a position now to support the limited approach to the consideration and solution of the question of non-stationing. It will therefore abstain again in the vote on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.18.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, 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, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen

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

Abstaining: Algeria, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Djibouti, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Lebanon, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.18 was adopted by 55 votes to 19, with 44 abstentions.*

* Subsequently the delegation of Togo advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

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

Mr. DARNOSUTANTO (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.18 because it is in complete agreement with the thrust of the draft resolution as a whole. However, my delegation is not satisfied with the wording of operative paragraph 3; had operative paragraph 3 been put to a separate vote, my delegation would have voted differently.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The Finnish delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.18 on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present.

I wish to make the following points in explanation of vote. First, we support the objective of a world-wide "zone" of countries that are permanently free from nuclear weapons. That, however, is an objective that requires a carefully considered and balanced arrangement of obligations and responsibilities, including appropriate security assurances. In view of the overall goal of nuclear disarmament as the ultimate priority both in global and regional terms, we believe that there should be no new owners of nuclear arms, that no new types of nuclear weapons should be developed and that there should be no new deployment in areas where the weapons have not existed hitherto.

Secondly, in our view it follows from the concept of State sovereignty that only the Government of the country concerned, be it small or big, aligned or non-aligned, is qualified to interpret its own security needs. That should be kept in mind in particular when the possibility of an international agreement is examined, as is mentioned in operative paragraph 1.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

Thirdly, for its part, Finland has forgone the option of nuclear weapons and has worked consistently for the prevention of their proliferation. Consistent with its national position as a small neutral country, Finland will not receive nuclear weapons on its territory on behalf of other countries. My Government has endeavoured to strengthen the non-proliferation régime and has supported the concept and practice of nuclear-weapon-free zones as well as other measures to lessen the danger posed by nuclear weapons. Furthermore, my Government has put forward proposals for the complete exclusion of the Nordic countries from any nuclear speculation. That requires security assurances by the nuclear-weapon States involving respect for the non-nuclear-weapon status as well as non-use guarantees.

In voting for draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.18, for the reasons I have adduced, my delegation takes exception to operative paragraph 2 and the last preambular paragraph, inasmuch as those paragraphs tend to pre-judge the outcome of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) talks in Geneva. The outcome of those talks is crucial, not only for the parties involved but for all nations in Europe. The Government of Finland has emphasized time and again that these negotiations should be conducted in good faith and with the security of Europe as the only goal.

Mr. SARAN (India): Our support for the draft resolution that has just been adopted is based on a consistent position taken by India on this issue.

However, my delegation is constrained to point out that there has been an increasing tendency on the part of the delegations addressing such issues to introduce elements which give the subject unnecessary polemical overtones. My delegation would like to make it clear that its positive vote does not in any way constitute an endorsement of these polemical elements in the text.

It has also been our consistent position that the Committee on Disarmament should undertake multilateral negotiations on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. Therefore, our positive vote does not also imply an endorsement of the recommendation contained in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.18 for the following reasons. My Government is of the view that under the current circumstances in the world, any measure imposing restrictions on the deployment of nuclear weapons as proposed in the draft resolution just adopted might destabilize the international military balance and thereby prove detrimental to the maintenance of peace and security.

Furthermore, the means of effective verification on the stationing or non-stationing of nuclear weapons, vital to such an agreement, is far from clear in the proposal. My Government believes it is more important that the nuclear-weapon States should instead proceed step by step to realize concrete and effective nuclear disarmament measures and therefore it would like once again to appeal to those States to adopt such an approach.

As a matter of national policy, Japan itself has consistently upheld the three non-nuclear principles which are known worldwide. From a global perspective, however, my delegation, for the reasons I have just stated, was not able to support this draft resolution.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): As it has done in the last few years, the delegation of Argentina voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.18. Nevertheless, we should like to make it clear that the positive vote of the Argentina delegation must be construed in the context of its position of principle in relation to nuclear disarmament and the halting of the nuclear-weapons race, a position that has been demonstrated on many occasions, especially in the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva.

With regard to the text of the draft that has just been adopted, I should also like to point out that we believe that operative paragraph 3 introduces an extraneous element, and we have reservations about this paragraph. Had operative paragraph 3 been put to a separate vote, our delegation would have abstained.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.18.

