

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**  
**THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION**  
*Official Records\**



COPY:  
DO NOT REMOVE  
FROM ROOM  
L-201 (WVPR)

FIRST COMMITTEE  
39th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 22 November 1982  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 39TH MEETING**

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

**CONTENTS**

**DISARMAMENT ITEMS**

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

Draft resolutions were introduced by:

Mr. Garcia Robles (Mexico)  
Mr. de La Gorce (France)  
Mr. Saran (India)

- A/C.1/37/L.50, L.51 and L.12/Rev.1  
- A/C.1/37/L.55  
- A/C.1/37/L.2/Rev.1

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

82-64231

**Distr. GENERAL**  
A/C.1/37/PV.39  
30 November 1982

**ENGLISH**

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

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

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

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I am going to introduce in succession three draft resolutions: document A/C.1/37/L.50, on the World Disarmament Campaign; document A/C.1/37/L.51, on the Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco; and document A/C.1/37/L.12/Rev.1, on the obligation to inform the United Nations about disarmament negotiations conducted outside the framework of the Organization.

This statement introduces to the First Committee the draft resolution on the World Disarmament Campaign (A/C.1/37/L.50) sponsored by the delegations of India, Mexico, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Yugoslavia. The preamble to the draft resolution briefly summarizes the main antecedents of the Campaign, beginning with the pertinent decisions and the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in which, as the Committee will recall, the Assembly declared that it was essential that not only Governments but also the peoples of the world should recognize and understand the dangers in the present situation and stressed the importance of mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament.

The two draft resolutions on the campaign which have been adopted by the Assembly already, at its thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth sessions respectively, are also specifically mentioned, as are the reports of the Secretary-General submitted to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and to the second special session devoted to disarmament respectively.

The preamble also notes with satisfaction that the World Disarmament Campaign was solemnly launched at the opening meeting of the second special session of the General Assembly to which I have referred, on 7 June 1982, and it notes that at the same session the Assembly

"... defined in general terms the objectives, contents, modalities and financial implications of the Campaign, and requested the Secretary-General

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

to submit to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh regular session the specifics of the programme outlined in its previous report" in other words, the report dated 11 June 1982, contained in document A/S-12/27.

The preamble to the draft resolution concludes by saying that the Assembly has examined the new report which, in response to the request I have just referred to, was submitted to it by the Secretary-General - that is the report contained in document A/37/548, dated 3 November of this year. That is quite a comprehensive report and, as requested, it defines in precise terms the structure and the general plan for the Campaign as well as a programme of activities for 1983. I do not intend to repeat in this statement what should be carefully examined during the review of that document but I shall make general remarks on each of the topics contained therein which I feel deserve special attention.

With regard to structure, I should like to point out that the report, after recalling the three main purposes of the Campaign - to inform, to educate and to produce understanding and public support for the purposes of the United Nations in the field of disarmament - stresses that:

"The Campaign should be carried out in all regions of the world in a balanced, factual and objective manner. (A/37/548, para. 9) To that end the participation of the United Nations system of Member States and other bodies is especially envisaged, in particular the participation of non-governmental organizations".

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

It has been stressed that:

"Member States will be encouraged to co-operate with the United Nations to ensure a better flow of information with regard to the various aspects of disarmament and to avoid dissemination of false and tendentious information." (ibid., para. 11)

It has also been noted that the Campaign will focus largely on five main groups: elected representatives, mass media, non-governmental organizations, educational communities and research institutes.

It has been emphasized that:

"The United Nations will ... co-ordinate ... the implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign which should be carried out at the global, regional and national levels under the auspices of the Organization." (ibid., para. 12)

It has also been stated that the Secretary-General will submit to the General Assembly on an annual basis a report on the implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign during the preceding year and:

"will convey to the Assembly the relevant views of the Advisory Board on disarmament studies". (ibid., para. 21)

It would be most advisable that, when it deals with matters pertaining to the Campaign there be appropriate participation of non-governmental organizations.

Concerning the programme of activities for next year, I will simply note that, as indicated in the report:

"The specific activities to be conducted in 1983 have been selected primarily on the basis of three criteria: their immediate impact, multiplier effect and their ability to be carried out without extensive preparation." (Ibid., para. 23)

I would draw attention to the fact that it is expressly recognized that:

"The success of the Campaign will greatly depend on the extent of the active and material support of Member States and co-operation of non-governmental organizations." (ibid., para. 22)

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Bearing in mind the scope of the report and the specific nature of its provisions, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.50 have felt that it would suffice for the Assembly to approve both the overall structure of the Campaign and the programme of activities for 1983. That is the purpose of the first two operative paragraphs of the draft.

The next three are designed to promote the Campaign's financing.

The first of them - operative paragraph 3 - reiterates the Assembly's invitation to all Member States which have not yet done so to supplement available United Nations resources with voluntary contributions. This invitation should be understood as applying in particular to certain States which have been the most demanding with regard to the Organization and operation of the Campaign but have not yet announced any contributions to it.

The second of those paragraphs - operative paragraph 4 - would have the Assembly decide that at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly there should be a Pledging Conference of contributions of the Member States for the World Disarmament Campaign - a procedure which, as everyone knows, is customarily followed in similar cases.

The third of those paragraphs - operative paragraph 5 - declares again that voluntary contributions made by non-governmental organizations, foundations and trusts and other private sources would also be welcome.

The delegations sponsoring the draft resolution which I am introducing trust that, because of its general nature and meticulous preparation, in which special care was taken to avoid the inclusion of controversial issues, the draft will be adopted by consensus in the Committee as well as in the plenary Assembly.

