

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
FORTIETH SESSION  
*Official Records\**



MAY 19 1987

FIRST COMMITTEE  
43rd meeting  
held on  
Wednesday, 20 November 1985  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

AN/2001 21

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 43rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

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

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room 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.43  
25 November 1985

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will deal first with the draft resolutions listed in cluster 9 and then, when we have finished with cluster 9, it will take up the draft resolutions in cluster 10.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have asked to speak to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.1/Rev.1. The Soviet delegation has already had an opportunity to state in detail the substance of this Soviet proposal at this session of the General Assembly. The significance of this was emphasized once again during a meeting of the Congress by Mikhail Gorbachev, who noted the need "to prevent the great area of outer space from being an area of armaments".

The Soviet Union has submitted to this session a comprehensive programme for peaceful coexistence in outer space. We note with satisfaction that the basic ideas have met with a response from most participants in this session. The ways of implementing this proposal are set forth in draft resolution L.1, with which delegations are familiar. We have listened very carefully to the comments and proposals made in connection with that draft and during the discussions and consultations, as well as to specific comments on the text. Draft resolution L.1/Rev.1 has been prepared taking account of many of the wishes expressed, particularly by the non-aligned countries. Operative paragraph 1 reads:

"Urges all States ... to contribute actively to the goal of preventing an arms race in outer space, as an essential condition for the promotion of international co-operation in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes".

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The wording of this paragraph is a repetition of paragraph 13 of resolution 39/96, adopted by consensus at the last session of the General Assembly, on the question of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space. We proceeded from the fact that it was acceptable to all delegations, including those that have expressed fears about whether our proposal referred to some pre-conditions of peaceful coexistence in the use of space. In fact, there were no grounds for such fears.

Operative paragraph 2 calls for a new impetus to international co-operation in the peaceful use of outer space, including examination of the possibility of taking such specific measures as convening an international conference and setting up a world space organization, which would be a focus for co-ordinating efforts in this area on a world-wide scale. We took account of the desire of a number of countries that they should have some time to study these major issues and that no deadline should be established.

The draft resolution goes on to request that these matters be referred to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. This was in response to the wishes expressed by many delegations, which quite rightly pointed out that the Committee has played a very important and fruitful role in developing peaceful co-operation in outer space, including the preparation of the First and Second United Nations Conferences on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. In this connection I would recall that the non-aligned countries have frequently put forward in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space the idea of setting up a world organization. Draft resolution L.1/Rev.1, therefore, is in keeping with what is recommended by the majority of the members of the General Assembly.

This draft resolution is not confrontational in nature and it is not detrimental to the position of any country. Nor does it compete with the important draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.68, which, we believe, is quite clearly directed

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

towards negotiations, particularly in the Disarmament Commission, with a view to concluding agreements for the purpose of averting an arms race in outer space. These draft resolutions do not overlap, but rather complement each other.

Implementation of the concepts set forth in L.1/Rev.1 would be of great practical significance in preserving outer space for peaceful uses, improving the international political atmosphere and developing mutual understanding and mutually beneficial co-operation among all countries. Approval of this draft resolution would help enhance the authority of the United Nations and assist it in attaining its lofty objective of the use of space exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): The sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.6 and L.58 have conducted consultations aimed at submitting a single draft resolution on the question of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I am pleased to inform the Committee that the consultations have been successfully concluded. May I be permitted, therefore, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.58/Rev.1? The revised text contains the following amendments.

After the fifth preambular paragraph in L.15, the following new paragraph has been inserted:

"Believing that the preservation of the existing bilateral, regional and global system of arms limitation and disarmament agreements as well as the strict observance of such agreements by the parties are important elements of disarmament efforts at all levels,".

In the old seventh preambular paragraph, now the eighth preambular paragraph, after the words "as well as that", the words "the results of" have been inserted.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

At the end of the old eighth preambular paragraph, the following addition has been made: "and that all States should refrain from any actions which have or may have negative effects on the outcome of disarmament negotiations". That is the ninth preambular paragraph.

Lastly, in operative paragraph 5, which contains the appeal to the Conference on Disarmament to concentrate its work on the substantive and priority issues on its agenda, after the words "prevention of nuclear war", the words "to undertake and" have been inserted.

I should like to thank the sponsors of both draft resolutions, especially the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, whose readiness and understanding have contributed most directly to the successful outcome of the consultations.

Mr. KAHN (German Democratic Republic): Now that the representative of Yugoslavia has introduced draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.58/Rev.1, my delegation wishes to express its appreciation of the constructive co-operation with the delegation of Yugoslavia during the consultations on merging draft resolution L.6 with L.58. We also thank the other co-sponsors of L.58 for their valuable contributions to this process.