We shall now consider draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.34, dealing with the World Disarmament Campaign, under agenda item 133 (d), "Review and Implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly".

Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria): I should like to draw the attention of the members of the First Committee to two minor changes which the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.34, namely, Bulgaria, Mongolia and Romania, would like to introduce. The changes refer to the operative part of the draft resolution. We should like to substitute the word "Invites" for the words "Calls upon" in operative paragraph 1. In operative paragraph 2, which begins with the words "Also calls upon", we should like to substitute the words "Also invites". The sponsors believe that these minor changes -- although some might interpret them as editorial while others might not -- would make it easier for delegations to cast a positive vote for the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: This draft resolution has four sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 38th meeting of the First Committee on 19 November 1982. I call on the Secretary of the First Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.34 are Bulgaria, Mongolia, Romania and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.34 as orally amended.

I call first on the representative of the Netherlands who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): In the view of the Netherlands, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.34 is redundant and propagandistic. The frequent mass demonstrations in many cities in Western Europe and, indeed, last June here in New York City and in Central Park, provide the best possible evidence that public opinion in the West is not in need of Government guidance or State incentives in order to mobilize in favour of peace and disarmament. As a matter of fact, it is questionable whether the demonstrators in Western Europe or in North America would accept State-controlled action in this respect since those demonstrations are aimed precisely at bringing pressure to bear on their own Governments. This is where the tremendous difference in principle

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

and in spirit between an open society such as ours and a closed one becomes evident. Another practical problem would be: who is in charge of collecting the signatures, for instance in the socialist countries, and who will verify them and how?

For these reasons the Netherlands delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.34.

The CHAIRMAN: The voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.34 as orally amended will now begin.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea,

Paraguay, Portugal, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden,
Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay,
Venezuela

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.34, as orally amended, was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 38 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.34 and will now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.19 under agenda item 50, entitled 'Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session'. This draft resolution has 24 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Czechoslovakia at the 34th meeting of the First Committee on 16 November 1982. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors are Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam and Yemen.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.19. I call on the representative of Oman who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

Mr. MAKKI (Oman): My delegation will cast a positive vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.19 owing to our firm belief that international efforts on disarmament should indeed be intensified considerably in order to achieve our goal of general and complete disarmament.

My delegation, however, wishes to express its reservation on the slight imbalance which we feel exists in the text of this draft resolution.

* Subsequently the delegation of Jordan advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: The voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.19 will now begin.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Lebanon, Morocco, Norway, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.19 was adopted by 92 votes to 14, with 17 abstentions.*

* Subsequently the delegation of Cyprus informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

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

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation has just voted against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.19. Its objections concern the following points in particular: first, on the penultimate preambular paragraph's reference to an "obligation not to make first use of nuclear weapons", the French delegation has provided a very full account of its view on this point and has given the reasons why it felt that such an obligation would not serve the cause of non-use of force; furthermore, it explained the consequences that such an obligation would have on security conditions in the part of the world where France is situated; then, with regard to operative paragraph 2, which refers to "the elaboration and dissemination of any doctrines and concepts justifying the unleashing of nuclear war ..." and so on, we consider that this is polemical and will obviously be construed as intending to denounce the policy of nuclear dissuasion, on which the security of my country is largely founded and which is, in our view, a fundamental condition for the maintenance of balance and security in the part of the world where my country is situated.

Furthermore, we should like to refer to the misgivings that operative paragraph 6 causes us. It contains a call by the General Assembly to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to consider, in order further to mobilize world public opinion on behalf of disarmament, measures aimed at strengthening the ideas of international co-operation for disarmament through research, education, information, communication and culture. Here we think that certain comments are called for. The peace research programme presented in the First Committee by the representative of UNESCO goes far beyond what is contained in the Final Document, especially in paragraphs 103 and 107. We believe that the resources made available by UNESCO for carrying out this programme - almost \$2 million - could perhaps lead to duplication of some of the activities of the world campaign. At any rate we have no guarantee that this will not be so and so far we have not received a satisfactory reply to the questions we posed at the second special session on disarmament about how the activities are to be co-ordinated within the context of the world campaign.

