

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FORTIETH SESSION

*Official Records**



UNITED NATIONS

MAY 19 1985

FIRST COMMITTEE
44th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 20 November 1985
at 3 p.m.
New York

UN/SA/CONF/1/21

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 44th 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, Room DC 2-750, 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.44
25 November 1985

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 and 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon the Committee will proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 10. Before it does so, however, I shall call on the representative of Brazil, who wishes to make a statement.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): My delegation is grateful to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70 for Rev.1, which was put before the Committee some time yesterday, inasmuch as it incorporates one change that we deem to be symptomatic of the intentions of the sponsors, which are very positive to judge from that one change. It also, of course, incorporates one or two other less important changes.

That change deals with reaffirmation of and respect for the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, concerning which I shall have something to say later in this statement.

My delegation would have preferred, and I am sure that this is also the wish of the sponsors of the draft resolution, a text of the significance of a resolution on, and I quote from its title, "disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security" to be adopted by consensus. Peace and security, as well as their maintenance and strengthening, and also disarmament and arms limitation are all concepts that lie at the very heart of this Organization. No one in this Committee would take such matters lightly.

The achievement of consensus on formulations dealing with disarmament, peace and security could, I believe, come about in either of two ways. We may reaffirm consensus documents achieved earlier in the history of the United Nations or we may engage in a co-operative process of elaboration, which has to be based on existing

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

consensus documents. My delegation has made clear its readiness to follow either of those two paths, and I am glad to have found in Ambassador Butler's statement of this morning a sign of a similar willingness.

I am aware of the constraints of time at this final phase of our work. I shall therefore not make here the detailed comments my delegation communicated to the sponsors more than a week ago.

The first set of difficulties my delegation finds in the text as it stands has to do with the main concepts that appear in the preambular part of the draft resolution. The quotations are taken straight from the Charter of the United Nations, and no one here would disagree with the Charter. However, the problem is that the selective method utilized ignored other important purposes, principles and provisions of the Charter. In what regards the provisions of the Final Document, the preamble of the draft has been organized in a way that seems geared to arriving at a given conclusion, which appears in the latter part of the preamble, and the conclusion is that international security is predicated on the preservation of stability between the two military rivals and that the objective of States should be undiminished security at a lower level of forces, which is, of course, language to be found in the Final Document. But that would mean that disarmament would then simply disappear as an objective of States.

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

The very thrust of the main idea contained in the preamble, that is, disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security, presupposes that peace and security have already been achieved, since one cannot maintain something that does not exist.

However, in the world today, and particularly for developing countries, peace is, unfortunately, not an everyday event, and security is even scarcer. In many developing countries everyday reality includes either outright conflict or the threat of external violence, usually as a reflection of super-Power confrontation. By the same token, developing countries are the main victims of insecurity, generally in the form of overt or covert intervention by the major Powers, as well as in the form of economic, social and cultural dependence or domination.

Despite such unfortunate realities that are keenly felt by more than three fourths of humankind, the draft presented to us would have the security of all States made dependent on "the preservation of stability", that is, the maintenance of a status quo that thrives on the perpetuation of social, economic and political injustice. Concepts such as that of the new international economic order, for instance, do not find a place in such a philosophical framework.

My delegation submits that such premises are not compatible with the very principles upon which this Organization was founded and which are enshrined in its Charter. They are also at variance with the tenets of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which remains the most comprehensive consensus agreement ever achieved by the United Nations on questions of disarmament and its relationship to international security.

The second main feature that does not commend the present version of this draft resolution to my delegation's acceptance is its recommendation for urgent

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

measures in operative paragraph 1. If an enumeration of specific urgent measures is deemed necessary, it would be sufficient for us all to quote from and pledge our continuing commitment to the Programme of Action in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which has been accepted and reaffirmed by us all but remains unfulfilled. There we find a comprehensive list of all the measures considered urgent by the world community as a whole.

