

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FORTIETH SESSION

*Official Records**



UNITED NATIONS

MAY 19 1987

FIRST COMMITTEE
40th meeting
held on
Monday, 18 November 1985
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

W/CONF.100/10N

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 40th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

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

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, from DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/40/PV.40
25 November 1985

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call first upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following additions have been made to the list of sponsors of some of the draft resolutions: draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.37, Samoa; A/C.1/40/L.54, Zambia; A/C.1/40/L.64, Oman; and A/C.1/40/L.73, Bahamas, Austria and the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN: This morning, the Committee take action on draft resolutions which had been held in abeyance, and will then take up draft resolutions in clusters 6, 7 and 8, in sequence.

Among the draft resolutions held in abeyance, it is my understanding that the Committee is now ready to take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.53/Rev.1 and A/C.1/40/L.57.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): It is my honour, on behalf of the sponsors, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.53/Rev.1, entitled "Further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed, the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof". I shall also be making certain oral revisions to the text.

The draft resolution derives from two extremely important documents, each adopted by consensus: the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly (paragraph 79), and the Final Declaration of the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof. The draft resolution is designed to continue the work of the thirty-eighth session, at which the General Assembly, in resolution 38/188 B, requested the Conference on Disarmament to consider further measures for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and report on its consideration of such measures to the General Assembly at its fortieth session.

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

Such a report was incorporated into the report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly (A/40/27 and Corr.1, paras. 112-113).

In the light of the results of the Conference's consideration of measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed and the ocean floor, the sponsors have submitted a procedural draft resolution requesting that the Conference on Disarmament, in consultation with the States parties to the 1970 Treaty, continue its consideration of this question.

In the course of consultations among the sponsors, particularly with the delegation of Norway, it was brought out that at a future session of the General Assembly the sponsors of resolution 38/188 B would be submitting a draft resolution fully covering the question of the preparation and convening of a third review conference of parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof. Consultations with a view to arriving at a consensus text of the present draft resolution continued up to the last minute, and in that connection the sponsors wish to revise orally the operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/L.53/Rev.1 by deleting paragraphs 1 and 2 and replacing them by one operative paragraph reading as follows:

"Requests the Conference on Disarmament, in consultation with the States parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof, taking into account existing proposals and any relevant technological developments, to continue its consideration of further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed, the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof."

The revised text will be issued as document A/C.1/40/L.53/Rev.2.

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

I have to announce that, following the introduction of these changes, Canada wishes to become a sponsor of the text and that the present sponsors are therefore Cameroon, Canada, Poland, Romania and the Ukrainian SSR. The sponsors hope that the draft resolution, which is based on consensus texts, will itself be adopted by consensus at this session.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope that the oral revisions that have just been brought to the attention of the Committee have been duly noted. Technically, therefore, we are addressing our attention to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.53/Rev.2.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): I should like to make the following statement on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57.

Members will recall that the representative of Ireland submitted an oral amendment to paragraph 5 of this draft resolution. The sponsors of the draft resolution have considered that proposal and would like to suggest a solution on the basis of deleting the word "weapon" from that paragraph, so that it would read as follows:

"Urges the Conference on Disarmament to undertake, without further delay, negotiations with a view to elaborating a draft treaty on a nuclear-test ban". In that way, the wording of paragraph 5 would conform to that of the title of the Conference on Disarmament agenda item on a nuclear-test ban. We believe that our suggestion may be acceptable to the representative of Ireland and enable him possibly to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. MacFHIONNBHAIRR (Ireland): My delegation wishes to thank the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57 for the effort they have made to accommodate the concerns indicated by my delegation at a previous meeting, concerns which led to the suggestion by my delegation of alternative language which might facilitate a larger consensus in favour of the draft resolution. The proposal just

(Mr. MacFhionnbhairr, Ireland)

made by the representative of Yugoslavia is, indeed, acceptable to my delegation. In those circumstances, my delegation withdraws its earlier amendment in favour of that now proposed by the sponsors.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives wishing to explain their positions before a decision is taken on the draft resolutions.

