

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FORTIETH SESSION

Official Records*



1985

FIRST COMMITTEE

39th meeting

held on

Friday, 15 November 1985

at 10.30 a.m.

New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 39th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

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

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

*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 IX.1-730, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/40/PV.39
22 November 1985

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.69. The Committee will then act on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1, L.24 and L.31, which are listed in cluster 3 of the informal working paper before the Committee.

Before proceeding to take action on those draft resolutions, however, I call upon the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, who wishes to introduce a draft resolution.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): It is my privilege to introduce, on behalf of my own delegation and on behalf of the delegations of Canada, Denmark, Italy, Japan, Norway, Portugal, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.74 under agenda item 65 (h), "Prevention of nuclear war". It is a follow-up to the draft resolution submitted last year. Like its predecessor, it bears a double title: "Prevention of nuclear war", including all related matters, a title that brings it into line with the formulation of the agenda agreed upon by consensus in the Conference on Disarmament, and "Prevention of war in the nuclear age," a title designed to reflect the draft resolution's comprehensive approach to the problem of the prevention of nuclear war.

There is no need to set out in detail the rationale behind the draft resolution. The views of the sponsors and of the other members of the group of States Members united behind this text were articulated in the First Committee last year and have been articulated throughout the year in the Conference on Disarmament and in the replies Governments have conveyed to the Secretary-General pursuant to resolution 39/148 P. They are fully recorded in the annual report of the Conference

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

on Disarmament and in document A/40/498. The latter document also contains the report of the Secretary-General on the prevention of nuclear war, in which the predecessor draft resolution is fully reflected and aptly analysed. By way of summary, however, I should like to state that the delegations that support this draft resolution wish, in introducing its text, to underline their commitment to the overriding objective shared by all in this room, namely, to make the utmost contribution to the prevention of nuclear war and to the search for solutions to the pressing tasks of the nuclear age. The authors of the draft resolution continue to feel that the vital topic of the prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters, requires a coherent, overall perspective, a comprehensive strategy.

As I said last year in a similar context, that comprehensive approach is founded on the insight that the task of preventing war - and above all, nuclear war - cannot be achieved by a few selected measures with mere surface appeal. A broader effort is needed. The present draft resolution, like last year's text, is built on an integrated group of key concepts that are essential building blocks of a comprehensive strategy for the prevention of nuclear war. Those are: the renunciation of force, restraint, balanced disarmament measures and confidence-building. As I will point out, a fifth pillar has been added in this year's text, namely, the importance of regional efforts at peace-keeping and conflict resolution.

The draft resolution builds upon the text submitted last year, but it has been further developed and, its authors hope, improved in a certain number of areas. An attempt has been made to make it clearer and more persuasive and to accommodate a number of concerns compatible with the purpose of the draft resolution, concerns

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

that have been expressed in the past year on various sides. These modifications are evident on perusal.

Two new paragraphs have been added. Operative paragraph 9 highlights the importance of regional measures aimed at the prevention of war. I should point out that that paragraph is taken literally from the Declaration adopted at the Lomé Ministerial Conference on Security, Disarmament and Development in Africa, thereby honouring the valuable contribution the members of the African Group of States have made to the prevention of war in the present age. Operative paragraph 15 commends the Secretary-General for having prepared his report on the prevention of nuclear war and expresses the well-founded hope that this report can facilitate mutually acceptable solutions to this vital problem.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

With these new or modified paragraphs, as with the remainder of the draft resolution that is couched in already familiar language, it is the hope of the authors that the careful reader will readily discover the sincerity of purpose and the deliberate attempt of the authors to express their insights in broadly acceptable language, often taken directly from the United Nations Charter, the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and other General Assembly resolutions. There can be no doubt that the draft resolution in its entirety is fully compatible with these guiding instruments and that, in particular, the fine balance which the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament strikes between the priority of preventing a nuclear conflagration and promoting the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, on the one hand, and its overriding purpose of enhancing international security and world peace by the avoidance of conflict in any form, on the other, has been faithfully preserved in the present text.

As I indicated, the authors of the draft resolution see it as a serious contribution to our common task to enhance international security, stability and peace worldwide, and especially to rule out the terrifying possibility of a nuclear conflict. This contribution has been made from a particular security perspective. However, the draft is not an attempt to enshrine a particular security doctrine in resolution language. The delegations that support this initiative are deeply convinced that it provides the necessary elements for a comprehensive strategy for the prevention of nuclear war, such as can be approved by all members of the Assembly, and that the ground rules for behaviour in the nuclear age which the draft resolution recommends are suitable for universal application, with each State or group of States making a specific contribution under the constraints and characteristics of each region and the threat to peace and security prevailing in

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

specific situations. These delegations are, however, equally prepared to look at the security concepts of others: to study them, to compare and weigh them with care and to work with determination towards the elaboration of common perspectives.