In view of the outcome of those consultations, my delegation wishes to announce that we will not press draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.6 to a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on cluster 9. We will first hear those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of vote on the draft resolutions in cluster 9.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8, which is sponsored by the Federal Republic of Germany and a number of other countries, I should like to point out that my delegation interprets this draft resolution as meaning that the fact that there

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

should not be an operative paragraph which corresponds to what is said in the sixth preambular paragraph in no way means that the sponsors intended that, in adopting the draft resolution, anyone should forget what is said in the preambular paragraph. It is a paragraph that corresponds to paragraph 114 of the Final Document.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

That paragraph reads as follows:

"Noting further that both the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America have expressed their readiness to keep the other States Members of the United Nations duly informed of progress in their bilateral negotiations, in accordance with paragraph 114 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly."

As I said a moment ago, there is no provision corresponding to this paragraph in the operative part of the draft resolution. However, my delegation understands that that does not mean the two negotiators will forget this point; rather, and quite the contrary, they will endeavour to comply with paragraph 114 of the Final Document.

The second point that I want to make relates to operative paragraph 2, which is very short and reads as follows:

"Urges the Governments of the two States concerned to work actively and without preconditions towards the achievement of that objective in order to enable the negotiations to make substantial progress."

I believe that what is requested in that paragraph is something of paramount importance which should be expressed in the clearest possible terms, and in no way should be open to what might be ambiguous or erroneous interpretations. What is asked here? In my view, the Governments of the two States concerned are being asked to work actively towards the achievement of that objective in order to enable negotiations to make substantial progress.

For that reason, my delegation, together with those of Argentina and Ecuador, ventures to submit the following amendment: omit the three words "and without preconditions".

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee takes note of the oral amendment proposed by the representative of Mexico.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): Speaking as one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8, I should like to start by assuring the representative of Mexico that it was certainly not the intention of the sponsors that the point in the sixth preambular paragraph should be forgotten. The reason for including that preambular paragraph was precisely to ensure that the two parties bore it in mind in considering the action to be taken on the basis of the resolution.

On the other point made by the representative of Mexico, I am puzzled, I think on two grounds, one procedural and the other substantive. It seems to us to be a late stage at which to raise this issue concerning the wording of this paragraph which, as the representative of Mexico said, is one of considerable importance.

On the substantive aspect, I think it is important to bear in mind that the phrase "and without preconditions" is an even-handed one: it applies equally to both parties to the negotiations. It seems to my delegation that all of us in this room and all the Governments which we represent have a common interest that the two Governments concerned should work actively towards the achievement of their objectives. It does not seem to me that there could be any interest on the part of the rest of us in admitting that this process might be subject to preconditions. It would seem to me, therefore, that the call is stronger if those words are left in.

I hope that in the light of this explanation the representative of Mexico will be able to accept and support the draft as it stands which seems to me to be an important point in the interests of us all. But if that is not the case, I think it is too important a point to be settled by a vote on the spot and we would wish to defer the matter to hold consultations and see any amendment in writing.



Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I shall begin by saying that my delegation has no objection to the vote being postponed until the amendment has been circulated in writing. I presented that amendment orally at this point because my delegation felt that the matter was quite clear and that, moreover, the sponsors of the draft resolution have known for quite a number of days that those words created a difficulty for a number of delegations which feel that they introduce an element of ambiguity - an element that may lend itself to ambiguous interpretations.

Preconditions for negotiations have already been laid down in the communiqué of 8 January with which we are all acquainted. But we would not want other conditions to be added later with which the Members of the United Nations are not acquainted. This is a matter of interest to all the peoples of the world and that is why everything should be clear and well known to all.

The paragraph without those words would be quite clear. It:

"Urges the Governments of the two States concerned to work actively towards the achievement of that objective in order to enable the negotiations to make substantial progress."

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): My delegation wishes to comment briefly on the draft resolutions in cluster 9.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8 on bilateral negotiations, I shall make some remarks on it at the end of my statement.

The other draft resolutions have certain characteristic features in common, and we attach great importance to those features in seeking to prevent a nuclear war and achieve nuclear disarmament. Thus the draft resolutions in question provide for concrete measures which are of great urgency and could be implemented quite speedily, given the goodwill of the States concerned. Secondly, the draft resolutions take into account the great significance of the bilateral negotiations

BG/7

A/C.1/40/PV.43  
14-15

(Mr. Rose, German  
Democratic Republic)

between the Soviet Union and the United States on the basis of their communiqué of 8 January of this year. At the same time, they reiterate that, in the case of nuclear weapons as well, it is imperative not to hamper the multilateral negotiating process but to strengthen it.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

We take this opportunity to reaffirm our position that bilateral and multilateral negotiations should complement and stimulate each other.