That concludes my introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.50. I now wish formally to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51, sponsored by the delegations of 20 States parties to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, generally known as the Treaty of Tlatelolco, of which the Government of Mexico has the honour of acting as the Depositary Government.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The delegations in question are: the Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago and Uruguay.

The specific subject of the draft - that is, the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty - is far from being anything new on the agenda on the First Committee, as witnessed by the fact that the first preambular paragraph mentions no less than nine resolutions on the item, the first of which was adopted 15 years ago, on 5 December 1967.

The draft resolution takes into account that within the area of application of the Treaty there are some territories which, in spite of not being sovereign political entities, are nevertheless in a position to receive the benefits deriving from the Treaty through its Additional Protocol I, to which the States that de jure or de facto are internationally responsible for those territories may become parties.

As is recalled in the third and last preambular paragraph, three of those States - the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Netherlands and the United States of America - became parties to Additional Protocol XI, in chronological order, in 1969, 1971 and 1981, respectively. There is only one State to which the Protocol is open; although that State signed it nearly four years ago, on 2 March 1979, it has not yet become a party to the Treaty because it has not ratified it.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Thus the first two operative paragraphs of the draft resolution are aimed at regretting that that situation continues to exist despite the time that has elapsed since the signature and the "pressing invitations" which the Assembly has addressed to the State in question, which is urged on this occasion "not to delay any further such a ratification which has been requested so many times".

In view of the fact that the State in question is France, one of the three main exponents of the Romance tradition in Europe and that the Treaty of Tlatelolco is considered - and rightly so - to be one of the most important contributions of Latin America at the international level, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.51 wish to believe that this will be the last time that the Assembly will have to urge that country to act in conformity with the excellent political, economic and cultural relations that exist between it and the States parties to the Treaty. We therefore hope that inclusion of this item in the provisional agenda of the thirty-eighty session of the General Assembly will be solely for the purpose of celebrating next year the fact that Additional Protocol I will be fully in force, as envisaged when it was prepared in 1967. I have thus concluded the introduction of the second draft resolution.

I wish now to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.12/Rev.1.

As will be recalled, on Friday, 5 November, I offered some explanations on a text which was to be reproduced that same day as draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.12 and was mainly intended to highlight the need for complying with the obligation of keeping the United Nations duly informed about disarmament negotiations which may be undertaken outside the framework of the Organization so that the United Nations could play effectively the "central role" and the "primary responsibility" which it has in this area, as contained in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament in 1978, which was unanimously and categorically reaffirmed by all Member States at the second special session on disarmament which took place in June-July of this year.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The brief comments that I wish to add today to what I said at that time are intended solely for a better understanding of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.12/Rev.1 which is sponsored by Indonesia, Sweden, Yugoslavia and Mexico and was handed to the Secretariat last Friday for distribution, as well as to refer to the changes this entails compared with the original text. Those comments are the following.

First, the first two preambular paragraphs are the same as in the original text, to which, so far as we know, no one has objected.

Secondly, given the fact that the titles of the two sets of bilateral negotiations referred to in the text of 5 November were not unanimously supported by the two super-Powers, the third preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 of the revised text use a title - "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations" - which, because it is general and states an irrefutable fact, we think will not give rise to any difficulties.

Thirdly, the position is similar in respect of operative paragraph 2. With regard to substance, it reproduces verbatim operative paragraph 6 of resolution 36/97 I, which was adopted by consensus on 9 December 1981, that is to say, the need for the two negotiating parties "to bear constantly in mind that not only their national interests but also the vital interests of all the peoples of the world are at stake in this question".

Fourthly, with regard to the request contained in operative paragraph 1 and as allowed by the need in principle to maintain unchanged the obligation to inform the United Nations entered into in 1978 and reaffirmed in 1982, it has been worded in terms of the date envisaged - 1 September 1983 - as well as of the fact that two alternatives are provided for - a joint report or two separate reports - and will, it seems to us, be easy for the two super-Powers to implement.

In the light of the aforementioned, representatives will easily understand why the sponsors of the revised draft resolution venture to hope that our efforts will be rewarded by the adoption of this text by consensus.



Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation would like, on behalf of the 35 sponsors, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.55, entitled "Monitoring of international disarmament agreements and strengthening of international security (proposal for the establishment of an international satellite monitoring agency)". The sponsors of the draft are the delegations of the following countries: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Italy, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon and Yugoslavia.

The second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was called upon to consider the report prepared for it by the Secretary-General with the assistance of a group of experts on the proposed satellite monitoring agency. The special session was not able to consider the report or to draw conclusions from it. In accordance with a decision which is to be found in the report of the plenary Committee, adopted on 8 July 1982, the report of the Secretary-General, and the study of the experts are thus before this session of the General Assembly.

The sponsors of the draft resolution would like to recall the conclusions contained in the experts' report:

"The Group ... recognized the valuable contribution which monitoring by satellites could make to the verification of certain parts or types of arms-control and disarmament agreements. ... The Group also appreciated the positive role that satellite monitoring could play in preventing or settling crises ... thus contributing to confidence-building among nations." (A/34/540 Annex, p. 9, para. 23.)

The technology of satellite monitoring is gradually becoming more widely known and a growing number of States will have national systems in the years to come. It would be wrong not to give the international community as well

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

access under proper conditions to this modern and irreplaceable tool for verification and monitoring. The proposal for a satellite agency is a long-term, very complex undertaking and one that would have to be carried out by stages. We feel that all its aspects should continue to be considered. We felt that a report from the Secretary-General on the means of implementation of the experts' recommendations on the institutional aspects of the proposal would be a useful contribution.