All States Members of the United Nations have agreed on the need to prevent a nuclear war. Many States have gone on record, presenting their views on how these supreme objectives can most effectively be achieved. The challenge for the multilateral disarmament forums, and especially this Committee and the Conference on Disarmament, is therefore to probe all these proposals in earnest and to broaden areas of understanding and agreement in order to facilitate mutually acceptable solutions and effective practical measures.

In this perspective it has been of particular importance for the authors of the draft resolution to place it before the Committee, to evoke comments and to contribute to a thorough debate on the prevention of nuclear war, where the general awareness of the real issues is heightened. This is the aim we seek, and the subsequent mechanics of voting procedures are, I am tempted to say, almost of secondary importance by comparison.

Agreement on concepts and any possible specific measures will not come easy, and it cannot be achieved by a single resolution in a one-stroke operation. A more patient, longer-term approach is needed if one wants to build common ground and to reconcile existing positions. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.74 wholeheartedly agree with the representative of Argentina, who pointed out before the Committee that all existing proposals must be analysed thoroughly and examined without any pre-condition or prejudice as a prerequisite for the joint elaboration of effective measures for the prevention of nuclear war.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

If this is the procedure we should all responsibly chart for ourselves, a co-operative disposition is needed; harshness and controversy must be avoided; and the subject should be treated at every juncture with the common objective in mind, and with fairness to those who hold other views.

It is in that spirit that, the members of the Western group that support draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.74 look at their own text and at the discussion they wish to evoke - and they hope that this spirit is shared.

There have been welcome signals from many members of this Committee - including particularly the representative of Argentina - that the most constructive way of dealing with agenda item 65 (h) at this session of the First Committee would be agreement on a procedural resolution which would foreshadow an in-depth consideration of the subject-matter in the Conference on Disarmament next year. My delegation, with the full assent of the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.74, has quickly seized upon this idea and has embarked on a series of consultations in an attempt to draft a broadly acceptable procedural draft resolution on the subject, taking draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.65 as a starting-point. Had these consultations come to fruition, there would have been logic to the proposition that other, substantive draft resolutions on agenda item 65 (h) need not be put to the vote at this time and that the ideas contained therein could have been preserved for a sustained consideration in the Conference on Disarmament.

I must state with regret, however, that so far we have not been successful in this exercise, and that not enough flexibility was demonstrated by some delegations to encourage those of us who were willing to follow this course to pursue it further. This solution, in the view of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.74, would, however, still be open, and I should like to avail myself of

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

this statement to appeal to the more hesitant members of the Committee to allow that promising approach to go forward. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.74 would bring to such a renewed consultation the full measure of their co-operative inclinations. It continues to be our hope that good sense will prevail. An agreed procedural approach may substantially facilitate a meaningful in-depth consideration of the subject at the Conference on Disarmament.

But even if this avenue turns out to be closed, I wish to be on record as affirming that the sponsors of the present draft resolution want to proceed with caution and in an unremitting search for co-operative procedures which would facilitate a constructive future discussion of the subject on hand, as well as the elaboration of ever-growing common ground on the issue. The group of countries that stand behind draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.74 wish to avoid steps that would precipitate controversy in any form.

It is in this spirit that I would like to appeal to those delegations which cannot yet give their full assent to the draft resolution to contact the sponsors of A/C.1/40/L.74 with such suggestions as they would consider useful to broaden its acceptability and improve mutual understanding. I should add that a number of suggestions of this nature have already been received and are under careful consideration.

Such friendly and co-operative probing of the additional wishes which a number of delegations may want to see incorporated in a draft resolution that comes from another group is, after all, the normal and civil working procedure which this Committee has practised in the past. The ground rules that should govern such procedures would, however, require that suggestions proposed would maintain the

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

substantive thrust of a draft resolution; that they are of a constructive nature. This is quite obviously the method by which a consensus can be broadened and the search for common ground be facilitated.

I should like to declare at this juncture, on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.74, that they would earnestly consider building into the draft resolution all elements which could truly enhance its purpose.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

Regrettably, last year another method was used. I refer to the submission, by surprise and against all assurances, of a series of amendments to last year's draft resolution, amendments that were obviously designed not to enhance the resolution's purpose and broaden its appeal but to prevent it from being voted upon and to deprive its authors - the voting relationships being what they are - of the right to put their own text to the vote.

The fact that such so-called killer amendments may be proposed in accordance with the rules of procedure is not contested, but it is beside the point. The hub of the matter is that such deliberate curtailing of the right of delegations or groups of delegations to see texts of their own choosing processed in the normal manner is an affront to the democratic principles of the Assembly. Such a procedure, in the view of the sponsors of this draft resolution, would not meet the standards of fairness which are a prerequisite for the joint fulfilment of our noble purpose in the Committee.