These are the comments we felt we should make since they pertain to an important issue - the role of UNESCO in the disarmament field.

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.19 touches upon many questions. However, it omits the main one, that is, respect for the United Nations Charter as the primary factor of international co-operation in disarmament matters. The numerous hypotheses contained in this text do not constitute a guarantee of co-operation. Belgium believes that the best contribution that the General Assembly could make to stimulate co-operation in disarmament would be to ensure scrupulous respect by States for their commitments under the United Nations Charter and to encourage ongoing negotiations, particularly in the nuclear field. To call for a moratorium in Europe on medium-range missiles would not go as far as what we hope will be the result of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) negotiations and it would also widen the disquieting disparity between the arsenals in question. As to the concept of non-first use of nuclear weapons, I and other representatives, particularly Mr. van Well, of the Federal Republic of Germany, stated during the general debate that that was far from sufficient to meet the supreme requirement of the prevention of nuclear war. For this reason and those put forward by the representative of France, Belgium voted against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.19.

Mr. ADAN (Somalia): My delegation abstained on this draft resolution because we have serious objections to some of the language in which certain paragraphs are couched. However, if operative paragraph 3, which deals with the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had been put to the vote, we should have voted in favour of it.

The CHAIRMAN: We have therefore completed our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.19.

The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.27, under agenda item 50 (b), review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, specifically on the report of the Committee on Disarmament. This draft resolution has 29 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 17 November 1982. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.27 are: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burma, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, the United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Netherlands who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation, to its regret, will not be able to support draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.27. Traditionally, draft resolutions pertaining to the work of the multilateral disarmament negotiating body in Geneva have been adopted by consensus. In the past few years, however, this consensus seems to have been lost.

We regret this negative trend. It is obvious that the maintenance of a consensus on the operations of an important negotiating forum such as the Committee on Disarmament should be a priority objective of delegations to the First Committee. It is also obvious, however, that if such a consensus is to be achieved the draft resolution in question should be balanced and equitable. In analysing the text of draft resolution L.27, the Netherlands delegation cannot but draw the conclusion that it is not balanced and equitable. On the contrary, the thrust of the draft resolution reflects, in a rather biased way, the approach of one group of States to the multilateral disarmament process. No serious attempt was made to accommodate the views of delegations such as my own.

The Netherlands delegation, while advocating a flexible approach to the establishment of ad hoc working groups, maintains that the mandates of such ad hoc working groups should be geared to preparing specific, concrete arms limitation and disarmament measures. The call for the establishment of an ad hoc working group on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament - across the board, so to speak - does not meet this criterion. It would be much more expedient if the Committee on Disarmament, before establishing an ad hoc working group under its agenda item 2, first considered and agreed which structures would have to be established to deal with specific questions.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

We also strongly object to the interpretation given in operative paragraph 2, which states that the Ad Hoc Working Group established under agenda item 1 would prepare a treaty on a nuclear-weapon test ban. The correct description of the Working Group's task is, of course, "Nuclear Test Ban", which, by the way, is to be found in the fifth preambular paragraph. We are all the more perplexed on this point when we compare the English text of the fifth preambular paragraph -

"an ad hoc working group under item 1 of its agenda entitled "Nuclear Test Ban" -

with the French and Spanish translations of that paragraph. In French, the fifth preambular paragraph refers to :

"un groupe de travail spécial au titre du point 1 de son ordre du jour intitulé 'Interdiction des essais d'armes nucléaires'".

In Spanish, the fifth preambular paragraph refers to :

"un Grupo de Trabajo ad hoc en relación con el tema 1 de su programa titulado 'Prohibición de los ensayos de armas nucleares'".

By virtue of this wording, the fifth preambular paragraph is in line with operative paragraph 2, which in the English, French and Spanish versions refers to a nuclear-weapon test ban.