Mr. van SCHAIK (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation wishes to place on record its reason for once again not being in a position to support the draft resolution concerning the report of the Conference on Disarmament, which this year is draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57.

In years past the Netherlands delegation has made it clear that in its consideration of the draft resolution dealing with the report of the Conference on Disarmament it would use as a yardstick whether or not the draft resolution takes sufficiently into account the fact that the Conference on Disarmament operates by rule of consensus. I regret to note that, like its predecessors, the present draft resolution does not do so.

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

Much to our regret, draft resolution L.57, in using such terms as "the great majority of members of the Conference", in the seventh preambular paragraph, or stating that "the Conference ... has not been enabled", in operative paragraph 1, shows little respect for the consensus character of the Conference on Disarmament and, by implication, for points of views and positions held by delegations that, although not shared by all, have been taken in good faith. In my delegation's view, the General Assembly would be well advised to abandon this course and instead address the Conference in consensus language.

Furthermore, we notice that draft resolution L.57 regrettably also takes sides in the ongoing debate in the Conference on matters of substance. Let me mention as an example the reference made in the draft resolution to the question of negotiating mandates.

My delegation feels that the present draft resolution should take into account the fact that the Conference on Disarmament operates by consensus and should observe the necessary degree of impartiality in addressing it. That the draft resolution is still to a certain extent over-emphasizing those areas of the Conference's work where success has eluded us while at the same time mentioning only in passing those areas where the Conference was successful is an additional ground for the Netherlands delegation to abstain in the vote on draft resolution L.57, on the report of the Conference on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall take action first on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.53/Rev.2. This draft resolution has five co-sponsors: Cameroon, Canada, Poland, Romania and the Ukrainian SSR. A request has been made that this draft resolution should be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.53/Rev.2 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57, as orally revised. This draft resolution has 28 co-sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 12 November 1985. The co-sponsors are: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, 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 Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57, as orally revised, was adopted by 116 votes to 2, with 17 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their votes.

Miss NIELSEN (Denmark): The Danish delegation would like to explain its motives for abstaining on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57, on the report of the Conference on Disarmament. We think that this draft resolution reflects many interesting viewpoints. Accordingly, the Danish delegation can to a large extent subscribe to the recommendations and proposals contained in it. However, the procedure suggested in the draft resolution on how to achieve nuclear disarmament among the nuclear Powers seems hardly realistic. We do not think it is for the

(Miss Nielsen, Denmark)

General Assembly to tell the Conference on Disarmament what items it should consider when some of the parties most concerned at the present situation are not ready to initiate such negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament. A resolution of this kind would only have effect if such readiness existed.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): My delegation regrets that a revision to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57 has been found necessary at this late hour. A resolution has been adopted in the form of the draft resolution originally proposed by the co-sponsors for a number of years now without being called into question through amendments. We would have hoped that any proposed changes would have been made with sufficient time for discussion.

Nevertheless, we joined the other sponsors of draft resolution L.57 in suggesting a formula which accommodated the proposed revision. My delegation believed that this was the constructive way to proceed and in this spirit agreed to go along with the change.

It is our belief that we should not try to solve the substantive problems of the scope of a nuclear test-ban treaty by means of General Assembly resolutions. Such questions can only be effectively addressed in the negotiations themselves, if and when such negotiations start, in the proper multilateral forum.

Brazil continues to support the urgent multilateral negotiation of a treaty to ban all tests of nuclear weapons for all time. In this connection, we note the continuing inability of some nuclear-weapon Powers to agree to the starting of such negotiations, despite the commitments contained in international, juridically binding treaties. Moreover the nuclear-weapon Powers are the ones who are currently testing and what they test - until we can verify their activities - are nuclear weapons. Brazil believes that we should concentrate on placing an

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

effective ban on the tests that are currently being carried out, that is the tests of nuclear weapons, and not delay further the negotiation of a treaty under the pretext of curbing tests which are not being carried out.

Mr. OKELY (Australia): I wish to explain Australia's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57/Rev.1, introduced by Yugoslavia, on the report of the Conference on Disarmament.