Alternatively, we might find another source of inspiration for a consensus enumeration of some urgent measures to be taken in the field of disarmament. I refer to another unimplemented document, which was adopted by consensus - the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. It contains a set of very urgent measures that we all agreed should be implemented during 1981-1990 but which remain on paper. It seems strange that we are now being called upon to adopt yet another set of urgent measures, very much different from those that we all accepted not too long ago and which have not been realized to this day.

During a number of days before the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, many delegations represented here endeavoured to achieve a declaratory text on disarmament measures to be adopted solemnly by the General Assembly. The result of that work - which failed for reasons not connected with the disarmament sphere - was contained in two or three paragraphs of a draft declaration to commemorate the fortieth anniversary. If the intention of the authors of the draft is for the First Committee to adopt a declaration on questions of disarmament and security to celebrate the 40 years of United Nations existence, I believe that that text could be used as a basis for consensus. That is contained in a document with the symbol A/AC.222/L.5 of 24 October.

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

The very thrust of the main idea contained in the preamble, that is, disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security, presupposes that peace and security have already been achieved, since one cannot maintain something that does not exist.

However, in the world today, and particularly for developing countries, peace is, unfortunately, not an everyday event, and security is even scarcer. In many developing countries everyday reality includes either outright conflict or the threat of external violence, usually as a reflection of super-Power confrontation. By the same token, developing countries are the main victims of insecurity, generally in the form of overt or covert intervention by the major Powers, as well as in the form of economic, social and cultural dependence or domination.

Despite such unfortunate realities that are keenly felt by more than three fourths of humankind, the draft presented to us would have the security of all States made dependent on "the preservation of stability", that is, the maintenance of a status quo that thrives on the perpetuation of social, economic and political injustice. Concepts such as that of the new international economic order, for instance, do not find a place in such a philosophical framework.

My delegation submits that such premises are not compatible with the very principles upon which this Organization was founded and which are enshrined in its Charter. They are also at variance with the tenets of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which remains the most comprehensive consensus agreement ever achieved by the United Nations on questions of disarmament and its relationship to international security.

The second main feature that does not commend the present version of this draft resolution to my delegation's acceptance is its recommendation for urgent

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

measures in operative paragraph 1. If an enumeration of specific urgent measures is deemed necessary, it would be sufficient for us all to quote from and pledge our continuing commitment to the Programme of Action in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which has been accepted and reaffirmed by us all but remains unfulfilled. There we find a comprehensive list of all the measures considered urgent by the world community as a whole.

Alternatively, we might find another source of inspiration for a consensus enumeration of some urgent measures to be taken in the field of disarmament. I refer to another unimplemented document, which was adopted by consensus - the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. It contains a set of very urgent measures that we all agreed should be implemented during 1981-1990 but which remain on paper. It seems strange that we are now being called upon to adopt yet another set of urgent measures, very much different from those that we all accepted not too long ago and which have not been realized to this day.

During a number of days before the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, many delegations represented here endeavoured to achieve a declaratory text on disarmament measures to be adopted solemnly by the General Assembly. The result of that work - which failed for reasons not connected with the disarmament sphere - was contained in two or three paragraphs of a draft declaration to commemorate the fortieth anniversary. If the intention of the authors of the draft is for the First Committee to adopt a declaration on questions of disarmament and security to celebrate the 40 years of United Nations existence, I believe that that text could be used as a basis for consensus. That is contained in a document with the symbol A/AC.222/L.5 of 24 October.

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

The introduction of entirely new language to describe the relationship between disarmament and security, especially when it draws different conclusions and suggests different measures from those accepted by all, without adequate discussion and without taking into account stated positions does not seem to be a course of action conducive to consensus.

In Ambassador Butler's statement this morning he assured us that his delegation's intention was not to detract or in any way deviate from the Final Document. My delegation was very glad to hear that and hopes that the draft resolution can accordingly be made to conform with the Final Document and other consensus texts that are before us by incorporating language that agrees with those documents and discarding the concepts that do not. For my part, I would welcome any opportunity to work in that direction together with the delegation of Australia and the other sponsors of that draft resolution.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): I should like to take a minute or two of the Committee's time to respond to the very important and very interesting statement just made by our colleague from Brazil with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.1.