It may well be that the official translation of the text of agenda item 1 of the Committee on Disarmament is different in the languages that I have mentioned, but the original draft of draft resolution L.27 was couched in the English language. The Arabic, Chinese and Russian language versions also have wording on agenda item 1 of the Committee on Disarmament which is equivalent to "Nuclear Test Ban", not "Nuclear-Weapon Test Ban". So the text in Arabic, Chinese, English and Russian at least allows our interpretation of the mandate of the ad hoc working group established under item 1 - to wit, that it prepare a comprehensive test ban, a treaty banning tests of all nuclear explosive devices. We regret that on this important matter there exists such language differences as I have pointed out and that in the French and Spanish versions our approach is not reflected at all.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.27.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 113 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

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

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): It is with regret that we note that for the second time it has been impossible for us to adopt by consensus a resolution relating to the report of the Committee on Disarmament to the General Assembly.

We abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.27 because we believe that it fails to take account of certain conditions which we regard as essential for the effective functioning of the Committee on Disarmament. Among these I refer to the need to maintain the rule of consensus in the Committee on Disarmament and particularly the need for the Committee on Disarmament to be entirely autonomous in choosing the procedures that it regards as appropriate to carry out its mission.

While certain subjects in the Committee on Disarmament have reached the negotiating stage - which is true of the question of chemical and radiological weapons, for example - others have not at this stage met the necessary conditions for such negotiations to be carried out. Therefore, it is essential that the Committee on Disarmament may organize itself in order to carry out certain preparatory work which will facilitate subsequent negotiations, particularly on the prohibition of nuclear tests.

As to the question of nuclear disarmament, we firmly believe that the nature of this problem necessarily implies that for negotiations to be effective they should be pursued in the bilateral context in which they are now carried on, and which we should support. It follows that the interest of the international community in the negotiations justifies reports on them being drawn up by the States parties to them in due course and communicated to both the General Assembly and the Committee on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.27.

(The Chairman)

I have been asked how I intend to proceed with the work of the Committee for the remainder of the day. May I take this opportunity to announce which draft resolutions I intend the Committee to take up for the rest of the day. They are: A/C.1/37/L.30 L.65 L.31 L.39/Rev.1 L.45 L.48 L.21/Rev.1, L.51 L.53, L.56, L.57 and L.55. In the absence of any unforeseen development the draft resolutions will be taken up in that order.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian). May I draw attention to the fact that on 19 November at the 38th meeting of the Committee, you, Sir, told us the order in which the draft resolutions would be voted upon and in accordance with that order the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65 was to take place on 26 November. However, at the end of the afternoon meeting yesterday a new order was announced which proposed that the vote on that draft resolution would take place today.

We should like to submit a written amendment to that draft resolution, so the voting could take place as had been planned but in view of a request made by the United States delegation to us and to others we would have no objection to holding the vote today on that draft resolution and we shall make an oral amendment when the Committee takes up the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I did outline at a meeting last week the draft resolutions that I intended the Committee to take up this week. When I did so I explained that the rationale behind the allocation of draft resolutions to the specific dates announced was entirely upon the wishes expressed by the sponsors of those draft resolutions. We have remained flexible on that score and have to a large degree met the wishes of the sponsors. If there has been a change in the date, the only reason is that the sponsors have requested a certain date on which a draft resolution should be voted upon.

I have taken note of the intention of the Soviet delegation to make an oral amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65 and I shall call upon the Soviet representative when the Committee comes to take up that draft resolution.

(The Chairman)

The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.30. under agenda item 55 General and complete disarmament, dealing specifically with the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. The draft resolution, which has six sponsors, was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 17 November 1982. I call upon the Secretary of the Committee to read the names of the sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.30 are: Ecuador Indonesia Mali, Mexico Nigeria and Sweden.

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

Mr. C. LIDGARD (Sweden): It may be that there is a misunderstanding but we had asked that this draft resolution should be adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: It is the wish of the sponsors of this draft resolution that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): That was our understanding too. The United States is happy to join a consensus on this draft resolution but wishes to express its position on some aspects of the draft.

The adoption of this draft resolution would place on the agenda of the Disarmament Commission, as well as of the General Assembly, a report which was prepared by a group of eminent individuals in their capacity as private citizens, but the report does not represent the official views of any Member State or group of States. The draft resolution also requests from the Disarmament Commission suggestions on how the General Assembly

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

could best ensure an effective follow-up on the report, within the United Nations system or otherwise".