A year ago when such a violation of established principles of behaviour occurred in this Committee, the representative of Australia, Ambassador Butler, said the following:

"It is not acceptable to the Australian delegation that amendments should be put to the vote which have the purpose of completely distorting or changing the clear and evident thrust of a draft resolution... The longer-term implication of such behaviour is to suggest that the content of any given draft resolution in this Committee will be determined solely by one group of countries. In our view, that would be a dangerous development and one which would have grave implications for the orderly conduct of work in this body, which should, as I have already said, have its decisions determined on the basis of a free and open vote." (A/C.1/39/PV.49, p. 18-20)

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

My delegation and the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.74 place full confidence in all groups represented in the Committee that they will not be a party to such action that would, in the final analysis, only discredit their own views and form a serious obstacle on the way to a mutually acceptable solution of a shared and important task.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.69. It has 52 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of France at the 34th meeting on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Gabon, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Italy, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

This draft resolution has programme budget implications, which are contained in document A/C.1/40/L.75.

Its sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to do so.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.69 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation fully shares the profound concern of the overwhelming majority of countries of the world in regard to the fact that the arms

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

race which is being whipped up by the imperialist forces with every year is diverting for unproductive purposes a growing volume of material and intellectual resources; whereas a considerable portion of the population of our planet continues to suffer from undernourishment and disease and is deprived of elementary education and medical assistance. The Soviet Union, like other socialist countries, views the question of ensuring international peace and security, cessation of the arms race and embarking on disarmament as closely connected with other global problems encountered by mankind: overcoming economic backwardness, eliminating hunger, poverty, epidemic diseases and illiteracy; satisfying the growing demands of mankind for food resources and raw materials; protecting the environment; and peaceful conquest and exploration of the seas and outer space.

If those problems are not resolved by the concerted efforts of the world community, they will inevitably become exacerbated in the future and form new sources of international tension. The necessary conditions for resolving those problems are: cessation of the arms race; reduction of military expenditures by States, particularly those States which possess a major military potential, and diverting some of the funds saved by those means for the economic and social development of developing countries.

We are sympathetic particularly to the developing countries with regard to the adoption of measures for reducing armaments, which is closely connected with resolving the problem of economic development. Last year we supported the proposal for holding an International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, and we intend to make an active contribution, including our work in the Preparatory Committee, in the hope that it will be successfully concluded.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

We have joined the consensus on the draft resolution on the relationship between disarmament and development contained in document A/C.1/40/L.69. In so doing, like other delegations we express our gratitude to the Government of France for its invitation to hold the Conference in Paris and for its willingness, as we understand it, to assume the additional expenses incurred in holding the Conference away from United Nations Headquarters.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take up the draft resolutions contained in cluster 3.

Do any representatives wish to make statements other than explanations of vote? Since that is not the case, I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before we take decisions on the draft resolutions in cluster 3.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1, L.24 and L.31.

Our joining in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.24 shows the continued support of Brazil for the current negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a multilateral convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and on their destruction.

We believe that the concept of chemical-weapon-free zones, as well as the singling out of specific types of such weapons, does not facilitate such negotiations, and we shall therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1, as my delegation has on past occasions.

Finally, regarding draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.31, I wish to recall the understanding on which Brazil voted in favour of resolution 39/65 A last year. We shall support draft resolution L.31, whose references to efforts to ensure the most effective prohibitions are in our view specifically related to the ongoing negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament for a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons and for their complete elimination from existing national arsenals.

Mr. NOUANETHASING (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1, L.24 and L.31, on chemical, bacteriological and biological weapons.

(Mr. Nouanethasing, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

We believe that chemical weapons should be outlawed and prohibited. The sooner those weapons are eliminated, the more reliably can we save mankind from the danger of their use. With that in mind, we favour the earliest possible completion of negotiations on the conclusion of a convention on the full and effective prohibition of the development, manufacture and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their elimination. We sincerely hope that such a convention would embrace all forms of chemical weapons, excluding any possibility of the use of any type of such weapons. On the basis of that position, we shall vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1 and L.24.

As for draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.31, we shall vote against it, for the same reasons we have voted against previous draft resolutions on this question. I shall therefore not repeat our position today.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.31, on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons.

My country is a signatory of the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare. It is also a signatory of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction. In other words, the position of Yugoslavia regarding the use of such weapons is unequivocal. We condemn most energetically any use of such weapons, regardless of who may use them. We resolutely endeavour, and shall continue to do so, to bring about the prohibition of the use and the destruction of all chemical, bacteriological, biological and other toxin weapons.

Consequently we call for the establishment of an effective system of verification and control of the implementation of international agreements on

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

disarmament. However, such a system should have as its objective the building of confidence and the promotion of co-operation between States signatories of the agreement in order to secure consistent implementation of accepted obligations. Regarding its application, such a system should be universal and not selective; otherwise, as we have repeatedly pointed out, it could be abused and not always be motivated by the objectives it wishes to achieve.

In view of the fact that draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.31 constitutes a continuation of the action my country did not support last year, my delegation will again abstain in the vote on the draft resolution this year.

Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connection with the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.31, relating to the prohibition of chemical weapons, the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement.

The Soviet Union views the prohibition and destruction of this type of weapon of mass destruction as one of the most important and urgent tasks in the field of disarmament and vigorously condemns the use of chemical weapons. Quite recently, once again a statement to this effect was made by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Gorbachev. With regard to the interest of the Soviet Union in a businesslike, dynamic round of negotiations on this problem at the Conference on Disarmament and in speeding up work on the text of the convention, this is demonstrated by our actions at the Geneva multilateral forum and the proposals we have made there. We believe that the earliest possible achievement of agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons would be greatly helped by draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1 and L.24. They are aimed at energetic progress in the responsible matter of working towards agreement on the provisions of a future convention and are fully in keeping with the concerting of the efforts of States parties in the achievement of that goal.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

As for draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.31, we are firmly convinced that all it would do is create additional obstacles to the elimination of the chemical-weapon threat, among other things, through the trumping up of artificial issues about creating verification machinery outside the context of the current multilateral negotiations at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. At previous sessions the Soviet Union has already stressed that the idea of creating verification machinery has been outside the current talks in Geneva, and it remains a stillborn idea that could only lead to illegal actions and would in essence be tantamount to a revision of the Geneva Protocol. Our position on this matter remains unchanged, and the Soviet delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.31.

Mr. LE HOAI TRUNG (Viet Nam): The delegation of Viet Nam has asked to speak to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.31, "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons."

For more than a decade, from 1960 to 1971, an unprecedented chemical warfare was carried out against the Vietnamese people involving nearly 100,000 tons of various chemical agents. Toxic materials sprayed on a large scale with a high concentration and in large amounts, have had unforeseeable effects, both immediate and long term, on our people and environment. Viet Nam is therefore resolutely in favour of the complete prohibition of all types of chemical and bacteriological weapons.

Viet Nam is a Party to both the 1925 Geneva Protocol on the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare and the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.

At this session of the General Assembly Viet Nam has also joined in sponsoring draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1 and L.24 on the question of chemical and bacteriological weapons. Viet Nam shares the widely held view that in order to exclude completely the possibility of the use of chemical weapons, and thereby fully implement the provisions of the 1925 Protocol and the 1972 Convention, it is of the utmost importance that international efforts be concentrated on the current negotiations on a new convention on chemical weapons, with all relevant questions discussed and resolved in such negotiations, and that all States refrain from taking any action detrimental to the negotiating process.

Unfortunately, that is not the main direction outlined in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.31. That is why the delegation of Viet Nam feels itself unable to go along with that draft resolution.

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): Venezuela has supported all efforts to agree on a convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction. Venezuela considers that such abhorrent weapons of mass destruction should be totally eliminated and that measures should be taken to prevent their use.

In accordance with that position, Venezuela will vote in favour of the three draft resolutions, A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1, L.24 and L.31.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 3, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1. That draft resolution has 12 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 36th meeting on 13 November 1985. The sponsors are: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Honduras, India, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritania, Morocco, New Zealand, Paraguay, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted by 81 votes to 13, with 38 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.24. It has 22 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 36th meeting on 13 November 1985. The sponsors are: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Rwanda, Spain, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to proceed accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.24 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution

A/C.1/40/L.31. It has 26 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the United States at the 30th meeting on 7 November 1985. The sponsors are: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mexico, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.31 was adopted by 96 votes to 16, with 21 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on the draft resolutions in cluster 3.

Mr. van SCHAIK (The Netherlands): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.15, introduced by the delegation of the German Democratic Republic.

In 1985 the Conference on Disarmament continued its efforts aimed at the early conclusion of a comprehensive, effective and verifiable ban on chemical weapons. That task is all the more pressing, as we witnessed, as we did also in 1984, the repeated use of those appalling weapons in the ongoing Gulf war. In the negotiations on a chemical weapons ban a number of important problems remains to be solved. These problems continue to demand our full attention and our united efforts. Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.24, co-sponsored by the Netherlands, on which consensus has just been reached, gives expression to our common determination to do so. This draft certainly underlines the general agreement existing among States to participate in the final elaboration of a chemical weapons convention at the earliest possible date.

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

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

Having said that, I cannot but deplore the fact that the German Democratic Republic and the other sponsors have introduced draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.15, as they have done in previous years. As my delegation observed last year, this draft resolution casts growing doubt on the sincerity of the participation of the countries concerned in the consensus approach I just mentioned. The draft once again criticizes the intended resumption of chemical weapons production by the United States, a country that has unilaterally observed a freeze on such production for over 15 years. The Soviet Union on the other hand has not matched that restraint shown by the United States and has, on the contrary, to the best of our knowledge, continued its massive build-up of stockpiles of chemical weapons of all sorts.