Australia attaches high importance to the Conference on Disarmament and participates actively in its work. The Conference is also a body which operates under the rule of consensus. We would accordingly like to have seen the draft resolution relating to the work of the Conference framed in such a way as to enable it to be adopted by consensus.

The draft resolution contains much that we endorse. We welcome in particular the amendment to paragraph 5 to change "nuclear-weapon test" to "nuclear test ban". The use of the correct terminology of the Conference on Disarmament regarding the prohibition of nuclear testing - that is, a nuclear test ban - as specified in item 1 of the Conference's agenda is something we have long advocated. We also note the call for the Conference to establish an ad hoc committee on the prevention nuclear war. We support this proposal. We also welcome the call for the Conference to intensify its work on the negotiation of a chemical weapons convention.

Australia strongly supports action taken with the objective of achieving nuclear disarmament, in particular through the bilateral negotiations in Geneva. However, we believe that the international community should give such negotiations a chance to succeed before the Conference on Disarmament considers establishing an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament. We do not, therefore, endorse the call for the Conference to establish as a matter of urgency an ad hoc committee on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. Furthermore such a call does not reflect the consensus view of the Conference on this question.

Australia therefore abstained from the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I wish to make a statement in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/40/C.1/L.57/Rev.1, which deals with the report of the Conference on Disarmament for 1985.

It has long been a matter of regret for my delegation that we have been unable to support resolutions on this topic, and in our explanation of vote last year and the year before we expressed regret at the failure of the sponsors to negotiate on the language of this resolution. We expressed the hope that in future consultations would take place so that more widely acceptable formulations could be found.

Although we were glad to note that some of the more objectionable language contained in last year's resolution has been omitted from this year's, we regret that once again the sponsors have not sought to negotiate the language with a view to arriving at a text which would be adopted by consensus. I very much hope that this practice will be adopted in the future.

Meanwhile, my delegation abstained from the vote on draft resolution A/40/C.1/L.57/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: As it appears that no other delegations wish to explain their vote after the vote on draft resolution A/40/C.1/L.53/Rev.2 and L.57/Rev.1, the Committee will now take up the draft resolutions contained in cluster 6. Before we discuss the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/40/L.36 and L.46/Rev.1, cluster 6, I shall call on those representatives who wish to make statements other than explanations of vote.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): I wish to make some remarks about two draft resolutions, A/40/C.1/L.36 and L.46, now before the Committee, on which we shall be voting shortly and which come under the general heading of naval issues. The major part of what I shall have to say relates to A/40/C.1/L.46, but I should first like to say a few words about A/40/C.1/L.36.

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

My delegation will support draft resolution A/40/C.1/L.36, entitled "Study on the naval arms race", which was introduced by the delegation of Sweden and is supported by a broadly based group of countries. My delegation does not necessarily share the views expressed on every aspect of the draft resolution or in the study on which it is based. However, we do believe that it offers a generally acceptable and reasonable basis for work on the subject of naval issues by the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

In this respect, Mr. Chairman, we wish to pay a tribute to you in your capacity as the Chairman of the Study Group for its positive outcome. We shall play a full and active part in the debate on this subject at the Disarmament Commission.

The substance of what I have to say relates to draft resolution A/40/C.1/L.46, introduced in the name of Bulgaria and supported by a number of other Soviet allies.

We were somewhat surprised that the Bulgarian delegation has persisted in pursuing this initiative, which we regard as deeply flawed and which now seems to us to be irrelevant in the face of a generally acceptable resolution firmly grounded on a United Nations expert study. At no stage has this Warsaw Treaty initiative generated much enthusiasm. The predecessor resolutions of L.46, which are quoted in its first preambular paragraph, received very poor votes, in fact with fewer States voting in favour than those voting against and abstaining. The same initiative received a dismal reception at this year's session of the Disarmament Commission.

The reasons for this situation are as follows. This initiative cuts across that proposed by Sweden and a number of other countries in 1983 for a study on naval issues carried out by a group of experts. It seems that those concerned are more interested in making propaganda than in contributing to an attempt at a

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

factual and balanced study of naval issues. In this respect it is interesting to note that, despite the supposed interest in and concern about the subject of naval activities, both the Soviet Union and Bulgaria declined to participate in the group established under General Assembly resolution 38/188 G, despite initially indicating a willingness to take part. Instead the Soviet Union opted to put forward unilaterally a set of proposals on naval issues which are somewhat coyly referred to in the eleventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/40/C.1/L.46. These proposals are discriminatory and contain too many propaganda points to be treated as a serious initiative on which the Governments concerned would wish to begin substantive negotiations.