The experts considered various formuli in respect of the possible legal status. They concluded unanimously that the Agency should be an independent body, closely linked to the United Nations through the General Assembly and one that would have international legal status. The constituent legal instrument, which would be a treaty, would define the bodies of the agency.

The experts' report contains proposals which we feel require further in-depth consideration. The proposals should be further elaborated and possible solutions considered in relation to problems that are raised in the report as to the establishment and operation of the bodies of the agency. Some of those problems are of great importance, particularly those in relation to membership of the Council, the appointment of its members and the decision-making process. It would also be very useful to study the means of implementing the conclusions reached by the experts in the initial development phase of the agency, taking into account the technical means available and the missions with which it would be entrusted.

We feel that the report requested in the draft resolution could be prepared by the centre - or the department of disarmament - without any need for recourse to experts. If so, adoption of the draft resolution would not entail any financial implications.

Other studies on various aspects of the proposed satellite monitoring agency would no doubt have to be carried out before the General Assembly takes a decision

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

on establishing this agency and calls for the opening of negotiations to that end. For the time being, we believe that the adoption of the text before this Committee would be a useful contribution to the preparation of this item. It will also give the international community an opportunity to confirm its already demonstrated interest in the subject.

Mr. SARAN (India): I have asked to speak to bring to the notice of the Committee a revised version of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.2/Rev.1 entitled 'Prevention of Nuclear War', on behalf of the delegations of Ecuador, Liberia, Mexico and India.

During the past few weeks we have had the opportunity to engage in intensive consultations with a number of delegations concerning the proposal for the Secretary-General to appoint a representative group of eminent persons to advise the General Assembly on special measures and procedures for the prevention of nuclear war. We have been gratified by the favourable reaction to the proposal, but it appears to us that a number of delegations would like more time for reflection. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.2, have all along expressed the desire to have the proposal accepted as non-controversial and adopted by consensus.

Therefore, in order to preserve this initiative as one that can command consensus and to accommodate delegations which have requested more time to study the proposal in all its aspects, the sponsors of A/C.1/37/L.2 have decided to present a revised draft which invites Member States to communicate to the Secretary-General their views on the proposal. It is our hope that at the next session of the General Assembly, a unanimous decision to convene the Group may be adopted.

The sponsors request that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.2/Rev.1 be adopted without a vote.

Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): Last Friday, 19 November, my delegation had the honour to introduce formally into the First Committee a draft resolution on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 36/85, on the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. We did so on behalf of a number of sponsoring delegations. These were my own delegation, Austria, the Bahamas, Canada, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, Ireland, Japan, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Singapore, the Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Thailand and Uruguay. The draft resolution is contained in document A/C.1/37/L.40.

Today, we wish to give a short explanation of the intent and purpose of this draft resolution. My delegation, together with the other sponsors, reiterate our conviction, which has been expressed in other General Assembly resolutions in previous years, that a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty leading to the cessation of all nuclear test explosions for all time is a matter of the highest priority.

It would cover explosions for both military and peaceful purposes and would thereby limit and perhaps even stop the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons by the parties to the treaty. Added to this, such a treaty would make the development of new nuclear weapons and the improvement of existing ones more difficult. The implementation of and wide adherence to such a treaty could considerably strengthen the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty by leading to its fuller implementation and by helping overcome the objections of those States which see the Non-Proliferation Treaty as discriminating in favour of existing nuclear-weapon States. Certainly the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty would be seen as a major demonstration by the nuclear-weapon States of their intention to work for measures of nuclear disarmament which are fundamental to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

As I have said, the conclusion of such a treaty would also contribute to limiting or even preventing horizontal proliferation. In this respect it is relevant that States which are not a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty could become a party to a comprehensive test-ban treaty and thus provide assurances that they would not become nuclear-weapon States.

My delegation welcomed the formation of a working group under the nuclear test-ban agenda topic of the Committee on Disarmament this year and we participated actively in its work. We regard it as logical that work on such a treaty should begin by examining fully the issues of verification and compliance,

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

without which such a treaty would not be possible. We hope that the Committee on Disarmament will be able to carry forward its work with all due speed. Its successful completion would clear the way for the initiation of substantive negotiations on the drafting of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty which could then be submitted to the General Assembly at the earliest possible date.

In this connection, my delegation regards the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to establish an international data exchange system as of great importance and hope that all States will continue to co-operate with this Group.

My delegation remains of the view that if we are to prevent further proliferation of nuclear weapons and if we are to make a positive contribution towards ending the arms race and towards the achievement of nuclear-arms reduction and disarmament, then a comprehensive nuclear-test ban is a vital element in action towards those objectives. We believe that the text, as it now stands, takes into account the points of view of a very wide range of countries.

On behalf of its sponsors, I commend the draft resolution to the Committee.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation worked intensively with other sponsoring delegations in trying to reflect the views of others in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.40, which was introduced by the representative of Australia last Friday and which the Ambassador of Australia further commented on a few minutes ago.

Taking advantage of this opportunity, I should like to reiterate the position of my Government on the issue of a comprehensive test ban. As I stated on 3 November 1982 in the course of the general debate, the great significance my country attaches to a comprehensive test-ban as one of the most effective measures in the nuclear disarmament field lies not only in the fact that it would constitute a brake to the further sophistication of nuclear weapons, but equally important, that it would help prevent the appearance on the scene of new nuclear-weapon States. At the same time, Japan has been grappling with the comprehensive test-ban problem as a matter of the highest priority in the field of nuclear disarmament because we think it will provide a realistic basis for efforts towards the reduction and eventually the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. In other words, a comprehensive test ban would indeed be an important first step in the direction of nuclear disarmament.