Thirdly, the draft resolutions just mentioned are not only fully in line with the consensus of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament but are also striking examples of how to implement that Final Document. On the basis of those fundamental considerations, the German Democratic Republic will support draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.64 initiated by Argentina, the more so in that we recognise in it the same thrust as embodied in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.13/Rev.1, "Nuclear weapons in all aspects," which my delegation submitted jointly with the other sponsors.

Practical measures are also the objective of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.47 on the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon, which was initiated by my delegation, as well as draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.37 on the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

The German Democratic Republic regards a freeze of nuclear-weapon arsenals as an extremely effective step to end the nuclear arms race and stimulate cuts in nuclear arms. It is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.44 and is also going to vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.18 and L.25.

In conclusion, let me say a few words about draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8 as it now stands. While the delegation of the German Democratic Republic can agree to parts of the text of that draft resolution, we cannot overlook the connection existing between that draft resolution and draft resolutions we have been unable to support in the past. Indeed, that connection is directly established in the text of the present draft resolution. For those reasons, my delegation cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8.

Mr. GONSALVES (India): I should like to make some brief observations relating to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.37. Paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament set forth the various stages of the process of nuclear disarmament. One of the stages in that process consists of:

"Cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, and of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". (S-10/2, para. 50)

India has consistently abstained in the voting on proposals that seek to isolate the question of the cessation of production of fissionable material for weapons purposes precisely because such a one-sided and partial approach is inconsistent with the approach agreed upon by consensus in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In our view, there ought to be a simultaneous stoppage of the production of nuclear weapons and of all fissionable material for weapons purposes. In that event, all States, including the nuclear-weapon States, would have no reasons not to accept the same system of equitable and non-discriminatory safeguards on all their nuclear facilities.

India will not, therefore, support proposals such as that contained in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.37.

The CHAIRMAN: In view of the amendment proposed by the representative of Mexico and the statement we have just heard from the representative of the United Kingdom, I should like to propose that we defer taking action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8.

I now call upon those representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting on the draft resolutions in cluster 9.

Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): I should like to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.18, L.25 and L.44, which relate to the

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

question of a nuclear-arms freeze. The position of the Norwegian Government is and has been that a verifiable nuclear-arms freeze based on an agreement among the parties concerned can constitute an important element in our efforts to achieve reductions in the nuclear-weapons arsenals.

On the basis of that position we have undertaken consultations with countries sponsoring proposals within the United Nations on a nuclear-arms freeze. We note with satisfaction that now, as last year, certain changes have been made in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18, submitted by the delegation of Mexico and some other countries, which we consider positive. Although the draft resolution in some respects does not correspond to our view, we have decided to vote in favour of it.

In connection with that vote, I should like to make the following statement: the Mexican draft resolution on a nuclear-arms freeze gives direct support to the ongoing Geneva negotiations. For this reason we view the draft resolution as advocating a freeze to be agreed between the two parties concerned.

Norway supports the defensive strategy of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and cannot accept the view that reliance on doctrines of nuclear deterrence has heightened the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war and led to greater insecurity and instability in international relations.

Norway continues to support NATO's double-track decision, which is also aimed at negotiations to reduce the danger of nuclear war in Europe. Norway's vote in favour of the present draft resolution cannot, therefore, be construed as any criticism of the countries which are implementing that decision or of other decisions agreed to in NATO.

As regards draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.25 and L.44, we have taken note of the fact that no important changes have been made compared with prior years. Consequently, we shall not be able to support those proposals and we shall, instead, vote as we did last year.

Mr. MANSFIELD (New Zealand): New Zealand will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18 on a nuclear-arms freeze. Our positive vote on that draft resolution will signal the concern of the New Zealand Government and people over the continuing nuclear arms race. It will also give expression to their aspiration that the nuclear arms race be brought to a halt as soon as possible and that the reduction of nuclear arsenals should begin forthwith.

In New Zealand's view, a nuclear-arms freeze should be based on a balance of deterrence at the lowest possible level of nuclear arsenals. First and foremost amongst the elements of a freeze, we call for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, which would ban all nuclear tests in all environments for all time. A nuclear-arms freeze should also be accompanied by negotiations - not unilateral actions - aimed at achieving deep cuts in nuclear arsenals as a matter of priority, with the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. The freeze must be balanced, mutual and verifiable in all its elements.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18 does not meet all those concerns. However, our decision to vote for such a resolution this year reflects our concern that the nuclear arms race be stopped and turned back. A properly ordered nuclear freeze would represent a substantial step in that direction.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The position of the Soviet Union on the important issue of a nuclear-arms freeze is reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.44, of which the USSR is a sponsor. We also intend to vote in favour of the other two draft resolutions on the same question, A/C.1/40/L.18 and L.25.