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

For example, they are designed to limit naval deployments only in areas which are extensively used by Western navies while areas which are used by the Soviet Navy are not mentioned. Limits on particular types of naval vessels concentrate exclusively on types where Western countries currently hold the advantage, while types in which the Soviet Union has numerical superiority - such as submarines designed to attack surface vessels, including merchant ships - are not mentioned.

This same group of countries also attempted to induce the Disarmament Commission this May to embark upon a premature examination of the subject of naval activities in advance of the finalization of the United Nations expert study. In the process, in an attempt to get their way, they held up an important initiative by a group of African countries on the review of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. Ultimately, however, that tactic failed.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1 is no exception to the approach to which I referred just now. Although naval activities are undoubtedly of legitimate international concern, draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1, like its predecessors, seeks to convey the impression that we are in the middle of some dangerous escalation of a "naval arms race" which poses a new and volatile threat. I draw the Committee's attention, for example, to its second preambular paragraph. We do not share that view.

Further, it seeks to give the impression that the West, especially the United States, is to blame for this new "threat" that it has identified. That is the purpose of the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs.

What are the facts? Overall, in the last 20 years, there has been a sharp drop, even a worrying drop, in the total naval forces available to the Western alliance. Perusal of the definitive reference work Jane's Fighting Ships illustrates this point irrefutably.

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

On the other hand, despite the fact that the Soviet Union does not make objective information on military matters available publicly, the same period has seen a massive and unprecedented build-up in Soviet naval might.

Fortunately, we do have Soviet sources to illustrate my point that it is the Soviet Union, not the West, which is engaged in a naval arms race. Understandably proud of his achievement, the father of the new-style Soviet Navy, Admiral Sergey Gorshkov, said the following in a book entitled The Sea Power of the State:

"... within the briefest time a qualitatively new [Soviet] fleet was built, capable of fulfilling tasks of a strategic character and waging a successful struggle with a powerful sea adversary."

How, in more detail, does the language in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1 square with the real situation?

Of course, despite the sharp drop in naval units, countries of the Western alliance do have substantial naval forces. This naval capability is of long standing - historic in the case of my country's Royal Navy - and essential to our security. Why is this so? One part of the answer lies in the fact that the component elements of the Western alliance are separated by gigantic bodies of water, the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The other major part of the explanation lies in the fact that all allied countries, especially those in Western Europe, Japan and Australasia, depend for their very economic existence on sea-borne trade. The countries of the alliance thus depend vitally on sea communications which have to be safeguarded and, if necessary, defended.

This situation is in contrast to that of the Warsaw Treaty countries. The Soviet Union and its allies constitute a massive contiguous land mass with secure interior land communications and little sea-borne trade. The sea approaches to the Soviet Union are limited and difficult, and can be easily defended by relatively small naval forces.

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

What, then, can be the purpose and effect of the massive Soviet naval build-up? By the potential and growing threat that it presents to Western lines of communication and trade it can, in our view, only be offensive and therefore inherently destabilizing. Is this exaggeration on my part? I think not. I turn again to Admiral Gorshkov, a very handy source of reference. In the same work that I quoted earlier, he said:

"... an ever-growing role is being played by [our] sea power, expressing the real ability of the State to make effective use of the world ocean in the interest of communist construction... The naval forces are becoming the main carrier of weapons, including nuclear missiles capable of striking at the enemy in all continents and seas."

Particularly remarkable has been the expansion of the Soviet submarine fleet, both nuclear-missile and ship-attack types. The Soviet submarine fleet, comprising up to 300 units, is the largest in the world. I note that at the beginning of the Second World War our then adversaries had only 50 or 60 submarines available. But look at the havoc that they caused.