Let me say immediately that I take what he has said in the spirit in which it was offered, namely, as an earnest contribution to a debate, a discussion and, I hope, a concertation on what is a very serious subject.

I hope he will accept my saying immediately that, like him, I do not think it appropriate to go into detail at the present time; but I should like to state that I found that some of the representations of the terms of the draft resolution given by him and some of the - shall we say - logical implications he derived from the terms of the text were not representations or implications with which we would

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

readily agree. But perhaps that is not the main point. The main point is, I think, we have heard an important offer, a sincere offer, to continue consultations on this draft resolution, and my delegation certainly wants to do that.

I recall that this morning I also made it clear that this draft resolution has already been the subject of consultations - I think I said "across all groups" represented in this Committee. I would hope to be in a position to facilitate further such consultations across all groups in the very near future, so that we may be able to come to the kind of result on these matters of great importance that I think the representative of Brazil, certainly my delegation, and others sincerely want to achieve.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the draft resolutions contained in cluster 10. I shall call on those representatives who wish to make statements other than in explanation of votes on them.

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic has repeatedly had the opportunity to emphasize in this Committee the great importance it attaches to a ban on all nuclear-weapon tests. While we are aware of the fact that such a ban would not be sufficient to put a final end to the nuclear-arms race, we are firmly convinced that it would be a big step in the right direction. In the light of the plans to create space weapons with the use of nuclear explosions, the cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests has become even more urgent.

(Mr. Rose, German
Democratic Republic)

Today, the demand for a complete nuclear-weapon-test ban is being raised the world over. The well-known moratorium of the Soviet Union has met with a positive international response, as has also the proposal submitted by the Heads of State or Government to the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, and to the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan.

At the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic is working for finally bringing about multilateral negotiations on that subject. It opposes attempts to distract attention from the openly admitted lack of political will, notably on the part of one nuclear Power, by playing up the issues of verification. We welcome the fact that the majority of delegations have made it clear in the general debate of this Committee that they consider that the ways and means to verify a relevant agreement are available.

On the basis of these considerations, my delegation is a sponsor of draft resolution L.42, and it will also vote in favour of draft resolutions L.35 and L.49.

I should now like to make a few remarks on draft resolution L.73.

First of all, we recognize that the authors have made efforts better to meet the demand for the opening of negotiations on a nuclear-weapon-test ban. We welcome this development, even if we cannot overlook the fact that there is a certain contradiction between the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4 as far as the scope of a treaty is concerned.

However, we ask the sponsors to understand that we cannot vote for the draft resolution. There are mainly two reasons for this stand. First, my delegation does not believe that the General Assembly should stipulate the working programme of a committee to be set up at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. That has

(Mr. Rose, German
Democratic Republic)

always been a matter to be dealt with by the appropriate committee and should remain so. But what is even more important to us than these objections concerning procedure is the artificial selection of the subjects for negotiation. Working paper CD/629 of 2 August 1985, submitted to the Geneva Conference on Disarmament by Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic, includes all the essential elements of the complex negotiations for an agreement. We consider that to be the only promising approach.

Secondly, the same working paper, CD/629, also makes it clear that, in establishing an "international seismic monitoring network", one should rely heavily on the agreement itself. In contradiction to that, operative paragraph 5 (a) in L.73 calls for "immediate steps," separated not only from the agreement but even from negotiations leading to an agreement.

For the reasons I have given, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic cannot support draft resolution L.73.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): I would like to make the following statement with regard to the subject-matter of cluster 10.

In the field of nuclear disarmament, the Government of Japan has always placed highest priority on the issue of a nuclear-test ban and has been one of the most active participants in efforts to achieve this objective in the United Nations Conference on Disarmament and other international forums. It goes without saying that programmes of verification and compliance are particularly important in achieving a nuclear-test ban, which has direct bearings on the security of the countries concerned.