We wish at the same time to draw attention to the Soviet proposal concerning first steps that could be taken by the Soviet Union and the United States before they work out agreements on a series of issues concerning nuclear and outer space weapons that are under consideration at the Soviet/United States negotiations, and

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

that are welcomed in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18. We refer specifically to the following: first of all, a halt to all work to develop, test and deploy outer space strike weapons, including anti-satellite devices; a freeze on nuclear weapons at present levels with a limit placed on their modernization, and a halt to testing and deployment of new forms and types of such weapons; and a halt to the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.25, we would recall that in response to the call by the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session in 1983 to the United States, the United Kingdom, France, China and the Soviet Union, my country responded with a proposal that all nuclear Powers should declare a qualitative and quantitative freeze on all existing nuclear weapons. That is the key to our proposal in the United Nations for a nuclear-weapon freeze.

We would draw the attention of the Assembly once again to the unilateral steps taken in that direction, among them the unilateral moratorium by the Soviet Union on nuclear explosions and on the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. We have also unilaterally declared a reduction of such missiles in that region where they are already deployed.

We wish also to note that the last preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.25 does not fully and accurately reflect the actual situation.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): I wish to explain my delegation's votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.18 and L.44, which we shall vote against, and A/C.1/40/L.25, on which we shall abstain.

We shall vote in that way because we have certain reservations about the practicability and meaningfulness of these so-called freeze proposals. I do not need to emphasize here the long and continued efforts of Japan in pursuit of nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of all nuclear weapons

(Mr. Imai, Japan)

from the earth. We have been engaged in such efforts at the United Nations, at the Conference on Disarmament, and in various other international forums. We play an active part in such matters as a nuclear-test ban. We take an active interest in the promotion of nuclear disarmament and arms control negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

In all those processes towards the achievement of serious measures of nuclear disarmament, we cannot and should not overlook the reality that there is a certain balance of military strength which works to maintain an equilibrium, and that nuclear power undoubtedly plays a very major role in formulating that equilibrium. If the peace and security of the international community is in reality so greatly dependent upon the notion of deterrence, then any realistic steps of disarmament should be predicated upon the workings of that mechanism and should be mindful of the underlying stability that is created through various balancing acts.

A nuclear freeze, unless it is immediately followed by firmly and delicately constructed arrangements for balanced reductions in nuclear arms, could be used as a means to freeze the real or perceived nuclear superiority of one side over the other. Such an outcome would contribute to destabilizing the basic fabric of international security.

In addition to such conceptual difficulties as those, it is also widely recognized that the verification of a nuclear freeze would be extremely difficult and thus could not lead to proper confidence-building. It would be more useful and meaningful if, instead of playing with the somewhat unrealistic notion of a freeze, we worked more on such priority items as a nuclear test ban and nuclear non-proliferation, and then went on to verifiable arrangements to reduce the existing nuclear weapons that are being deployed by the nuclear-weapon States.



(Mr. Imai, Japan)

Those are the basic reasons why we cannot support draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.18, L.25 and L.44.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take decisions on the draft resolutions in cluster 9, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.13/Rev.1. That draft resolution has 15 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.13/Rev.1 was adopted by 99 votes to 19, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18. It has eight sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 31st meeting, on 7 November 1985. The sponsors are Ecuador, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sweden and Uruguay. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, 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, Jamaica, 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, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, 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: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Bahamas, China, Iceland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18 was adopted by 113 votes to 11, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.25. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the 33rd meeting, on 11 November 1985. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, 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, 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: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, China, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.25 was adopted by 110 votes to 12, with 8 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution

A/C.1/40/L.37. It has 22 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 36th meeting, on 13 November 1985. The sponsors are Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Singapore, Sweden and Uruguay. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, 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, 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 Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, China, France, India, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.37 was adopted by 127 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.44. It has 13 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the 36th meeting, on 13 November 1985. The sponsors are Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, 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, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, 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, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, China, Gabon, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, New Zealand, Thailand

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.44 was adopted by 101 votes to 17, with 8 abstentions.\*

---

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

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution

A/C.1/40/L.47. It has 18 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 34th meeting on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.47 was adopted by 62 votes to 11, with 56 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution

A/C.1/40/L.64. It has 11 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the 36th meeting on 13 November 1985. The sponsors are: Argentina, Bangladesh, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Oman, Romania, Sweden and the United Republic of Tanzania. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, 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, 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, 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, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Bahamas, Denmark, Japan, Spain, Togo

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.64 was adopted by 112 votes to 16, with 5 abstentions.