Read in conjunction with the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, that latter phrase has implications as regards the scope and extent of the General Assembly's competence. We trust that in implementing this draft resolution both the Disarmament Commission and the General Assembly will be conscious of those implications.

Without commenting in any way on the contents of the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues - better known as the Palme Commission - the United States wishes to stress its full and unreserved support for a free flow of information and ideas, including those relating to disarmament and security issues. It therefore did not raise any objection to the circulation of that Commission's report as background material at the second special session on disarmament. For the same reason the United States has also decided not to object to the draft resolution now before us. The United States wishes to make clear, however, that its consent to this draft resolution does not represent its acceptance of any action which is inconsistent with the established rules and procedures of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee decides to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.30 without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.30 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. SARAN (India): Our support for draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.30, which has just been adopted, is without prejudice to our position of principle that the General Assembly should not be called upon to commend reports of independent groups or commissions and be requested to follow-up action thereon. It is our understanding that the adoption of this draft resolution does not necessarily constitute an endorsement by the Committee of all the observations and conclusions contained in the report of the Commission.

Mr. TANAHASHI (Japan): The report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues contains many valuable suggestions and proposals and it could serve as a useful background document which could be referred to in the course of future disarmament deliberations. Furthermore, it should be noted that, since the Commission was composed of eminent persons from all over the world, the report of the Commission enjoys considerable prestige and will exert authoritative influence to a certain extent. It might indeed be useful for the United Nations Disarmament Commission to take note of the relevant suggestions and proposals in that report as far as that Commission finds merit in them in connection with its agenda items.

However, in the light of the fact that the Independent Commission has conducted its examination of disarmament and security issues independently of the positions of the individual countries from which members of the Commission were selected, my delegation finds difficulty in the procedure and the approach suggested by this draft resolution: namely, that the United Nations, composed of Governments of Member States, be requested to conduct follow-up work on reports produced by private, non-governmental organizations such as the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. In this respect, although my delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.30, we have strong reservations on this draft resolution.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): Although the French delegation joined in the consensus just reached with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.30, we have serious reservations. We have the highest regard for the Palme Commission, that is, the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. That Commission was received in France and in fact had a French member. We attach a great deal of importance to its work and the conclusions it has reached. However, these must be seen in the context of the independent nature of the Commission.

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

As an independent commission, in our opinion, its work deserves to be taken into consideration, and we are of the view that the position that the conclusions of the Palme Commission must be taken into account in our debates is a correct one. On the other hand, we do not believe that the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the Palme Commission should be formally and explicitly submitted by the General Assembly to the Disarmament Commission, which under the terms of the draft resolution is requested to consider a follow-up to those recommendations. We believe that such a procedure might introduce confusion into the debates and might in fact affect the value of the work conducted independently by exceptionally qualified persons. We should have preferred that the draft resolution recommend that Member States take into account the conclusions and recommendations of the Palme Commission in the consideration of the items on the agenda of the Disarmament Commission, for which these conclusions and recommendations would be useful.

Mr. ROEMER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation was pleased to join in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.30. There is no doubt that the report of the Independent Commission has made a major contribution to the world-wide debate on disarmament. This comprehensive study, which has benefited from the co-operation of a large number of renowned and respected experts and statesmen of many countries, certainly merits, in its broad range of recommendations, a thorough examination. My delegation is ready to contribute to such an endeavour.

Nevertheless, I should like to sound a note of caution. In a way we seem to be setting a precedent. The Independent Commission is not a governmental body. My delegation would not wish other organizations without any formal status in the United Nations system to demand, on the basis of this draft resolution, that the results of their work be considered by the General Assembly in a similar manner. We would resist such possible future attempts, especially where the material offered to the Assembly would be of a plainly propagandistic nature.

(Mr. Roehr, Federal Republic of Germany)

Very shortly the United Nations Disarmament Commission will have to consider how it can make draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.30 operational and what working format can be found for the consideration of the Palme Commission's report in that body, also in relation to other work assignments then before it. The Disarmament Commission, in organizing its work programme for 1983, will have to give emphasis to those subjects in which it can most effectively contribute to the work of the General Assembly in the form of concrete recommendations.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): Although we have total confidence in the integrity and undoubted value of the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, we wish to place on record our hesitation about providing, as we would with this draft resolution, a precedent by bringing into United Nations practice the discussion of private reports.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now completed action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.30.