It is from this point of view that Japan's Foreign Minister, Mr. Abe, proposed a step-by-step approach at the Conference on Disarmament in June last year as a practical way for achieving a nuclear-test ban. It is regrettable that the

(Mr. Imai, Japan)

Conference on Disarmament did not reach a consensus on the mandate of the ad hoc committee on this subject and that we have not been able to establish the committee for the past two years.

On behalf of my delegation I should like once again to emphasize the very urgent need to achieve an agreement on this very important subject.

At the same time I should also like to urge that we proceed with work on a nuclear-test ban in a practical manner, even before the formal arrangement of the ad hoc committee. The Government of Japan is firmly convinced that the step-by-step approach proposed, although it might appear to be a roundabout path, is nevertheless the surest and shortest way towards the realization of a nuclear-test ban. Many delegations have already expressed agreement with this point of view, and we very much hope that this approach will receive wider support at the next session of the Conference on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to propose to the Committee that we suspend the meeting for a few minutes in view of certain developments that will require further consultations in which I as Chairman will have to participate.

The meeting was suspended at 4.25 p.m. and resumed at 4.55 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Because of some technical difficulties, I should like to propose that we defer action on cluster 10 for a short time. Instead, I suggest that the Committee take up some of the draft resolutions that have been held in abeyance and on which I believe the Committee is now prepared to take action. I am referring to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1, on fellowships, and draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.58/Rev.1.

I realize that the Committee has now become used to working in a much more methodical fashion than would be the case in my present proposal, and I therefore ask members to be indulgent and to concur with my suggestion for the sake of the best utilization of our time. We hope that the technical difficulties to which I referred with regard to the draft resolutions in cluster 10 can be cleared up shortly and allow us to take decisions on them.

As I hear no objections, I shall take it that the Committee is prepared to take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1 and L.58/Rev.1 at this time.

Since no delegation wishes to speak on or to make a statement in explanation of vote before the voting, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1. It has 24 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 34th meeting on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are: the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Greece, Indonesia, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Sudan, Senegal, Somalia, Swaziland, Tunisia, Uganda, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The draft resolution has programme budget implications which are contained in document A/C.1/40/L.79.

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, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1 was adopted by 127 votes to 1.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): The United States delegation greatly regrets that, despite consultations with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1, we were not able to support it. As the draft resolution itself notes, the United States has been a strong supporter of the

*Subsequently the delegations of Bolivia, Central African Republic, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Democratic Kampuchea, Niger, Pakistan and Swaziland advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Lowitz, United States)

United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament. Representatives of the United States Government have spoken to several classes of Fellows, both in Geneva and Washington, and we have ourselves profited from such exchanges, as we hope the Fellows have.

My delegation is grateful for the recognition given our efforts in operative paragraph 5 of this draft resolution. Nevertheless, as members of the Committee are aware, United States representatives throughout the United Nations are under strict instructions to oppose any real increase in spending such as would result from this proposal and is detailed in document A/C.1/40/L.79. What is more, we are concerned that beyond the \$63,700 required for 1986-1987 there could be substantial additional costs in later years if the programmes described in operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution are implemented.

We would have hoped that more careful preparations, including earlier consultations with interested States, could have taken place so that my delegation could have joined in a consensus resolution on the Disarmament Fellows.

Mr. BATSANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union attaches great importance to United Nations activities with regard to the Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament. We fully share the objective of that Programme, which is to promote professional training on disarmament matters in a larger number of Member States, particularly among the developing countries, as indicated in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I would recall that quite recently we once again invited parties to the Programme on Fellowships to visit the Soviet Union in 1986 in order to hold discussions with Soviet State scientific organizations concerned with disarmament matters.

(Mr. Batsanov, USSR)

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1, which proposes additional ways in which activities in this field can be pursued, we believe that the financial implications of the Programme should remain within the confines of the present level of funding. In determining our position on the draft resolution, we took into account the provisions of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, which indicates that the programme should be implemented bearing in mind the savings that can be made within the existing overall budgetary appropriations for the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament.