It was from that this viewpoint that my Government welcomed the establishment in the Committee on Disarmament last April of an ad hoc working group on a comprehensive test ban which has initiated consideration of issues relating to verification and compliance with a view to making further progress towards a nuclear-test ban. Japan strongly hopes that the working group, with the active participation of all nuclear-weapon States, will continue and intensify its work from the beginning of the Committee on Disarmament session in 1983 in order to make possible early agreement on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty.

Finally my delegation would like to stress once again Japan's basic view that a nuclear test-ban should be comprehensive - comprehensive in the sense that it should prohibit all nuclear-test explosions, including so-called peaceful nuclear explosions by all States and for all time.

Mr. THIELICKE (German Democratic Republic): My delegation would like to inform the Committee that today a revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15, on the prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons, was submitted. The new text is the result of many consultations we had with other delegations. We hope that draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1 will achieve broad support.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic is in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.44, since it is aimed at the intensification of the negotiations on the Committee on Disarmament on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons. Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.15/Rev.1 provides for additional ways and means to further the quick achievement of such a convention. It therefore supplements draft resolution A/C.1.37/L.44.

This applies especially to the aim of stopping the qualitative arms race in the field of chemical weapons and to curb the geographical spread of these weapons. There can be no doubt that such steps would promote an early achievement of a total prohibition of these weapons.

As far as verification of compliance with a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons is concerned, my country advocates a combination of national and international measures. At the same time we cannot but express our concern that certain delegations do not seem to look upon verification along the lines of the relevant provisions of the Final Document, that is, that disarmament measures

(Mr. Thielicke, German Democratic Republic)

should provide for appropriate verification procedures and that those procedures should depend on the scope of prohibition of the concrete disarmament measure.

(Mr. Thielicke, German  
Democratic Republic))

On the contrary, those delegations try to deal separately with verification, and to forget about disarmament - to put it philosophically. The consequences of such an approach are especially clear with regard to a comprehensive nuclear-weapon test ban, where the singling out by some countries of a so-called verification question is calculated to consolidate their position that the time is not propitious today for a comprehensive test ban.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): Before the voting begins on the draft resolutions before the Committee I should like to note certain procedural understandings that significantly affect our work.

It is vital to the fiscal integrity of the United Nations system that there be no failure to prevent unwise and uncontrolled increases in the United Nations budget. It is understood that all those resolutions that require an appropriation additional to the regular United Nations budget will be accompanied, before action is taken on them here, by financial implications statements, as required by General Assembly rule of procedure 153.

The United States wishes to request that all financial implications statements be made available in writing, with sufficient time for all delegations to consider them thoroughly at least 24 hours before our consideration of the resolution in question, as implied by rule 120.

I wish to put a question to you, Mr. Chairman. May we assume that no increase in the regular United Nations budget will be authorized in support of any activity arising from a resolution for which no financial implications statement was provided before our consideration of that resolution?

The CHAIRMAN: The understanding of the representative of the United States is correct: the financial implications statement will be provided before we vote.



Mr. HARLAND (New Zealand): For many years New Zealand has taken an active part in preparing and sponsoring a resolution calling on the Committee on Disarmament to negotiate a comprehensive test-ban treaty as a matter of the highest priority. The urgent need for such a treaty is evident, and what it would accomplish is not in question. It would retard technical advances in nuclear weaponry of the sort which have had such destabilizing effects over the past two decades; it would limit growth in the nuclear arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States; and it would, if universally adhered to, prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to countries which do not now have them. The conclusion of a nuclear test-ban treaty would, moreover, be a demonstration by the major nuclear Powers of their commitment to the arms control process, and of their acceptance that military competition needs to be limited by negotiation.

Although every Member State of this Organization has expressed support for the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, it would be idle to ignore the fact that there are different views concerning the content, timing and modalities of such a treaty. I wish to comment on two of these points - the problem of so-called peaceful nuclear explosions and the issue of verification - because it is mainly in these areas that the three draft resolutions before the Committee can be distinguished from one another.

A peaceful nuclear explosion is not essentially different from that of a nuclear weapon. The mechanism in both cases is a bomb. It is highly doubtful whether any practical non-military uses for nuclear explosives can be developed. But even if they can be, which is more important - the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, or a test-ban treaty that would allow States to continue with so-called peaceful explosions? There is no doubt in our mind that a comprehensive treaty must take priority. At the very least, non-military uses should be permitted only after a universally agreed, and universally applicable, international system of supervision and control has been devised and put into operation.

The second, and related, issue is that of verification, which has been in the past, and is now again, one of the principal obstacles in the way of agreement. It has often been said that national capabilities are sufficient

(Mr. Harland, New Zealand)

to detect all but low-yield explosions, and that the risk of undetected tests in that category must be weighed against the greater risk involved in the continuance of nuclear testing programmes without restriction. That, in fact, has been New Zealand's position for some time. It must nevertheless be recognized that that approach is not shared by all the nuclear-weapon States, and that their requirements for verification must be satisfied before any treaty on the prohibition of nuclear tests can come into effect.