The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting on the draft resolutions in cluster 9.

Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): Despite the objections I have had to many resolutions adopted in this Committee over the years, I have refrained from explaining my delegation's support, abstention or rejection since small, militarily insignificant States should not register too many of the latter. But with regard to cluster 9, I can no longer run the risk of having my silence misconstrued as indifference. Let me hasten to say that my silence heretofore has left me with a very sore tongue. I am quite aware that my general comments here could be misinterpreted as well, so I shall endeavour to make my brief observations clear.

With regard to draft resolution L.8, I was unable to see any disagreement in the main thrust of this draft resolution and that in L.60, which was adopted earlier. They both welcomed the bilateral negotiations in Geneva and urged both Governments concerned to do everything possible to promote disarmament and to keep lesser mortals informed of their progress or decisions. I must concede that there are incompatible nuances and innuendos in both texts, but I cannot understand why a marriage did not occur, particularly since there is consensus that opposites attract. I trust that the deferral of L.8 will bring about this kind of agreement.

If we look carefully at L.13/Rev.1 and L.64, the main difference seems to be in the concept or meaning of cessation and prevention. Of course there is more, but while my delegation is convinced that prevention is better than cure, it fails to see the merit in trying to implement two similar decisions, however fraught with explainable technicalities.

The texts of L.18, L.25 and L.44 talk about freezes on nuclear arms and nuclear weapons. I think that one would have to be an expert linguist, semanticist or gadfly to ferret out any real positive difference in the purpose contained in this grouping. Draft resolution L.18 inter alia calls for the implementation of a specific mandate, and my delegation not only supports such an effort, but recommends

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

action. Draft resolution L.44 urges the two super-Powers to set an example for other States in this regard. Who can disagree? Draft resolution L.25 touches my sense of agreement in the economy of words. But these are the very reasons that cause confusion for my delegation. Upon examining the texts I find no clear line of disagreement on principle and on the main thrust of the theme. Yet they seem to arrive at crossroads where they all go off in different directions. My delegation is in total agreement with many aspects of all of these draft resolutions, but I am disappointed that the similar elements could not be extracted and combined into a positive whole. I must ask, once again, whether we are more concerned with point average than with mutual understanding on how to stop what we all deplore - the escalation of the arms race.

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

Granted, these diversions often add some intrigue and excitement to our deliberations. But we ought to bear in mind that we are not engaged in a game of chess or bowling; we are supposed to be seeking the best ways to strengthen and maintain peace and "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", particularly nuclear war, as all these resolutions are wont to include. Certainly it is a monumental task which will not be accomplished by any one individual or regional group. It calls for total interdependence, and if we are not willing to aim for that goal then we are wasting time.

Finally, I realize that my delegation's protests are not new, but they continue to be positive. Given my observations, then, I could not in good conscience vote against any of the texts before us. In fact, some are highly commendable and serious in nature, but it would be equally imprudent to support them. My hope is that my delegation's abstentions in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.13/Rev.1, L.18, L.25, L.44, L.47 and L.64 would continue to represent that "voice in the wilderness" syndrome which would one day be heard above the din of plausible rhetoric when all players would be more united on these and other very important international issues.

Mr. ALI (Bangladesh): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.47 regarding the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon. The Bangladesh delegation is fully aware of the destructive potential of the neutron weapon. However, we had to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution because we are opposed to singling out any type of such deadly weapons.

At preceding sessions we expressed our conviction that such action will not serve any useful purpose in promoting much cherished and common objective of achieving nuclear disarmament. On the contrary, it may give a narrow perspective to the consideration of an issue which has a much wider spectrum and implications.

(Mr. Ali, Bangladesh)

The delegation of Bangladesh once again reiterates its unequivocal position that nuclear weapons, irrespective of their types, pose the greatest danger to mankind and human civilization. We believe it is essential to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race in all its aspects with the objective of achieving disarmament.

Let me now explain our vote on other draft resolutions included in cluster 9 and voted on today. My delegation is a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.37 and L.64 and fully endorses the views contained in them. With regard to the other draft resolutions, my delegation voted in favour of them. While admittedly some of their paragraphs contain one-sided and contradictory positions, we believe that the spirit underlying them is in conformity with the common aspiration of mankind to achieve nuclear disarmament. That underlying spirit needs to be encouraged for the common good of humanity. We have voted in favour of those draft resolutions in that spirit and our affirmative votes do not in any way imply our endorsement of any negotiating position of the principal parties.