The time had come for my delegation seriously to reconsider our vote on this draft resolution. The main reason for this was our feeling that the annual return and virtually automatic introduction of the draft resolution is not conducive to the constructive work of the Conference on Disarmament, nor is it to the serious approach to this matter that is to be expected from the First Committee. The draft resolution is superfluous in view of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.24, just adopted.

Our reaction in the past few years has been one of moderation and restraint. We fostered the hope, apparently in vain, that the authors of this draft resolution would in the end show the wisdom to discontinue the exercise. Unfortunately, this year again we are faced with a text similar to the one submitted last year, which cannot convince us.

That, in particular, is what has brought us to a negative vote this year.

Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1. We voted in favour of this draft resolution and in so doing we expressed our view on the need

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

to prohibit chemical weapons. We consider it necessary to speed up the negotiations under way in the framework of the Conference on Disarmament with a view to the quickest possible adoption of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction.

In that context, we share the concern which has been expressed over recent decisions to produce binary chemical weapons and over their deployment, which not only increases existing dangers but further complicates negotiations. It is important and necessary to reaffirm the appeal made to all States to hold negotiations in good faith. And what is even more important is that they refrain from taking any measures which may hamper the course of negotiations and refrain from producing and deploying binary chemical weapons and other new types of weapons.

Having said that, my delegation wishes to refer to the idea mentioned in the last preambular paragraph on the proposals to create chemical-weapon-free zones. Such a measure could facilitate the total prohibition of chemical weapons. We have heard proposals on the creation of chemical-weapon-free zones from some delegations, in particular the delegations of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic jointly, which have suggested the establishment of such a zone in part of the European continent. We welcome that initiative and we hope that it will be successful, since we are all familiar with the special characteristics of this region, where there is a high concentration of chemical weapons.

As is well known, all regions have different characteristics. Therefore, in establishing chemical-weapon-free zones, we must bear in mind the specific characteristics of each region and the views of all the States concerned.

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

It is obvious that in the case of Latin America and the Caribbean, account will have to be taken not only of the countries of that region but also of those others which, while not belonging to the region, are very close, have colonial Territories in the region and not only possess major arsenals of chemical weapons but are even developing binary weapons and maintaining continuous policies of aggression and hostility against countries of the region, against which they could use or threaten to use chemical weapons.

Mr. ALI (Bangladesh): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1, L.24 and L.31, on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons.

It is the firm conviction of my delegation that effective and urgent measures should be taken to prohibit the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. My delegation thus joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.24 and voted in favour of the other two draft resolutions on this item.

While some paragraphs of these draft resolutions contain positions that are one-sided and contradictory, we believe that the spirit underlying them is in conformity with the common aspirations of mankind, namely to prohibit the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons and to promote negotiations to achieve that objective. That underlying spirit needs to be encouraged for the common good of humanity.

It is a pity that, though the Conference on Disarmament has been negotiating for the last five years, we have not yet been able to conclude a convention banning the development, production, stockpiling, transfer, acquisition and use of chemical weapons. We are, however, encouraged to note the progress the Conference has been able to achieve in this regard during recent months. We strongly feel that the present moment must be maintained and call upon all parties, particularly the major Powers, to show the necessary political will to facilitate the early conclusion of a convention that would effectively and comprehensively ban these weapons and provide an international mechanism to ensure full compliance.

Mr. ROWE (Australia): Australia abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on chemical weapons in document A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1, introduced by the delegation of the German Democratic Republic.

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

Australia is strongly in favour of, and has actively worked for, the prohibition of chemical weapons. Draft resolution L.15, however, does not meet our concerns in two respects. First, in our view it is deficient in that it singles out one particular type of chemical weapon for non-production and non-deployment when in fact these weapons will be covered by the new convention being negotiated in Geneva. Indeed the call in paragraph 4 for States to refrain from producing and deploying binary and other new types of chemical weapons is not a verifiable measure without a strict verification system of high standard, which will have to be negotiated as an integral part of a comprehensive chemical weapons convention. Secondly, we have taken careful note of the references in the draft resolution to chemical-weapon-free zones, particularly in the light of recent proposals in this regard.

We adhere to the view that the problems involved in negotiating an equitable and verifiable treaty establishing a chemical-weapon-free zone, particularly in relation to verification of compliance with such a treaty, are no less than those involved in negotiating a comprehensive global ban on chemical weapons. Negotiations on such a ban are under way in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, and my Government believes that priority should be given to the conclusion of those negotiations, which offer the best hope for reaching international agreement on a comprehensive chemical-weapons convention and which would make regional chemical-free zones unnecessary.

Australia will continue to give its full support to the endeavour under way in Geneva.

Mr. TINCA (Romania): The Romanian delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1 and L.31 and joined the consensus on L.24. We did so in spite of the fact that not all the provisions of those three draft resolutions entirely coincided with our wishes. My delegation's positive votes are based on recognition that the primary intent of the drafts just adopted is, first, to accelerate the negotiations under way at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva on the convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons; secondly, to stimulate the interest of all States in undertaking practical measures which might contribute to an earlier conclusion of the convention; and, thirdly, to strengthen the effectiveness of the international prohibitions and agreements that already exist in this domain.