The Soviet Union has also built up enormously its capacity in surface vessels, including aircraft carriers, landing ships and marines. What is the purpose of those developments? Once again Admiral Gorshkov had an interesting comment to make in this connection:

"... with the emergence of her navy on the oceanic expanses, the Soviet Union has gained new and wider possibilities for its use in peacetime to ensure her State interests... The mobility of the fleet and its flexibility where limited military conflicts come to a head enable it to exert an influence on coastal countries, employ and extend a military threat at any level, starting from a show of military force and ending with the mounting of landings..."

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

Looking at the language of the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1, it seems to me that its sponsors are addressing themselves.

It is also remarkable that all the sponsors of that draft resolution, with the exception of one land-locked State, furnish the Soviet Union with naval facilities. In the case of two of those States, both of which are far distant from the shores of the Soviet Union - one being on the Indian Ocean and the other on the Pacific Ocean - they play host to large and increasingly significant permanent Soviet naval bases.

In the light of what I have said, it will come as no surprise that my delegation will cast a negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation also wishes to speak to draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.36 and L.46/Rev.1. Together with the other socialist countries, the Soviet Union has consistently advocated that the question of curbing the arms race on the seas and oceans should be brought down to a practical level. We have repeatedly taken initiatives in this regard, and they are summarized in the letter of 9 April 1984 from the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union addressed to the Secretary-General.

We note with satisfaction that many of the Soviet Union's proposals on concrete measures for curbing naval activities and naval armaments, as well as on the form that negotiations should take, have been reflected in the United Nations study conducted under your guidance, Mr. Chairman.

We cannot, however, agree with a number of the points made in that document. There is no need for me at this stage to go into a detailed analysis of the report. I would merely refer to its main flaws, namely, the unbalanced nature of many of its arguments, its unjustified attempts to blame the Soviet Union for the naval arms race and the tendentiousness and inaccuracy of the statistics it presents which give a distorted picture of the actual situation.

Much of what is said in the report requires further study by States. We thus do not consider ourselves bound in any way by this report, and we reserve our right to revert to this subject during the Committee's further consideration of the question of curbing naval armaments. Nonetheless, the Soviet delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.36, because we feel that consideration of the question of naval armaments in the Disarmament Commission can help to open up serious negotiations on the matter with the participation of all the major naval Powers and other interested States. Now that the study on naval armaments has been prepared, any further delay in this important matter is obviously unwarranted.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1 is also aimed at bringing about negotiations on curbing the naval arms race. I should again like to draw attention to the main provisions of that draft resolution, and specifically to the appeal addressed to all Member States, in particular the nuclear-weapon States and other major naval Powers - and here I would emphasize that, contrary to what was stated by the United Kingdom representative, no discrimination whatever is being made against any State - to refrain from increasing their naval presence and activities in areas of conflict or tension, or far from their own shores. In our view, the draft resolution rightly expresses alarm at the increasingly frequent use of fleets or other naval formations for the demonstration or use of force and as a means of exerting pressure against sovereign States, especially developing countries, interfering in their internal affairs, and committing acts of armed aggression and intervention in order to preserve the vestiges of the colonial system. The Soviet delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

It is obviously that provision, and in particular the second one I mentioned, that prompted the representative of the United Kingdom once again to make slanderous remarks about the Soviet Union. I do not understand precisely why he chose to do so today, on the eve of important events designed to improve the international climate. His statement with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1 was tantamount to a lament over the United Kingdom's erstwhile role as the ruler of the seas and oceans when it sent vessels to the colonial countries over which it held sway. I shall not at this time reply to the United Kingdom representative, but I would point out that anti-Sovietism is a dangerous disease and that we are seeing that many conservative statesmen are gradually being cured of it. That, unfortunately, cannot yet be said of the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen): As everyone knows, my country is one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1. Unfortunately, the delegation of the United Kingdom may once again be crying over the loss of its historical colonialism, when it had the biggest base east of Suez, in Aden. Now they may be wanting to return to that region, and their actions bear witness to that.

It is for that reason that the representative of the United Kingdom has attempted to regale this Committee with slanderous allegations against one of the sponsors of the draft resolution in connection with its mention of the Indian Ocean, and a perusal of the names of the sponsors will reveal that Democratic Yemen is the Indian Ocean sponsor.