(Mr. Batsanov, USSR)

However, we learned with surprise today that in document A/C.1/40/L.79, which gives an account of the financial implications, it is proposed that additional appropriations for US\$63,700 for a two-year period be allocated. Therefore the Soviet delegation would like to stress that our positive vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1 should in no wise be interpreted to mean that we approve of these additional appropriations. We reserve our right to return to this issue in the Fifth Committee.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): My delegation was pleased to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1, on the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament. We did so because we attach importance to this Programme and the valuable job it does in introducing officials to the field of disarmament. That is particularly so this year because in 1985, for the first time, a British Fellow was nominated for the Programme, which began in June, the members of which are among us today.

Paragraphs 4 and 6 of the draft resolution call for the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the modalities for expansion of the training programme. My delegation has cast a positive vote on the understanding that this is without prejudice to the report the Secretary-General is being asked to prepare. We look forward to considering at a later date the suggestions that will be made by the Secretary-General with a view to deciding whether or not to implement them.

My delegation was therefore concerned that the paper containing the financial implications of this draft resolution, that is document A/C.1/40/L.79, contains certain modalities for a programme to be implemented before the report of the Secretary-General is submitted to the General Assembly. My delegation is of the view that this is the aim of the report the Secretary-General is being asked to prepare on this subject, and it reserves the right to return to this question in the future.

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

My delegation takes the view that the resources required for the preparation of the Secretary-General's report should be found within the appropriations initially proposed for the biennium 1986-1987.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): The Japanese Government considers the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament as having great importance in promoting expertise in disarmament, especially in the developing countries. For that reason we have annually invited the participants in that Programme to visit Japan.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1, we find in it proposals for an expansion of the said Programme which, regrettably, have not been sufficiently discussed beforehand by the States Members concerned, and the modalities of which have yet to be developed by the Secretary-General in a report on this item to the forty-first session of the General Assembly as stipulated in paragraph 6.

My delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution on the understanding that we shall be given ample opportunities further to look into and discuss the matter, including related financial implications.

Mr. JESSEL (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1 in order to indicate, as it does each year, the importance it attaches to the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament. In fact we see in that Programme an irreplaceable instrument aimed at familiarizing students and researchers from the most diverse States with the cause of disarmament and promoting that cause. That being so, my delegation wonders about the exact meaning of paragraph 3, where it states that "all the programmes are to be consolidated under the Department for Disarmament Affairs, at the appropriate level". We interpret that to mean that the Programme will be administered within the framework of existing structures - in other words, specifically, without the creation of new posts. In our view that interpretation

(Mr. Jessel, France)

is confirmed by the presence in the draft resolution of the words "bearing in mind the savings that can be made within the existing overall budgetary appropriations for the United Nations disarmament fellowship programme". The creation of a new post, which we do not want to see, would, it seems to us, contradict the need for savings referred to here, which, if I understand it correctly, is still hypothetical.

It is on the basis of that interpretation that the French delegation has voted in favour of a text the substance of which it once again supports.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to draw it to the attention of the representative of France that a new paper has been issued, A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1*, the asterisk denoting that it was reissued for technical reasons, on 19 November 1985, providing corrections to a paper issued earlier that refers to the matter to which he has referred in his statement. I simply wished to draw his attention to that new paper.

(The Chairman)

We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.58/Rev.1. It has 27 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the Committee's 36th meeting, on 13 November 1985. The sponsors are Algeria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Burma, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia, 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, Denmark, 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, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, France, Japan, New Zealand, Rwanda, Spain.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.58/Rev.1 was adopted by 113 votes to 13, with 6 abstentions.*

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

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. LUNDBO (Norway): Norway has voted against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/40/L.58/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session".

Norway's vote must, inter alia, be viewed in the light of the inclusion of the fourth preambular paragraph in that draft resolution, which reads as follows:

"Convinced that the renewed escalation of the nuclear-arms race, in both the quantitative and qualitative dimensions, as well as reliance on nuclear deterrence and on the use of nuclear weapons, has heightened the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war and led to greater insecurity and instability in international relations."