Ms. WANG Zhiyun (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation has maintained all along that, owing to the ever escalating arms race between the two super-Powers with the largest nuclear arsenals, they should bear special responsibility for the achievement of nuclear disarmament. We are of the view that that special responsibility requires that not only should the two super-Powers be the first to stop testing, improving and producing nuclear weapons; they should also take the lead in drastically reducing their nuclear arsenals. When they have taken effective action in the field of nuclear disarmament, other nuclear-weapon States should also take corresponding measures. Basing ourselves on that fundamental position, we abstained in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.18, L.25 and L.44.

(Ms. Wang Zhiyun, China)

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.64, the Chinese delegation voted in favour, for we support its main thrust. However, in our view, this draft resolution fails to mention the special responsibility to be shouldered by the countries with the largest nuclear arsenals, and there is more room for improvement on that point.

Mr. HERZBRUCH (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to explain my delegation's votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.18, L.25 and L.44, all concerning a proposed freeze on nuclear weapons. My delegation voted against all three of them, based on its conviction that a nuclear-weapon freeze under the present military situation in the world is not conducive to nuclear disarmament but, rather, is counterproductive.

Against the background of the military situation, especially in Europe, a nuclear-arms freeze at the present time and level of build-up of stockpiles of nuclear weapons would freeze the advantage of one party over another. A freeze leaves existing nuclear arsenals in place, so that the threat emanating from them will endure. Instead of a freeze at the present level of nuclear weapons, we are aiming for a disarmament process leading to a much lower level of armaments and military forces, taking into account the requirement of undiminished security for all States as stipulated in paragraph 29 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We are of the view that freeze decisions cannot promote the process of agreed substantial reductions of weapons.

For those reasons, my delegation voted against them.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): I should like to explain Australia's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.18 and L.47.

Australia voted in support of the broad proposition of nuclear freeze as reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18, submitted by Mexico, in order to demonstrate once again the Australian Government's support for a freeze on nuclear-weapon testing, production and development as a means of breaking the upward spiral of the nuclear-arms race. However, in Australia's view, a freeze should be only the first step; it must be followed by negotiations which aim for deep cuts in the high stockpiles of nuclear weapons. The immediate goal must be the most stable possible balance, at the lowest possible level of nuclear weapons. The ultimate goal must remain their complete elimination.

Australia's approach to the freeze question recognizes that the continuation of nuclear stability is essential. Nuclear deterrence is the only option available at the present time to avoid serious nuclear instability and overt nuclear conflict. However, in our view, it must be regarded as only an interim step along the road to the essential ultimate goal of complete disarmament.

Australia's approach to a freeze also takes into account the need for mutuality and balance. Any attempt to implement a nuclear freeze in which one side felt a serious strategic inferiority was being imposed on it could lead to instability and run the risk of provoking nuclear conflict.

Australia also attaches importance to the need for any arms control agreement, such as would be represented by a freeze, to include in it adequate measures for verification. Without such measures there can be no confidence in international disarmament and arms control agreements.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Australia's support for the freeze concept does not preclude support for alternative approaches as well. Australia has long given priority to the achievement of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban which, in its conception, goes further than the nuclear-weapons test-ban called for in the draft resolution, since in our view a comprehensive test-ban should also include a ban on so-called peaceful nuclear explosions.

Australia has also made known its strong support for the bilateral nuclear-arms-limitations negotiations that are being conducted by the United States and the Soviet Union in Geneva. We appreciate that these will be long and difficult negotiations, but they are of vital importance and cover much the same ground that would need to be covered even if they were instituted following an agreement to freeze.

Similarly, our work to maintain and strengthen the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons may be regarded as contributing to control over production and development of nuclear weapons as envisaged in the draft resolution.

Obviously, these remarks reflect some variance in a number of areas between our national approach and that of the draft resolution just adopted. Our vote is without prejudice in this respect and has been cast, as indicated at the outset and at last year's session of the General Assembly, to give expression to Australia's support for the aspirations manifest in the freeze proposal. Australia will continue to work towards these goals in all responsible ways open to it.

I should now turn briefly to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.47. Australia abstained in the vote on that draft resolution on the nuclear neutron weapon. Australia supports the principle that nuclear weapons should be eliminated through negotiations. We do not, however, consider that the nuclear neutron weapon can be the subject of a separate disarmament treaty, not least because of the difficulties which would exist in verifying such a treaty, but can only be

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

prohibited in the context of negotiations on nuclear weapons as a whole. We consider that the draft resolution, and particularly paragraph 1, which is the essential element in the draft resolution, does not meet that requirement. Accordingly, Australia has abstained in the vote on it.

Mr. TORSTILA (Finland): I wish to explain Finland's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.13/Rev.1, "Nuclear weapons in all aspects." Although Finland has reservations with regard to certain formulations in the preambular part of the draft resolution, we voted in favour of it because we concur with its main thrust, namely, putting an end to the nuclear-arms race.