In the Committee on Disarmament this year an Ad Hoc Working Group was set up to examine the issue of verification and compliance. So far it does not seem to have achieved very much. For that reason, among others, it appears that some members of this Committee would prefer that the Working Group should next year proceed directly to the drafting of a treaty. That, of course, is for the Committee on Disarmament to decide, and New Zealand is not a member of it. We would simply observe that a treaty that does not contain provisions on compliance verification in which the nuclear Powers have confidence is not likely to get their support. It follows, in our view, that the Committee on Disarmament would be unwise not to persist with its work in the area of verification, though that need not be an obstacle to its consideration of the text of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

It is against that background that my delegation has considered the three draft resolutions concerning a test ban. The first of these, in document A/C.1/37/L.32, in its operative paragraph 2, reaffirms the conviction that a treaty to achieve the prohibition of nuclear-test explosions by all States for all time is a matter of the highest priority. But what the draft then calls for is, first, negotiations on a treaty that would only prohibit nuclear-weapon tests and, secondly, a moratorium on nuclear testing only by the three nuclear-weapon States that are the depositaries of the partial test-ban Treaty. It omits any reference to the need for any treaty to be adequately verified.

(Mr. Harland, New Zealand)

The second draft resolution is that submitted by the Soviet Union in document A/C.1/37/L.6. It, too, would not prohibit so-called peaceful nuclear explosions, and therefore falls short of the objectives of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. It proposes a moratorium which would not be binding and would not be supervised, and though the annexed text of the treaty includes general provisions on verification, these are not in a form that gives confidence that the measures would meet the minimum requirements of other nuclear-weapon States.

Accordingly, my delegation will abstain on draft resolutions L.32 and L.6, and will vote in favour only of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.40, of which New Zealand is a sponsor. That draft resolution alone calls for the negotiation and conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty as a matter of urgency, and acknowledges that no such treaty can be effective unless it is adequately verified

The CHAIRMAN: The announcement made on Friday in connection with the Committee's programme of work and timetable for this week had been prepared by the Secretariat with the co-operation of the sponsors of the draft resolutions before the Committee. Because of some difficulties, certain draft resolutions which had been scheduled for today will not be put to the Committee for action today. The Committee will take action on them at its future meetings.

(The Chairman)

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee, who will inform the Committee of the draft resolutions on which action should be taken today and also of additional sponsors to various draft resolutions.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): As you have indicated, Mr. Chairman, the Committee will take decisions on the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/37/L.20, L.24, L.25, L.33, L.35 and L.58/Rev.1.

I shall now read out the list of additional sponsors:  
for draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.1/Rev.1, the German Democratic Republic;  
L.3/Rev.2, Colombia; L.6, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic,  
the German Democratic Republic, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic  
and Viet Nam; L.12/Rev.1, Colombia; L.16, Liberia; L.19, Guyana;  
L.24, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet  
Socialist Republic; L.27, the German Democratic Republic; L.28, Mongolia;  
L.29, Viet Nam; L.31, Viet Nam; L.30, Indonesia; L.32/Rev.1, Colombia and  
Bangladesh; L.35, Bangladesh; L.39, the Bahamas, L.40, Colombia;  
L.41, Spain; L.42, Ecuador and Morocco; L.44, the Federal Republic of Germany,  
Mongolia and Belgium; L.50, Colombia; L.52, Colombia, Morocco and Uruguay;  
L.53, Ecuador; L.56, Ecuador; L.58/Rev.1, Colombia and Costa Rica;  
L.59, Ecuador and Mongolia; L.60, Ecuador and the United Republic of Cameroon;  
L.62, Ecuador; L.63, Ecuador; and L.64, Venezuela and the Maldives.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall take up first the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.20, under agenda item 40, entitled "Reduction of military budgets". It has 16 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 34th meeting of the Committee on 16 November 1982.

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

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The list of sponsors for draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.20 is: Austria, Bangladesh, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, Ireland, Mali, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sudan, Sweden and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting procedure with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.20. Its sponsors have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

I call on the representative of Brazil, who wishes to express his delegation's position before a decision is taken.

Mr. de SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation has consistently supported the general thrust of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly under the agenda item dealing with the reduction of military budgets.

It is our understanding that the reduction of military budgets is first and foremost incumbent upon the nuclear-weapon States, whose military expenditures account for nearly 90 per cent of the resources devoted to armaments. We also support the principle generally recognized in the United Nations that savings generated by reductions in the military expenditures of those States be reallocated for economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries.

Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.20 requests the Disarmament Commission to continue its consideration of the item entitled "Reduction of military budgets" at its 1983 session. My delegation understands this provision as being in direct connection with the general directives which will be given the Commission on the organization of its future work and which are contained in another draft resolution to be voted upon later. In our view, operative paragraph 5 does not mean that the question of military budgets enjoys any privileged position among the items from which the Commission will select, at the appropriate time, the specific subjects to which it will direct its attention at its 1983 substantive session.

The CHAIRMAN: No other representative wishes to explain his delegation's position before the Committee takes a decision.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.20 without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.20 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position in connexion with the decision just taken by the Committee.

Mr. SARAN (India): Although draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.20 has been adopted without a vote I should like to state that, had a vote been taken on the draft, my delegation would have abstained.

It has been our consistent position that since it is the five or six militarily significant States which account for over 80 per cent of global military expenditures, it is they who must take the lead in cutting military budgets. We are unable to accept the proposition that rising military expenditures is a phenomenon for which all States are somehow responsible. It is this mistaken assumption that has led to the idea of codifying principles for freezing or reducing military budgets which would be applicable equally to all States.

The considerations I have just outlined apply equally to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.22/Rev.1, which will be taken up for action in this Committee at a later date. A further objectionable element in this draft resolution is the faulty notion that the question of the reduction of military expenditures can be based on untenable concepts, such as that of military balance. India's position in this regard is well known. We are of the view that notions such as military balance, parity, equal security, etc. are inherently unquantifiable and cannot in any event serve as the basis for undertaking measures of disarmament.