At Geneva, within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament, Romania has pronounced itself in favour of the comprehensive prohibition of the development, production, development and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their destruction and for a system of verification acceptable to all parties concerned, and the inclusion in the convention of all required provisions that would ensure the right of all States to the peaceful use of chemistry and scientific research in this field.

We particularly favour the view expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1 to the effect that all States should refrain from any action that could delay or further complicate negotiations on a chemical-weapons convention. In this connection we believe that a unilateral or common undertaking to renounce the development and production of new chemical weapons and their deployment, especially on the territories of other countries, would have a positive impact on all efforts now being exerted for the successful conclusion of the negotiations.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

In this respect I should like to state that Romania, on whose territory there is no foreign military base provided with weapons of any kind, including chemical weapons, not only is taking a firm stand on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their destruction but has also for many years steadily advocated the urgent dismantling of all foreign military bases with or without chemical weapons and the withdrawal of all foreign armed forces and armaments from the territories of other countries.

Mr. MANSOOR (Pakistan): The Pakistan delegation has actively and very strongly supported all efforts and all initiatives directed towards bringing about a comprehensive prohibition of the use, development, production and stockpiling of all types of chemical weapons, as well as their destruction.

Accordingly the Pakistan delegation voted affirmatively on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1 and L.31, and it participated in the consensus on L.24.

We would, however, like to place it on record that in the preambular part of draft resolution A/C.1/L.15/Rev.1 there are two references on which we have reservations. We do not regard the concept of the chemical-weapon-free zone as important or even helpful in our efforts to bring about the speedy conclusion of a comprehensive ban on the use, production and development of chemical weapons. We also do not believe that the singling out of a specific type of chemical weapon would facilitate the speedy conclusion of such a convention.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen): My delegation believes in the need for the speediest elaboration and conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction. That is why we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1 and joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.24 to speed negotiations on this matter in the Conference on Disarmament.

However, my delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.31 because it contains a one-sided view of the subject and does not help to achieve the common goal of the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction.

Mr. BARNETT (Jamaica): My delegation voted in favour of all three draft resolutions, A/C.1/40/L.15/Rev.1, L.24 and L.31. We must, however, record our scepticism about the efficacy of chemical-weapon-free zones, and we take the reference to a particular weapon as an earnest of the international community's will to deal with all types of chemical weapons, whatever they are, and to prohibit their use. We find all such weapons, including biological and radiological weapons, particularly repulsive and we wish them to be prohibited entirely, in keeping with international concerns.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its action on the draft resolutions in cluster 3.

As I indicated yesterday afternoon, the Committee will now move on to take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 5 - that is, draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.17, L.20, L.21, L.39 and L.54. However, I should like to inform members that the Committee will need to postpone a decision on one of those draft resolutions, namely A/C.1/40/L.54.

The Committee will now hear statements members may wish to make - other than in explanation of vote - on the draft resolutions in cluster 5.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): I would merely like to draw attention to a minor error in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.21. In operative paragraph 4 at the end of the fourth line, the word "action" should be plural, "actions".

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the representative of Canada, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. MORRISON (Canada): My delegation would like to explain its vote with reference to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.17 on "Review and implementation of the concluding document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, World Disarmament Campaign.

My delegation intends to vote in favour of that draft resolution. However, we would like to make a specific remark with regard to operative paragraph 6. Canada, of course, agrees in principle with that paragraph and has observed the recommendation made last year. Yet we recognize that occasionally there may be projects or activities of particular interest or concern to Member States, and that in such cases an earmarking of funds may be warranted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 5, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.17. This draft resolution has 10 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 31st meeting on 7 November 1985. The sponsors are: Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo and Yugoslavia. The sponsors have requested that this draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): We would appreciate a recorded vote on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.17.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.17 was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution

A/C.1/40/L.20. It has 12 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 34th meeting on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.20 was adopted by 110 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution

A/C.1/40/L.21. It has 7 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 33rd meeting on 11 November 1985. The sponsors are: Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Rwanda, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.21 was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 33 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.39. It was introduced by the representative of Mauritius, on behalf of the Group of African States, at the 35th meeting on 12 November 1985. The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If there are no objections, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to proceed accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.39 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: As already indicated, we shall defer taking action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 5.

Mr. FISCHER (Federal Republic of Germany): The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.17, L.20 and L.39.

First, as it did last year, the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany has abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.17 on the World Disarmament Campaign. We have again done so with reluctance, since we support the World Disarmament Campaign conducted under the provisions of the conclusions of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. However, we feel that the present text again fails to confirm the principles of universality and of voluntariness which underlie the World Disarmament Campaign. We had wished all the more to be in a position to support the text this year since at the recent Third Pledging Conference for the World Disarmament Campaign the Federal Republic of Germany for the first time was able to announce that a sizable contribution might be forthcoming.