That paragraph contains language which, for well-known reasons, cannot be shared by the Norwegian Government.

Mr. GROOT (Denmark): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.58/Rev.1 on the "Implementation of recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session".

Although my delegation voted in favour of it, we, too, have strong reservations in particular with regard to the fourth preambular paragraph. My delegation in no way shares the security perceptions endorsed in that paragraph. If a separate vote had been taken on that paragraph we would have voted against it. However, since it is a preambular paragraph and we can subscribe to the main thrust of the draft resolution, we decided to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to explain its vote, we have thus concluded action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.58/Rev.1.

(The Chairman)

With the Committee's consent and, again, to utilize our time as efficiently as possible, I propose that we now consider and take action on some of the draft resolutions contained in cluster 11. As I have explained, we shall take up cluster 10 after a short while. There are some draft resolutions in cluster 11 which I assume are at such a stage that the Committee can act on them now.

(The Chairman)

I refer specifically to the following draft resolutions in cluster 11:

A/C.1/40/L.7, A/C.1/40/L.26 and A/C.1/40/L.43. Those are three draft resolutions in cluster 11 which appear to me to be ready to be acted upon in an expeditious manner now. If I hear no objections, I shall take it that it is the Committee's wish to proceed to take action on them and in so doing to start work on cluster 11.

I shall give the floor to any delegation wishing to make a statement, other than an explanation of vote, on those three draft resolutions.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to make a very slight amendment to the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.43. At the present time that paragraph begins: "Noting that the conclusions of those studies confirm ...". My delegation would like to propose the insertion of the words "some of" before the words "those studies", so that the paragraph would begin: "Noting that the conclusions of some of those studies...".

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any delegations wishing to make explanations of their positions or votes before we take decisions on these three draft resolutions? Since there is none, we shall proceed to take action first on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.7. It has four sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 34th meeting on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are: Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary and Romania.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.7 was adopted by 98 votes to 19, with 8 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.26. It has 15 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of India at the 33rd meeting on 11 November 1985. The sponsors are: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Nigeria, Romania, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Austria, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Japan.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.26 was adopted by 106 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions.*

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

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.43, as orally amended. It has seven sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 32nd meeting on 8 November 1985. The sponsors are: Bangladesh, Ecuador, India, Mexico, Pakistan, Sweden and Yugoslavia. The draft resolution has programme budget implications which are contained in document A/C.1/40/L.78.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, 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, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, 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, 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: United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.43, as orally amended, was adopted by 118 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.*

*Subsequently the delegations of Nicaragua and Swaziland advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. NORHEIM (Norway): The Norwegian delegation cast a negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.7. We did so this year for the same reasons we voted against earlier draft resolutions along the same lines, since, in our view, the draft resolution is directed at the defensive strategy of an Alliance to which my country belongs.

I should like to stress, however, that the Norwegian Government fully supports efforts to reduce the importance of and dependence on nuclear weapons. In fact, all our efforts in our own Alliance and in international disarmament forums are directed towards that goal. I would add that that view has received broad support in the Norwegian Parliament and in our public opinion.

Mr. DIEM (Austria): My delegation would like to explain its abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.7, submitted by Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary and Romania. The Austrian delegation wishes to emphasize that Austria is totally opposed to the use of all weapons of mass destruction and therefore also rejects the use of nuclear weapons. Austria believes that a ban on the first-use of nuclear weapons is in principle a desirable goal.

We should like, however, to point out that an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, if its credibility is to have the necessary impact, has to find its expression in a modification of military doctrines and military structures. Furthermore, such an obligation should be verifiable, so that its declaratory character can find its necessary complement. Any agreement regarding the non-first-use of nuclear weapons will only be realistically possible if the nuclear powers reach an understanding on force relationship in the conventional area that will ensure stability and prevent conflicts.