The United Nations has already undertaken a study on a so-called international reporting system to be used by States to provide data on their military expenditures. Only a small handful of States have been using this so-called reporting system. Despite the very clear impracticability of such an exercise, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.22/Rev.1 proposes an even more complex and technical study which has a rather tenuous relationship with the question of the reduction of military expenditures. It is not lack of data or lack of prior agreement on verification procedures that is responsible for the failure to make progress in disarmament. As we have pointed out time and again, it is the lack of political will on the part of the major Powers that is responsible for the fact that the arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, continues unabated. Exercises such as the one proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.22/Rev.1 serve merely to detract attention from this central political issue.

(Mr. Saran, India)

In accordance with this consistent position, India will be forced to abstain also on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.22/Rev.1.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): The Netherlands has participated in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.20, entitled "Reduction of military budgets". We shall explain our position on that draft resolution when the Committee takes a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.22/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.20.

We now move on to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.24, under agenda item 50 (c), entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session Disarmament Week." This draft resolution has 12 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 34th meeting of the First Committee on 16 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 are Afghanistan, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, India, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.24. The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed a wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.24 without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.24 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.24.

We move on to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.25 under agenda item 50 (g), entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: prohibition

(The Chairman)

of the nuclear neutron weapon. This draft resolution has 22 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 34th meeting of the First Committee on 16 November 1982. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to give the list of sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.25 are Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

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

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.25. Brazil condemns with equal vigour all manifestations of the current acceleration of the nuclear arms race which puts in jeopardy the security of all nations, nuclear and non-nuclear alike. We believe, however, that it does not serve a useful purpose to single out in a draft resolution of this kind any particular aspect of the nuclear-arms race. The inclusion of a specific item on neutron weapons in the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament would further compound the difficulties that already exist in that multilateral negotiating body with regard to the long overdue negotiations on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament.



(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

My delegation continues to be firmly convinced that urgent steps must be taken to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects and that the nuclear-weapon Powers should refrain from engaging in the proliferation of nuclear weapons, as regards both their numbers and their horizontal spread in a geographic dimension, as well as from increasing the sophistication of their nuclear arsenals far in excess of their security needs.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): The Swedish Government has on a number of occasions strongly condemned plans to develop and produce neutron weapons. Ever since such plans became known it has emphasized the grave risks of lowering the nuclear threshold, which these weapons entail. My Government's position remains unchanged as far as such weapons are concerned. The development, testing and production of all nuclear weapons, including the neutron weapon, should be prohibited. As a matter of principle the Swedish Government therefore has reservations against the idea of prohibiting one specific nuclear weapon while omitting other nuclear weapons of the same category from the prohibition.

We note with satisfaction that the draft resolution this year includes a reference to the development of nuclear neutron weapons. Sweden had proposed to the sponsors that operative paragraph 1 should be amended to include the words "tactical nuclear weapons, in particular" after the words "and use of" and before the words "nuclear neutron weapons". It is our understanding that the sponsors do not accept this amendment and Sweden will therefore abstain in the vote on the present draft resolution.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): The delegation of Guyana has consistently expressed its dissatisfaction with what has been achieved with regard to the establishment of conditions for a secure and lasting peace. We have consistently called .. and I here reiterate that call - for the adoption of effective measures to end the nuclear-arms race at an early date and for genuine and complete nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

The draft resolution before us in document A/C.1/37/L.25, in its second preambular paragraph, stresses that the nuclear neutron weapon represents a further step in the qualitative arms race in the field of nuclear weapons. Guyana opposes the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear weapons in all their aspects, including the neutron weapon. It is our conviction that the introduction of this weapon represents another upward movement in the spiralling arms race and dangerously worsens the present situation of tension and crisis in the world while complicating and frustrating United Nations efforts for the attainment of its disarmament goals.

My delegation would like to express its appreciation to the authors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.25, for reflecting as well as they do the profound concern which Guyana feels at the introduction of what has properly been described as the ultimate capitalist weapon - the neutron weapon. Guyana opposes the production of all types of nuclear weapons, without exception, and we are prepared to lend our support to any measure which seeks prohibition of the production of nuclear weapons in general, but we do not believe in calling for selective prohibitions. There are other types of nuclear weapons, apart from the neutron weapon, which make for an escalation of the nuclear arms race and on whose production we would also like to see a prohibition placed. Guyana believes, therefore, that to give its support to any selective approach to the question of nuclear weapon refinement would be inconsistent with the general concern which we feel at the overall process of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear weapons. My delegation will therefore abstain in the vote on this draft resolution, as we did last year.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.25.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Panama, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Fiji, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Iceland, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

The draft resolution was adopted by 59 votes to 14 with 52 abstentions.

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

Mr. SARAN (India): India voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.25 in line with our total opposition to all nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

It is our view that the Committee on Disarmament should without delay undertake multilateral negotiations on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament aimed at the total elimination of all nuclear weapons, including nuclear neutron weapons.

Miss DA SILVA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.25, on the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon, the delegation of Venezuela wishes to reiterate its position, as expressed at the last session on the draft resolution on the same item.

Our country has always been in favour of the prohibition of all nuclear weapons. We consider that all negotiations on the prohibition of a specific type of nuclear weapon, such as the neutron weapon, should take place within the framework of the nuclear disarmament negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament.

For those reasons the delegation of Venezuela abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.25.

Mr. MICHAELSEN (Denmark): The Danish delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.25. As stated last year, the Danish Government opposes production of the neutron weapon. As was further stated, Denmark, as part of an area which is free of nuclear weapons, would not accept such a weapon on its territory.

There has been no change in that position, but as the draft resolution just adopted seems to constitute an undisguised attempt to split the Western allies in an important area of defence policy, we again decided to abstain on the draft resolution.

Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): Pakistan's position on the nuclear question in all its aspects is firm and unequivocal: we believe that nuclear weapons - all nuclear weapons - pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization. It is therefore imperative to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects, and the objective in this context is the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

We are against the nuclear arms race, whether qualitative or quantitative, vertical or horizontal. We are against the neutron weapon as well as other nuclear weapons. However, we do not believe that the process leading to the ultimate goal - namely, the complete elimination of nuclear weapons - is served by singling out one particular weapon system.

The Pakistan delegation, therefore, while in full agreement with the goal of nuclear disarmament, has abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.25.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish):

My delegation's explanation of vote is similar to those of other delegations and I shall therefore not go into detail.

My delegation has repeatedly expressed condemnation of the neutron weapon and its development, considering, as we do, that it adds a new qualitative element in the race to develop nuclear weaponry, which should certainly be condemned. Nevertheless we have abstained this year, as we did last year, because as I have said, while we are against the development of any nuclear weapons, we consider it inadvisable in the negotiating process to single out a specific type of weapon, especially when there are others which are also subject to condemnation but which apparently do not merit special treatment.

For those reasons my delegation abstained on this draft resolution.

Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): The Egyptian delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.25 in keeping with the Egyptian position set forth on this matter last year and on the basis of the following considerations.

The Egyptian position is consistent concerning our support for general and complete disarmament under effective international control, and we are opposed to the development and proliferation of nuclear weapons, whether qualitative or quantitative. In this respect we do not accept or understand the singling out of one particular type of nuclear weapon when there are other similarly dangerous nuclear weapons. On that basis, and in view of the delicate nature of the ongoing negotiations and the existence of certain notions in the draft which relate to the competition between the Eastern and Western blocs, the Egyptian delegation abstained in the voting on it.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): Ireland has consistently stated its position that the development, testing and production of all nuclear weapons should be prohibited. We consider the neutron weapon to be a particularly destabilizing form of nuclear device which would lead to the lowering of the nuclear threshold. However, we have difficulties in singling it out while ignoring other weapons in the same category.

We therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution before us because we do not consider that the approach proposed will lead to the objective which we share with the authors of the draft resolution.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): The Netherlands abstained in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.25, concerning the neutron weapon. We wish to place on record, as we did last year, that our reasons are the following. The Netherlands does not intend to have the neutron weapon stationed on Netherlands territory. At the same time, however, it is obvious that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.25 is politically inspired.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

Furthermore, we are, in fact, not interested in a convention prohibiting this weapon system specifically.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): My delegation is definitely against all nuclear weapons. We consider any strike - first, second or third - a crime against humanity. Therefore, we wish to see a prohibition of the use of every kind of nuclear weapon.

However, there has now developed the notion of getting rid of the deterrence element of nuclear war so as to make nuclear war more likely to occur. In this sense we feel we ought to support any measure that restricts that tendency towards a limited nuclear war, that makes it more achievable or more probable and brings us nearer to the danger of a nuclear war.

The neutron weapon is one of those weapons. We should like to see other weapons restricted in the same fashion as this, and we would vote in favour of the prohibition of any nuclear weapon that makes for a limited nuclear war, because that is a grave danger, and we have to face it.

Therefore, it is not enough to say we want the prohibition of all nuclear weapons. Yes, we do, and we should like to see a resolution that prohibits all nuclear weapons. But in the meanwhile we would encourage any measures that restrict the tendency towards making a nuclear war more acceptable and more achievable, which would thus bring us nearer to total catastrophe.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Costa Rica did not take part in the voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.25 because we share the view of delegations that consider all nuclear weapons inhuman and abhorrent and favour their total prohibition, with no singling out of individual weapons, especially when done for political reasons.

Costa Rica will continue to strive for the total abolition of nuclear weapons, since all of them are equally dangerous.

I also take this opportunity to declare Costa Rica's great interest in joining the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.32/Rev.1, dealing specifically with the cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons, and draft



(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

resolution A/C.1/37/L.45, on the prevention of nuclear war, as well as draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.33, on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, and draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.35, on confidence-building measures.

Mr. ABDELWAHAB (Sudan): Sudan has consistently supported the idea that the arms race in all its aspects, and particularly its nuclear aspect, represents a serious threat to mankind and to the maintenance of international peace and security. We share the wide concern and alarm of the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Organization that the continued expansion and production of nuclear weapons escalate the nuclear arms race and significantly lowers the threshold of nuclear war.

We abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.25 because we oppose a selective reference to one particular weapon in the escalating arms race.

Mr. Syed ALI (Bangladesh): Bangladesh's position on the disarmament question is clear and unequivocal. We are firmly committed to working for **general** and complete disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. As a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, Bangladesh has been actively advocating the halting and reversing of the current nuclear arms race and the halting of the production of all nuclear weapons.

The draft resolution put to the vote a few minutes ago singled out a particular type of nuclear weapon. Since we are opposed to any selective approach, my delegation, as on previous occasions, abstained in the vote on that draft resolution.

Mr. KABIA (Sierra Leone): The delegation of Sierra Leone voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.25 because of our strong opposition to the development, production and testing of all nuclear weapons, including the neutron nuclear weapon. We are also in favour of negotiations about the production of neutron weapons being carried out in the Committee on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.25.

The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.33 under agenda item 55 (a), "General and complete disarmament: prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons". The draft resolution has five sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany at the Committee's 35th meeting on 17 November 1982.

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

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors are Costa Rica, the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, Japan and Sweden.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.33. Its sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote.