(Mr. Fischer, Federal Republic
of Germany)

Secondly, the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany has once again abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on Disarmament Week, this year contained in document A/C.1/40/L.20. As before, the text contains passages which we cannot support regardless of our general support for the thrust of the World Disarmament Campaign as laid out in the relevant passages of the conclusions of the second special session on disarmament, of which Disarmament Week has proven to be a valuable component. In particular we cannot accept the call on the relevant specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency contained in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution before us to disseminate information about matters outside their scope of activities. Those organizations have their own statutes, and owe it to their member States to maintain rigorous adherence to the terms of those statutes. The same position has also just recently been taken by my Government at the UNESCO General Conference in Sofia, where certain countries tried to propose activities alien to UNESCO.

Thirdly, the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany is pleased at having been able to join in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.39. We welcome the establishment of a Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa within the context of the World Disarmament Campaign and in line with the relevant passages of the conclusions of the second special session on disarmament, especially the principle of voluntary funding. Furthermore, we regard the creation of the Centre as a singular event occasioned by the specific situation in Africa. This one-time event should not, however, trigger a development that eventually results in a network of disarmament centres around the whole globe. However, in case a financial situation should arise leading to a burden on the regular United Nations budget, apart from minimal administrative overheads, we reserve the right

(Mr. Fischer, Federal Republic
of Germany)

in due course to examine our position on the project as set out in the present draft resolution.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): Before I explain the votes of my delegation on the draft resolutions in cluster 5, I should like on behalf of my delegation to extend heartfelt sympathy and condolences to the people and the Government of Colombia, which are experiencing suffering beyond description following the recent volcanic eruption, which claimed thousands of lives and wiped out entire communities. Japan, as a country that has experienced many volcanic eruptions, very closely shares the suffering and the sorrow of the people of Colombia. Japan is immediately sending a medical team there, and has set up a special team within the Foreign Ministry further to prepare for and follow up any with relief for and assistance to Colombia.

I should now like to explain my vote with regard to three draft resolutions, namely A/C.1/40/L.20, L.21 and L.39.

First with regard to draft resolution L.20, my delegation voted in favour because of the importance the Government Japan attaches to the purposes to be served by Disarmament Week. Ever since Disarmament Week was inaugurated in 1978 Japan has observed that important occasion in a very positive manner. However, I should like to recall the reservation my delegation expressed at the time of voting last year on resolution 39/148 J, in which I pointed out that the language used in various parts of the resolution contained alarmist overtones and did not precisely reflect our views. They could indeed be misleading. Since we believe that this sort of resolution should obtain the widest possible support, it is regrettable to note that draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.20 does not contain any improvement which would meet our concern. I should like to make our position clear: if this sort of negative trend continues in future, my delegation might be forced to change our affirmative voting pattern in the coming years.

(Mr. Imai, Japan)

With regard to draft resolution L.21, my delegation wishes to make it clear that our abstention on that draft resolution should not be construed in any way as meaning that Japan takes the World Disarmament Campaign lightly. The Government of Japan has always recognized the significance of the World Disarmament Campaign since it was launched at the second special session devoted to disarmament, and it will continue to do so. However, we abstained because we find its overall tone to be more alarmist and emotional than other draft resolutions on the same subject, and we therefore decided not to take a committed position on it.

I should now like to make a statement with regard to draft resolution L.39. We joined in the consensus on this draft resolution, which contains the idea of the establishment of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa. It is my delegation's understanding that the Centre would be financed with existing resources and voluntary contributions and not place burdens on the United Nations regular budget.

Mr. JESSEL (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain the reasons why the delegation of France abstained in the votes on two of the texts we have just considered: those of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.17 and L.20.

With regard to the first, I should like to stress that my authorities attach the greatest importance to the efforts undertaken within the framework of the World Disarmament Campaign. However, this year, like last year, my delegation felt compelled to abstain because of a provision which appears in paragraph 4, stating that the General Assembly regrets that most of the States which have the largest military expenditures have not so far made any financial contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign. I should like to stress that the effort made by France with regard to disarmament information and the promotion of this cause is very significant. Furthermore, we think that the contribution made by our country to

(Mr. Jessel, France)

the budget of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, \$1 million since it was founded, is a very sizable contribution to this campaign inasmuch as it is giving the most effective possible help for the dissemination of information on disarmament and the consideration of questions relating to disarmament.

Furthermore, it would undoubtedly have been preferable if in the text the expression of regret had been replaced by one of hope, because we do not think it is appropriate to point to certain States, if only implicitly, and accuse them of an absence of support when in our view the question should be seen from a rather different angle.