(Mr. Diem, Austria)

The question of the non-first-use of nuclear weapons should, in the view of my delegation, be approached in a global context in general and in a European context in particular. In the view of the Austrian delegation, the declaratory elements of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.7 need to be complemented by agreed steps in the foregoing sense in order to be envisaged as a contribution to the enhancement of global security. That is why my delegation, as in prior years, has abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. My delegation expresses the hope that the Geneva Summit meeting and the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on a set of issues related to nuclear disarmament will make possible arrangements, particularly between the super-Powers, which may initiate the process towards an agreement on the non-first-use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. STEPHANOU (Greece) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Greece would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.26, on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons. My delegation abstained in the voting on that draft resolution. That is not because Greece is against the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. On the contrary, Greece has always voted in favour of such draft resolutions. The only reason for our abstention in the vote on this draft resolution is our belief that the place to draw up a convention such as the one described in A/C.1/40/L.26 is the only multilateral negotiating body, the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

Mr. OJANEN (Finland): I wish to explain Finland's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.7, "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war". Nuclear war is nowhere professed to be an element of rational policy. It is the declared policy of the Government of Finland that nuclear weapons should never under any circumstances be used. That is the reason why Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.7.

Mr. WISNOEMOERTI (Indonesia): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.7, on "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war", since we believe that the renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons, besides being a unilateral measure showing good will, can also help to improve conditions for the resolution of disarmament issues. Although we voted in favour of the draft resolution, my delegation would like to emphasize Indonesia's long-established position that any use of nuclear weapons, not only the first use, must be prohibited. Additionally, my delegation has difficulty with the way the eighth preambular paragraph is drafted, since it tends to over-simplify the picture to the extent of blurring the distinctions that exist with regard to this particular issue.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): I wish to explain the vote of the Swedish delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.7, introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic. Let me reiterate first of all that the Swedish Government views unilateral declarations by the nuclear-weapon States committing them not to be the first to use nuclear weapons as an important aspect of efforts to reduce the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war. We hope that all nuclear-weapon States will find it possible to make such declarations. The establishment of rough parity in conventional forces at a lower level would obviously facilitate such commitments.

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

My delegation has taken special note of the statement made on 29 October 1985 by the representative of the German Democratic Republic, Ambassador Ott, in this Committee's general debate, in which he said, inter alia, that the Conference on Disarmament should discuss the drafting of a legally binding international document in which the obligation of nuclear-weapon States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons would be enshrined. Ambassador Ott then added that

"The proposed document could also include further provisions aimed at preventing a nuclear war". (A/C.1/40/PV.17, p. 28)

In the view of the Swedish Government, a firm commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, made through an international instrument of a legally binding character, would be an important contribution to successful efforts at preventing nuclear war. That is one reason for the support my Government gave today to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.7. However, my Government wishes to make clear its position that such an international instrument should deal solely with the concept of the non-first-use of nuclear weapons, and should not contain any further elements not directly related to that concept.

In fact, the Swedish Government considers that the prohibition of the use or threat of use of force in international relations, laid down in Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations, is mandatory and sufficient. What is required rather is improved compliance by Member States with existing prohibitions and with the obligation, also laid down in the Charter, to settle their international disputes by peaceful means.

I wish also to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.26. Let me first reiterate that Sweden supports the concept of an international legal instrument prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. In that

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

context, I wish to quote the following from the statement of the Swedish Prime Minister, Mr. Olof Palme, on the occasion of the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations:

"Any use of nuclear weapons would be deeply reprehensible. One can speak of an international norm which is gradually gaining acceptance. The time has come to consider whether mankind should not begin to study in earnest how this utter moral reprobation can be translated into binding international agreements. We should consider the possibility of prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons, by international law, as part of a process leading to general and complete disarmament." (A/40/PV.43, p. 66)