The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65, under agenda item 133 (d), entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly", dealing specifically with the "World Disarmament Campaign: Peace and disarmament movements".

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): As everybody in this room knows, this draft resolution builds on and is fully consistent with the report on the World Disarmament Campaign which was adopted by consensus by all the Member States of the United Nations at the second special session devoted to disarmament. The language is parallel to that in the report. Consequently, we do not regard this draft resolution as in any way, shape or form an East-West issue. We reached a consensus this summer at the second special session devoted to disarmament on the language with regard to the World Disarmament Campaign, and we hope that this draft resolution will be adopted by consensus this afternoon.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

As everybody in this room also knows, the draft resolution was submitted a week ago, on 17 November. We have heard no comments about the possibility of an amendment until five minutes ago, even though there has been a week to consult and discuss this. So we wish to proceed on a consensus basis, as expeditiously as possible, because of the press of business, and to move along on this draft resolution as on other World Disarmament Campaign issues.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I was pleased to hear the representative of the United States say that he did not regard this draft resolution as being designed to lead to confrontation between East and West. We did not regard it in that way either. We should have no objection to its adoption by consensus with a very slight amendment, which, in the same spirit as that mentioned by Mr. Adelman, I think could be accepted.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Our proposal is that in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution we add just the one word "truthful" or rather "authentic" - "authentic information" - after "broad range of" and before "information". That is the substance of our oral amendment.

We should also like to say that not only do we have no objection to the dissemination of information on disarmament matters - which is the main theme of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65 - but also we have in fact always supported the widest possible dissemination of such information. For the Soviet Union that is something which goes without saying. If someone has only just now become aware of the need to act in that way, it can only be regretted that that is so and that it did not happen sooner. However - and this is extremely important - the information thus disseminated should be authentic, otherwise there would be no benefit but rather it would cause harm.

Paragraph 105 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament (resolution S-10/2) refers to the need "to avoid the dissemination of false and tendentious information concerning armaments". If we include a reference to the authenticity of information, that would make it morally binding upon Governments, various organizations and agencies not to allow the dissemination of tendentious or false information - instead of truthful information - aimed at deceiving public opinion. I think with that slight amendment we can now proceed to adopt this draft resolution by consensus.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): In keeping with the wonderful spirit of co-operation prevailing right now, I should like to take up the point of the representative of the USSR. The word "truthful" would, I think, be very helpful. As I listened to the English interpretation of his statement the word "truthful" was mentioned as the first of his two preferences. If in English the word is "truthful", that would be a very nice addition.

The CHAIRMAN: I listened very carefully to the interpretation of the statement by the representative of the USSR. My understanding is that the word in English would be "authentic", not "truthful".

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Of course I have no objection to the word "truthful". I used the Russian word "pravdivy", and I have been told by my colleagues that in English it would more correctly be "authentic". However, if Ambassador Adelman believes that "truthful" is more appropriate and renders the sense of "pravdivy", I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN: Since the amendment was only just introduced, I do not intend to put it to a vote or to ask for its adoption now. We shall do so after lunch when representatives have had a chance to digest it.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): In continuing this spirit of co-operation, I think that the Soviet representative's amendment is, as I have said, a very fine one - "truthful" is a good word - and there does not seem to be any contention about that. As I understand it, this is going to be a consensus item - unless there is some objection to that - and I see no reason for having lunch right now in the midst of our debate. We can put draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.65 behind us, move on and take up new draft resolutions this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN: I see a reason for having lunch at this point. Let me explain.

Powerful as the delegations of the USSR and of the United States of America are, there are other parties who are being asked to make a judgement on this. I believe that I echo the feelings of many in saying that at least a few hours should be allowed for consideration to be given to the recent proposal. That is why I said we shall take it up after lunch. In addition, there are delegations which wish to make statements before a decision is taken. The amendment just proposed may prejudice the statements that they wish to make. In the circumstances, I think the best thing to do is to take up the matter after lunch, and unless I hear an objection I shall adjourn the meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.