(Mr. Jessel, France)

As for draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.20, our delegation abstained in the vote on that too, because we cannot give our support to operative paragraph 7. According to that paragraph, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) are invited to intensify activities to disseminate information on the consequences of the arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race. We do not think it either desirable or appropriate for the United Nations to invite in this way the specialized agencies to devote a proportion of their activities to matters outside their fields of competence, thus diverting them from what they should properly be doing. That would serve neither the interests of the agencies themselves nor of disarmament in general.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): Before I explain my vote, I too, on behalf of the United States, extend our deepest sympathy to the people of Colombia for the terrible tragedy they have just experienced.

My delegation, with some reluctance, joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.39, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa". We welcome the goals of the Centre - the realization of measures of peace, arms limitation and disarmament in the region. Regional approaches to arms limitation have always seemed to the United States an effective way of proceeding in this field and we are currently engaged in such efforts ourselves, the negotiations in Stockholm and Vienna in particular.

On the other hand, my Government has serious concerns about the establishment of new United Nations institutions away from the established Headquarters. We have been able to support this initiative because the draft resolution clearly indicates that it will be undertaken on the basis of existing resources and voluntary contributions. My Government takes that commitment seriously, while noting that

(Mr. Lowitz, United States)

the Secretary-General's report A/40/443/Add.1 states that those resources are limited. Therefore, I should like to make it clear that if in later years it turns out that funds are requested from the regular budget my Government would not expect to be able to support such requests.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like to explain why my delegation was unable to support draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.17 and L.21 on the World Disarmament Campaign, although it supports the Campaign itself.

My delegation cannot accept the statement contained in operative paragraph 4 of A/C.1/40/L.17 that some States have not contributed financially to the World Disarmament Campaign. The Campaign is predominantly funded from the United Nations regular budget, to which the United Kingdom has contributed over £140 million (sterling), that is, about \$200 million, during this financial year. Part of that money is accordingly used to fund United Nations services in support of the World Disarmament Campaign. Over the next two financial years, it is proposed to spend \$1.5 million from the regular budget on the Campaign of which the United Kingdom's share will be approximately \$75,000. My Government also devotes substantial sums of money to its own disarmament information activities which are consistent with the aims of the Campaign. Like most other Western countries, the United Kingdom does not make an additional voluntary contribution to the Campaign, although the British Government would not wish to discourage any British non-governmental organization from making a contribution if it should wish to do so.

I turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.21. Its operative paragraph 5 speaks, as do its predecessor resolutions 38/73 K of 1983 and 39/63 A of 1984, of Member States ensuring a flow of accurate information and avoiding the dissemination of false and tendentious information. This concept is repugnant to

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

the United Kingdom where we have a long-standing tradition of freedom of speech and a deep-rooted belief in it, even when the exercise of that freedom leads to the expression of ideas of which some of us may disapprove. We cannot accept that anyone has the right to decide what is accurate and suppress what is judged false and tendentious. We reject the censorship and suppression of free exchange of ideas for which this draft resolution appears to call.

My delegation was pleased to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.39 concerning the establishment of a Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa. We regard that as an excellent initiative in the context of Africa. We have joined the consensus on the understanding that there are no financial implications at the present time and that every effort will be made to establish the Centre on the basis of voluntary contributions, minimizing the use of funds from the regular budget. If that does not turn out to be the case, we reserve the right to return to this question in the future in the appropriate forum and do not regard it as a precedent for the establishment of any other such centres.

Mr. OKELY (Australia): The delegation of Australia, again this year, has had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.20 on Disarmament Week. We have done so for two reasons. The principal reason is that the draft resolution, in our view, contains language in operative paragraph 7 concerning the activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency and other specialized bodies that my delegation considers inappropriate. The second reason relates to the references, again in the draft resolution this year, to the mass media. My delegation considers to interpret those references as meaning an endorsement of the extremely important role of the mass media: that role is to transmit, without restriction, views on disarmament issues to ensure that individuals and groups

(Mr. Okely, Australia)

which make up the peace movements in countries with freely elected democratic Governments have the freest possible access to the widest range of opinions and factual material. Without that information freely available those individuals and groups cannot effectively shape their own views and opinions which, in turn, are translated into the policies of our Governments.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 5, except for the one draft resolution on which we decided to defer action.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: Before I adjourn the meeting, I should like to share some information with members on our programme of work.

First, a number of delegations and groups of delegations have approached me expressing the hope that we shall be able to use the time available this afternoon for consultations and for preparations in order to allow the Committee to take expeditious action starting next week.

Unless I hear very strenuous objections, I propose to accept this proposal and not to hold an afternoon meeting.

However, on Monday we shall continue with what I hope to be the same brisk pace of proceeding. We shall continue our work in sequence - that is, taking up the clusters in numerical order. But before we do so, I propose that we first take up the draft resolutions on which we have so far deferred action - namely, A/C.1/40/L.53/Rev.1, L.54 and L.57. We shall then begin taking up, in sequence, clusters 6, 7 and 8. After that, I think we should consider going back to cluster 4, which we have so far referred.

Unless I hear any objection, that is how I propose to proceed beginning Monday morning.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.