I would inform the United Kingdom representative that the days of colonialism are gone and cannot be brought back. Notwithstanding the naval arms race, our people, who fought for their freedom against one of the largest of naval bases, will resist any aggression on the part of that Power.

Mr. SOGLO (Benin) (interpretation from French): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1 because the People's Republic of Benin is a sovereign country. It cannot accept the comments just made by the representative of the United Kingdom to the effect that certain pressures have been brought to bear upon members of the Group of African States to have them vote in favour of that draft resolution.

My country knows where its interests lie, and it has always expressed its views in sovereign freedom. That is why my delegation would take this opportunity to reaffirm its sovereign right to exercise that sovereignty in full knowledge of the facts.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes before we take a decision on the draft resolutions in cluster 6.

Mr. MILDERS (Netherlands): My delegation wishes to explain why it will cast a negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1, submitted by Bulgaria and other countries, and entitled "Curbing the naval arms race: limitation and reduction of naval armaments and extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans." My delegation, which is a co-sponsor of L.36, considers L.46/Rev.1 superfluous and would prefer it to be withdrawn. The sponsors of L.36 made quite an effort to incorporate different views in their draft, and it is disappointing that it was not possible to find a common formula for the consideration of this item in the United Nations Disarmament Commission. We regret that, if draft resolution L.46/Rev.1 is adopted, next year two different items will once again be on the agenda of the General Assembly.

Last year, the Netherlands voted against resolution 39/151 I, primarily because it ignored the United Nations study by a group of experts that was under way at that time. This year, in draft resolution L.46/Rev.1, the situation is hardly better. That draft resolution does indeed take note of the study and mentions it as an element for consideration in the Disarmament Conference. But it does not, in the view of my delegation, give the study by the experts the place it deserves, nor does it try to build upon what has been achieved so far. The formulation of operative paragraphs 1 and 2 is the same as last year, and does not take into account existing geographical disparities between the major naval Powers. These asymmetries are, however, recognized in the study.

(Mr. Milders, Netherlands)

On 7 November we expressed our views on United Nations studies on behalf of the 10 members of the European Community, Portugal and Spain, and in particular on the study on the naval arms race. As I said, the present and future members of the European Community look forward to hearing the detailed comments of States Members of the United Nations so as to permit its further multilateral consideration in a manner acceptable to all of us. Operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of L.46, as well as the partisan notions in the preambular paragraphs of this draft resolution, seem as yet to provide an insufficient basis for a fruitful consideration of the issues involved in the Disarmament Conference. My delegation is, in principle, not against negotiations on aspects of naval armaments and their possible use. However, further clarification of the issues involved will be necessary before such negotiations could actually start.

For these reasons, my delegation does not favour the adoption of draft resolution L.46/Rev.1 and as a consequence will cast a negative vote on it.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): I would like to explain the position of the Bulgarian delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.36, entitled "Study on the naval arms race."

The general approach to the question of curbing the naval arms race, which my delegation has been consistently advocating for the last three years, consists basically in taking practical steps to limit and reduce armaments and activities, and to extend confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans, especially to areas with the busiest international sea lanes or to regions where the probability of conflict situations is high. Some delegations do not like our approach, especially the fact that it calls for going over familiar ground as regards the arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race, but this is the problem of those delegations.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

Having examined the study on the naval arms race prepared by the Secretary-General with the assistance of qualified governmental experts under the able guidance of the Chairman as representative of Indonesia, we were gratified to find that the general approach I have outlined was duly reflected in the document.

Although we have certain reservations and misgivings regarding some of the provisions and conclusions of the study, which we will explain later in the Disarmament Commission, we have decided to support draft resolution L.36 since, in its operative paragraph 7, it requests the Disarmament Commission to consider not only the study but also all other present and future proposals with a view to facilitating the identification of possible measures in the field of naval arms reductions and disarmament, as well as confidence-building measures in this field.

We are grateful to the sponsors of L.36 for consulting us and for taking into account our concerns.

We therefore join the consensus on the understanding that it will enable the Disarmament Commission to discuss thoroughly all the aspects of the whole subject at its next substantive session.

Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine delegation is taking the floor at this time to indicate that it intends to vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.36 and L.46/Rev.1.

The study on the naval arms race conducted by the Secretary-General with the assistance of a group of experts that the Chairman himself headed most efficiently and competently, is a useful contribution to the analysis of this important question which, in our view, thus far had not been duly considered during the deliberations on disarmament in the United Nations. The expert study confirmed the

(Mr. Campora, Argentina)

view of those delegations that wanted the subject of the naval arms race to be dealt with. My delegation will transmit its views to the Secretary-General, in particular on study A/40/535, as requested in operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution L.36, on which the Argentine delegation will cast an affirmative vote.

The Argentine delegation will also vote in favour of draft resolution L.46/Rev.1 on curbing the naval arms race because it places particular emphasis on the request to nuclear-weapon States to refrain from increasing their naval activities in areas of conflict or tension or far from their own shores. That request has the fullest support of the Argentine delegation in respect of naval activities in the South Atlantic.

(Mr. Campora, Argentina)

In conclusion, we wish to express our confidence that both draft resolutions will be adopted and that the Disarmament Commission, at its forthcoming session in 1986, will thoroughly consider this question, as requested in the two draft resolutions. My delegation hopes too that the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission will contribute to gathering the background information necessary to draw the attention of the Conference on Disarmament to the importance of this question.

Mrs. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1 poses serious difficulties for my delegation. It refers to something we fervently support: "Curbing the naval arms race: limitation and reduction of naval armaments and extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans". However, my delegation cannot accept many of the formulations in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1. We shall therefore be obliged to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolutions in cluster 6, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.36. The draft resolution has 14 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 36th meeting of the First Committee, on 13 November 1985. The sponsors are Australia, Austria, China, Finland, France, Gabon, Indonesia, Iceland, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala,

Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Egypt, India, Israel

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.36 was adopted by 131 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1. The draft resolution has eight sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 11 November 1985. The sponsors are Bulgaria, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Poland, the Syrian Arab Republic and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46/Rev.1 was adopted by 56 votes to 19, with 56 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on delegations wishing to explain their positions on all draft resolutions in cluster 6.

Mr. GONSALVES (India): My delegation abstained in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.36 and L.46/Rev.1, dealing with the naval arms race. We have noted the contents of the United Nations study on the naval arms race, and we fully appreciate the dedicated efforts of the study group, under your very able chairmanship, Sir.

(Mr. Gonsalves, India)

We are nevertheless unable to understand the rationale of organically detaching the limited issue of the naval arms race from the wider central issues of halting and reversing the nuclear arms race and general and complete disarmament, with regard to both of which, regrettably, no progress whatsoever has been made. Indeed, in our view this new initiative tends to distort established priorities in the field of disarmament.

It is for those reasons that my delegation was not able to support the proposals contained in documents A/C.1/40/L.36 and L.46/Rev.1.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): I wish to explain the vote my delegation cast on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.36. Two years ago, the United States voted against resolution 38/188 G, calling for a comprehensive study on the naval arms race, a naval arms race which, in the view of my Government did not and does not exist. The United States is not engaged in a naval arms race.

Geography dictates that naval forces will play an important - indeed, a vital - role in the national security of maritime nations. Other States, either by their very geography or for other reasons rely to a greater extent upon land-based military power. Any study that focuses only on naval forces in isolation, ignoring those inter-related threats which make maritime forces necessary in the first place, will perforce be skewed against those nations and groups of nations with vital maritime interests that must be defended.

Recognizing that these infirmities are inherent in the concept of this study, the United States opposed the resolution calling for such a study and did not participate in it. Therefore, my delegation did not support draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.36, which refers the completed study to the Disarmament Commission for its consideration, thereby diverting that Commission's attention from more appropriate pursuits. Our opposition to this draft resolution in no manner casts doubt upon the capabilities of the experts who participated in the study or upon your efforts, Mr. Chairman, in bringing the study to completion. Recognizing the good intentions of the sponsors, we regret our inability to support the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its action on the draft resolutions in cluster 6.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.