If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.33 without a vote.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their position.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation supported the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution on the prohibition of radiological weapons. As is known, our country has always been an active supporter of preventing any possibility of the appearance in the arsenals of States of this new kind of weapon of mass destruction, and thus of closing one possible path for the arms race.

The Soviet Union has actively participated in talks on the prohibition of radiological weapons, notably in the Committee on Disarmament. Naturally, we fully share the view that this work should continue and even

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

be speeded up, so that the draft of the relevant treaty can be prepared for the thirty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly, as indicated in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

As is known, significant complications arose in the Committee on Disarmament during the talks on the prohibition of radiological weapons, in connection with the question of refraining from attacks on peaceful nuclear facilities. The Soviet Union - and we have said this on several occasions - does not oppose proposals to draft international measures designed to prevent attacks on civilian nuclear facilities. In addition, we ourselves drew the attention of States Members of the United Nations to the importance of this issue when we submitted for consideration at this session of the General Assembly a proposal on the need to intensify efforts to remove the threat of nuclear war and to ensure the safe development of nuclear energy.

The prevention of attacks on civilian peaceful facilities is an important separate item which requires serious consideration. In our view, a solution to this problem should not be tied in with that of prohibiting radiological weapons.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.33, the Soviet delegation would like to state that it understands the provision of the second part of the ninth preambular paragraph as relating to peaceful nuclear facilities, since at the beginning of the paragraph what is specifically referred to is the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

We also put the same interpretation on the provisions of operative paragraph 2. In this connection, we emphasize that the provision on continuing to seek a solution to the question of the scope of the prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities can in no way be considered as a change in our position on this question. It should be interpreted only as an appeal, an attempt to reach agreement among States that have different view-points on the scope of such a prohibition.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation joined in the consensus on resolution A/C.1/37/L.33, but it would like to express a reservation about the title of the resolution. We note in fact that the resolution itself deals with two quite different topics, and we would like the resolution to be confined to radiological weapons, which is in the title and which was the mandate of the working group which did the preparatory work in the Committee on Disarmament on which this resolution is based.

The CHAIRMAN: That completes the Committee's consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.33.

We now turn to the draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.35 on confidence-building measures under agenda item 133, "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly".

This draft resolution has 35 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany at the 35th meeting of the First Committee on 17 November 1982.

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

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors are: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Mauritania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Zaire, Bangladesh, Costa Rica and Egypt.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.35. The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. There are no requests to speak in explanation before the decision is taken. Therefore, if I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.35 without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.35 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Japan to explain his delegation's position.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My Government believes that mutual trust among nations is essential for the promotion of disarmament. Therefore, it fully recognizes the significance of promoting confidence-building measures in general. However, my Government maintains that in considering the possible introduction of confidence-building measures in particular regions, the specific political, military and other conditions and requirements prevailing in the region concerned should be fully taken into account.

My delegation's concurrence in the resolution just adopted without a vote should not in any way be construed as affecting this basic provision of my Government.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the Committee's consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.35. We move on to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.58/Rev.1, under agenda item 133, "The Review and Implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly". This draft resolution has 31 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Belgium at the 38th meeting of the First Committee on 19 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: Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala,

(Mr. Rathore)

Indonesia, Italy, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. As there is no objection, I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.58/Rev.1 without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.58/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those representatives wishing to explain their delegation's position.

Mr. SARAN (India): India would have abstained on resolution A/C.1/37/L.58/Rev.1 had it been put to a vote. In the vital field of disarmament, there is an imperative need to focus on priority and central issues, particularly the halting and reversal of the nuclear arms race and the achievement of nuclear disarmament. In this respect only a global approach with generally accepted principles, priorities and objectives can have any opportunity for success. In an age of nuclear weapons, peace and security are indivisible. Disarmament cannot be piecemeal in terms of geographical extent. Our position of principle in this regard has already been stated in the First Committee on 22 October 1982.

Mr. KOMIVES (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation was pleased to be part of the consensus on the draft resolution dealing with regional disarmament measures introduced by the representative of Belgium and sponsored by delegations from every group. It did so because it considers this question important and timely. The Hungarian delegation attaches importance to the resolution that has been adopted because regional disarmament measures represent an increasingly significant part of the general disarmament process. Such measures, adopted on the initiative and with the participation of all States concerned, are important and potentially effective in that they can contribute to the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

(Mr. Komives, Hungary)

The Hungarian delegation considers the resolution adopted by consensus as a very timely one. When disarmament negotiations on the global scale are facing difficulties, regional disarmament measures could play a very important role. The resolution is all the more timely since its adoption coincides with the ongoing Madrid meeting as a follow-up to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. As all of us are aware, one of the most important questions at these meetings is the convening of a European conference on confidence-building and security measures and disarmament, which is practically the central issue of the Madrid meeting.

My delegation hopes that the resolution just adopted, as an appropriate, timely and important message from the United Nations General Assembly, will favourably influence the proceedings of the Madrid meeting in this respect and will serve as an impetus for the development of a variety of measures which, by contributing to strengthening security in Europe, will advantageously influence the solving of global problems as well.

Mr. DE SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.58 does not include some important elements which, in the opinion of the Brazilian delegation, must be considered in connection with regional measures of disarmament. Action in the field of disarmament should take into account the priorities recognized by the international community and the realities of the international situation. Recommendations on this subject should therefore be directed primarily to those regions where there is the largest concentration and accumulation of armaments and particularly to the nuclear-weapon Powers, who bear a special responsibility for disarmament.

For this reason my delegation would have abstained in the voting on this resolution had it been put to a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.58/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.