Mr. BATSANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.37 on the understanding that the words "its work" in the operative paragraph, referring to the work of the Conference on Disarmament, refer to practical negotiations on nuclear disarmament. As we have emphasized on more than one occasion, the question of prohibiting the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes should be linked with nuclear disarmament measures and, in particular, considered as one of the first steps in the implementation of the programme for nuclear disarmament. Such measures should also be an integral part of a nuclear-arms freeze.

Mr. van SHAIK (Netherlands): My delegation wishes to place on record the reasons that prompted it to abstain in the vote on the Swedish-Mexican draft resolution on a nuclear-arms freeze, A/C.1/40/L.18, and that led it to cast a negative vote against the other two draft resolutions on the same subject, A/C.1/40/L.25 and L.44.

The Netherlands, while deeply concerned about the continuing arms race, is not convinced that - at least at this stage - a nuclear-arms freeze would be an adequate step towards the imperative goal of reversing the arms race and reducing



(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

the overall levels of armaments. We consider this view to be even more compelling now that the two Powers possessing the largest military arsenals are intensely engaged in bilateral negotiations on their nuclear arsenals during which proposals for dramatic cuts have come forward from both sides.

Secondly, a nuclear-arms freeze would sanction the destabilizing imbalance prevailing in Europe. Freezing this destabilizing aspect of the present situation would be at variance with our most immediate security concerns, a point that is ignored in the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18. Establishing a stable balance at the lowest possible levels of armaments should be our first priority. Here again, our hopes turn to the bilateral negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces.

To be acceptable - that is to say, after a stable balance has been achieved at lower levels - any freeze should meet adequate standards of verification. Its scope should be well defined. Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18 contains a well-defined scope consisting of four different measures. But with regard to those measures we have doubts, for instance on the question of whether, in the words of the draft resolution, the

"complete cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and of their delivery vehicles"

can adequately be verified. In any case, acceptable solutions to the problems of verification may be found only as a result of negotiations. The declaratory approach to the freeze concept followed in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18, as reflected in operative paragraph 1 (b), falls short of meeting verification needs for a freeze.

While draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18 at least addresses the relevant aspects in some detail, the same cannot be said with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.44. Although it addresses verification, the implications

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

thereof are unclear, since no attempt is made to define the scope of the requested "freeze". Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.25, while completely ignoring aspects of verification, contains a scope that can only be qualified as imprecise and arbitrary.

In conclusion, although the Netherlands has objections to all three draft resolutions mentioned, it considers that the Swedish-Mexican draft resolution, A/C.1/40/L.18, addresses the freeze concept in the most comprehensive way, albeit without offering an overall acceptable solution. My delegation therefore voted against draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.25 and L.44, but abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18.

Mr. JESSEL (France) (interpretation from French): I wish to explain the negative votes cast by the French delegation in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.18, L.25 and L.64.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.18 and L.25 concern a freeze on nuclear weapons. Our objections involve the very concept of a freeze, and have been explained on many occasions. First of all, a freeze, by definition, would fix the existing situation and, hence, any imbalance that situation might entail with the consequent risks for the States concerned. Moreover, a freeze would give any State which might have engaged in a major increase in its weaponry a lasting advantage, to the detriment of States which might have reduced their efforts. Furthermore, a freeze would be difficult to verify, and the negotiations necessary to ensure conditions for effective verification would be as lengthy and as complex as negotiations on verification of an actual reduction of arsenals. Finally, to the extent that it could benefit a given Power, a freeze would risk substantially reducing that Power's interest in negotiations and in making major reductions in its weaponry. Thus, progress towards the reduction of nuclear arsenals would in no way be fostered by declarations on a freeze. The path to reductions begins with negotiations between the two nuclear super-Powers, with their point of departure in the definition and the establishment of a satisfactory balance.

My delegation also voted against draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.64. Obviously, we cannot associate ourselves with a text running directly counter to a doctrine which is at the root of the security and defence policy of my country.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like to explain why my delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.64, on multilateral nuclear-arms negotiations. It seems to my delegation to be self-evident that bilateral negotiations between the two Powers with the overwhelming preponderance - about 95 per cent - of the world's nuclear weapons and with the greatest military

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

capability in space offer by far the most realistic hope of halting the nuclear arms race and initiating the process of reducing nuclear armaments. It is for that reason that my delegation, with others, is unable to agree to calls to initiate multilateral negotiations on the subject in the Conference on Disarmament. It is our view that any such negotiations would be unrealistic and premature, and could well be harmful to the prospects for the bilateral negotiations. For the same reason, we do not consider that the creation of a subsidiary body under this item of the agenda of the Conference would serve any useful purpose at the present time.

Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.37 and L.47 because we believe it inappropriate to divorce from the general question of nuclear disarmament the two questions dealt with in those draft resolutions: the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes, and the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon.

Argentina agrees that the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons purposes should be prohibited along with the manufacture of the nuclear neutron weapon. But we believe that those questions should not be separated from the general question of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): I should like to explain my delegation's votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.18 and L.25. The People's Republic of Bulgaria fully supports the idea of freezing nuclear weapons. Our principled position is reflected in the draft resolution just adopted, entitled "Nuclear-weapon freeze" (A/C.1/40/L.44), of which my delegation is a sponsor.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

The Bulgarian delegation voted in favour of the draft resolutions entitled "Nuclear-arms freeze" (A/C.1/40/L.18) and "Freeze on nuclear weapons" (A/C.1/40/L.25). We fully endorse the general thrust of those two draft resolutions. My delegation shares the understanding that a nuclear-weapon freeze would be a major and extremely effective step towards the reduction and ultimate elimination of nuclear arms. We also concur with the idea that this measure is completely realistic and practical. The objective conditions exist, provided that all nuclear-weapon States display political will. Verification of compliance too should be no problem, given the presence of such political will.

Mr. AL-MOHAMED (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation has supported all efforts aimed at achieving nuclear disarmament. Thus, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions on that subject in the belief that nuclear disarmament, whatever the source of proposals, would strengthen world peace, security and stability.

The concept of there being a general framework of nuclear weapons issues and of the necessity to combine all those issues led us to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.47, on the nuclear neutron weapon. We do not consider that the nuclear neutron weapon should be singled out among the whole range of nuclear weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegation wish to explain its vote on the draft resolutions in cluster 9? It appears not.

I call on the representative of Australia.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): I should like to make a brief statement with regard to the revision of two draft resolutions that have now been issued. The first is that contained in document A/C.1/40/L.70/Rev.1, which is sponsored by Australia, Bolivia, Cameroon, Fiji, Greece and Samoa. The subject of that draft resolution is "Disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security", a subject of, we assume, profound importance to all Member States.

I want to emphasize that the issuance of Rev.1 to that draft resolution is the consequence of consultations that have taken place between the sponsors and a considerable number of delegations. It is my understanding that such consultations are continuing and may well result in further modifications to the draft resolution in document L.70/Rev.1. My delegation certainly welcomes that process of consultation and wishes it to continue including, as it does, representatives from the various groups of countries included in the First Committee.

I should also like to make a particular point with regard to the significance of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. That Final Document is, of course, a document adopted by consensus and one that is of immense importance to all of us. That document is referred to in the draft resolution and its validity is reaffirmed, as is our commitment to its provisions.

I have made this point because this draft resolution, L.70/Rev.1, provides for no further report to be made to the Assembly but is a resolution tabled on this one occasion, the fortieth anniversary of the founding of this Organization. This draft resolution in no way seeks to reinterpret or in any way cut across the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session, the validity and

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

importance of which are reaffirmed in this draft resolution. On the contrary, it is intended to try to express on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary session our firm recognition that the maintenance of international peace and security is of profound importance to all of us, and our belief that the maintenance of international peace and security requires real disarmament in ways which are called for in the Charter and in the Final Document of the first special session.

I turn briefly to the draft resolution that has now been issued in document A/40/C.1/71/Rev.1, entitled "Notification of nuclear tests". This draft resolution is sponsored by Australia, Fiji, Ireland, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Somoa and Sweden. The draft resolution is a simple one, as I think many delegations recognize. It rests on the firm conviction that, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, the peoples of the world have the right to a full and open account from the States concerned of all nuclear explosions conducted by them.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have entered into consultations with others, and we have been greatly encouraged by the outcome of those consultations. I should like to report to this Committee that in our United Nations community there is a real interest in studying further and giving real and practical consideration to the proposal for the notification of nuclear tests, but those consultations have also revealed that there are further technical issues, in particular, and further considerations which need to be entered into before we could bring into existence what is called for in this draft resolution. Therefore the sponsors have decided that we shall not request a vote on this draft resolution at this session. We shall in that sense leave it on the table for action next year, but we will not ask for a vote this year. Our main motive for doing this is, as I have just indicated, that the consultations we are having and are continuing reveal that there is a positive approach towards this proposal but that it requires

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

some further technical investigation in order to make it viable, and we take that in good faith. We want to see that further investigation continue, and for that reason we shall not this year press the draft resolution in A/40/C.1/L.71/Rev.1 to a vote.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to announce that this afternoon the Committee will begin taking action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 10.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.