My delegation was therefore in a position to vote in favour of India's proposal in document A/C.1/40/L.26, as was the case with the analogous draft resolution last year. However, with regard to the sixth preambular paragraph, my delegation has reservations as to its interpretation of the United Nations Charter. In fact, if the use of nuclear weapons were uncontestably a violation of the Charter, there would be no obvious need for another international legal instrument in that respect.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): The United States' negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.43 in no way signifies that we consider the issue of nuclear winter unimportant. On the contrary, we believe that the issue merits intensive study by highly qualified scientists and technicians. We further believe that it is critical that such work be shielded from emotionally and politically charged atmospheres. That would be impossible in a study such as that proposed in this draft resolution. In addition, the draft resolution has financial implications which further persuaded my Government to vote "no". In any event, the United States Government - and, I know, other national and international bodies of high qualification - will continue to study this question.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like to explain my delegation's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.43, on nuclear winter. That vote does not indicate any lack of concern regarding the scientific theory concerned. Whatever the eventual scientific consensus on the subject, no one can be in any doubt that there would be no winners in a nuclear war. In our view, the international community should devote its full attention to ways of ensuring that such a war would not take place. The current meeting in Geneva is a step in the right direction.

We are also doubtful about the terms of reference of the proposed study, especially the socio-economic aspect. In addition, the proposed study would duplicate the substantial work already done on the subject by governmental and academic experts.

Finally, we are concerned about the cost of the proposed study; the funds, we believe, could be better spent on other subjects on which less work has so far been done.

Mr. WHELAN (Ireland): I wish to explain my delegation's positive vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.7. When we supported last year's version of this text, which was adopted by the Assembly as resolution 38/148 D, we voiced certain substantial reservations. In particular, we had to question the value and credibility of a non-first-use pledge already announced. Also, we felt obliged to question the practicality of the proposal that the Conference on Disarmament should consider the elaboration of an international instrument of a legally binding character to cover non-first use.

(Mr. Whelan, Ireland)

The draft resolution now before us follows very closely the lines of resolution 39/148 D, and therefore does not accommodate our reservations. I should like to emphasize our view that non-first use is a subject that demands our very close attention. Difficult and complex though it is, it should be high on our agenda. As has been said, the one clearly definable fire-break against the world-wide disaster of general nuclear war is the one that stands between all other kinds of conflict and any use whatsoever of nuclear weapons.

At the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1982, we stated our belief that the nuclear Powers needed to consider seriously what methods or agreements they might work out providing against first use. Our view remains unchanged and, as our positive vote today shows, we have been predisposed to favour focusing attention on non-first use. However, the complexity of the question requires an approach likely to command the necessary acceptance and support.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.7, as it has evolved, does not appear to us to open the way to such an approach. In our view, the draft resolution as elaborated will require substantial improvement designed to ground it in the existing realities if it is to meet such reservations as those we have outlined and thereby be able to command the continued support of my delegation.

MR. IMAI (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.43. The last-minute amendment to the third preambular paragraph of this draft resolution has made it less definitive about the effect of what is popularly called nuclear winter, and has thus enabled my delegation to vote "yes", thus correctly reflecting our deep concern on this subject. It is our understanding that this phenomenon of nuclear winter is very much under debate within the scientific community, regarding, first, the method of calculation to be

(Mr. Imai, Japan)

employed, which is often considered too simple for the required complicated analysis of the after-effects of multiple nuclear explosions. Also, it is our understanding that scientists are not agreed on the assumptions of input data on the amount of smoke, dust and so forth for the calculation of after-effects which would be necessary for the study.

As we emphasized this in explaining our vote on a similar draft resolution last year, it is the view of my delegation that that part of the content of the draft resolution which is basically a scientific matter should first be subjected to full scientific consideration rather than having the General Assembly directly and hastily involve itself.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to draw the attention of members to the revised version of document A/C.1/40/L.35 which has been distributed in preliminary form. The final version will be made available as soon as possible.

Tomorrow morning it is my intention first to turn to the draft resolutions in cluster 10. After that, we shall continue with the remaining draft resolutions in cluster 11. We shall then consider draft resolutions action on which had been deferred. I would note that only two days remain for this work.

If I hear no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.