

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FORTIETH SESSION

Official Records*



UNITED NATIONS

MAY 19 1987

FIRST COMMITTEE

37th meeting

held on

Thursday, 14 November 1985

at 10.30 a.m.

New York

19 / NOVEMBER 1985

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 37th 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 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.37
19 November 1985

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with our programme of work and timetable, this morning the Committee will begin taking action on the draft resolutions under disarmament items which appear in cluster 1, as listed in the informal working paper distributed to representatives at yesterday's meeting, as follows:

A/C.1/40/L.5, L.12, L.14, L.16, L.19, L.27, L.28, L.29, L.32, L.41, L.50, L.55, L.59, L.69 and L.72.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/40/L.8, Swaziland; A/C.1/40/L.16, Samoa; A/C.1/40/L.28, Nigeria; A/C.1/40/L.29, Bolivia and Morocco; A/C.1/40/L.30, Bolivia; A/C.1/40/L.32, Viet Nam and Mongolia; A/C.1/40/L.57, Bolivia; A/C.1/40.L.58, Bolivia; A/C.1/40/L.59, Bolivia; A/C.1/40/L.68, Zimbabwe and Venezuela; A/C.1/40/L.69, Samoa; A/C.1/40/L.70, Samoa and Bolivia; A/C.1/40/L.71, Sweden; and A/C.1/40/L.72, Samoa, Trinidad and Tobago, Oman, and Jamaica.

The CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding to take action on the draft resolutions, I should like once again to remind delegations of the following procedures.

As far as action on each individual cluster is concerned, delegations will first have an opportunity to make a statement, other than in explanation of vote, they regard as necessary in respect of the draft resolutions in that cluster. Subsequently, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on any or all

the draft resolutions in a particular cluster before a decision is taken may do so. After the Committee has taken a decision on the draft resolutions contained in a given cluster, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes may do so. Further, I again urge delegations, to the extent possible, to make a consolidated statement on draft resolutions contained in a given cluster with respect to statements and relevant explanations of vote.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1.

Mr. van SCHAIK (Netherlands): On behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community, as well as Portugal and Spain, I wish to make some remarks on the question of the reduction of military budgets. The Ten, Portugal and Spain take a keen interest in this subject.

We are fully aware of the heavy burden high military expenditures place on the economies of all countries. The economies of the countries on whose behalf I speak today are no exception. We therefore favour international agreements on reducing military budgets. That is why we have participated actively in the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission on this subject.

We share the view expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.12 that reductions in military expenditure would have to be made in such a manner as not to undermine the rights of all States to undiminished security, self-defence and sovereignty.

A number of States on whose behalf I speak today have in their statements over the years stressed the need for greater transparency in military budgets as a prerequisite for agreement on the reduction of military expenditure. Transparency, comparability and verifiability remain key concepts.

Most of the States on whose behalf I speak have reacted positively to the recommendation in resolution 39/64 B, as well as to preceding resolutions on the subject, and have reported to the Secretary-General in standardized form their military expenditures.

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

We welcome the fact that the number of countries reporting is gradually increasing. We were happy to note that this year, for the first time, not only Western and non-aligned countries have reported on their military expenditure, demonstrating that the reporting requirements can, with appropriate efforts, be fulfilled, notwithstanding the existence of different social and economic systems.

We are encouraged by that development and hope that other countries will follow this example, since we continue to advocate an increased number of reporting countries as a necessary condition for progress on this subject. The appeal to that effect contained in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.16 therefore has our full support.

Mr. CALDERON (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation considers it necessary to make a statement on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.50 on the World Disarmament Conference. As this Committee knows, Peru has always been in favour of the idea of convening a World Disarmament Conference as the best way to promote and facilitate the adoption of effective measures for disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament. Therefore, we supported resolution 2833 (XXVI), adopted on 16 December 1971. Similarly, we did not object in the years that followed to the adoption of the draft resolutions aimed at maintaining in force that important initiative.

(Mr. Calderon, Peru)

None the less my delegation understands that this time the General Assembly has been called into a ritual procedure of adopting, by consensus, a renewal of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee for the World Disarmament Conference, in spite of the fact that it is clear that in present circumstances no consensus has been reached on the holding of that Conference among the nuclear-weapon States, whose participation Peru, and the majority of other Member States, considers essential.

This situation is of concern to my delegation because it involves a consensus on disagreement, something which is far from speeding up adequate preparations for the Conference and which, on the contrary, contributes to concealing a discouraging reality the General Assembly should not evade.

That is why I wish to put on record the fact that Peru's co-sponsorship of the above-mentioned draft resolution has been agreed unenthusiastically and on the understanding that the Ad Hoc Committee will in the coming year attempt to give a better formulation to the General Assembly on the difficulties in the way of substantive progress in the preparation of the Conference. Clearly, if promising work is not done, then next year Peru will not be able to continue co-sponsoring the draft resolution on the World Disarmament Conference. Although this is a valuable initiative, it in no way benefits the General Assembly to fall into procedural euphemism that only serves to postpone the debate on substantive issues.

Mr. TONNE (Nigeria): On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.55, I shall introduce the following amendments, since they wish to have it adopted by consensus, as in previous years.

Two minor amendments are submitted to the preambular part, which, we believe, will reflect and strengthen that general consensus.

The first would replace the third preambular paragraph with the following paragraph:

"Noting with concern that half-way through the Decade, its goals are far from being achieved and no substantial progress has been made even on items of highest priority,".

The second would include the following text, as an additional ninth preambular paragraph:

"Welcoming the bilateral negotiations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America in accordance with the joint communiqué issued by the two Governments on 8 January 1985,".

As I have said, these minor amendments have been agreed by all the sponsors. They are intended to take cognizance of developments in disarmament negotiations, and I hope that they will satisfy all delegations.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): I have asked to speak to propose a small amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.16 on "Reduction of military budgets". It concerns operative paragraph 3, which would read as follows:

"3. Commends the study and its conclusions and recommendations to the attention of all Member States;".

This amendment represents only a drafting change to realign the paragraph with the traditional formulations used in similar cases.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes before decisions are taken on the draft resolutions in first cluster.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish to set forth the position of the Soviet Union on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.16.

We have constantly been in favour of reducing military expenditures. Taking into account the fact that increasing military expenses directly connected with the stepping up of the arms race, the Soviet Union, together with its friends and allies under the Warsaw Treaty, put forward in March 1984 a well-developed proposal

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

regard to negotiations aimed at achieving practical agreement among the countries of the Warsaw Treaty and of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on freezing nuclear expenditures and their subsequent reduction in percentage or absolute terms.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

We continue to believe that efforts to avoid increasing, and in fact to reduce, military expenditures should be shared by all States, primarily the States which possess a major military potential. At the same time, the implementation of such measures by the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) would be of particular importance in the light of their heavy burden of military expenditure.

The urgency of our proposal was confirmed once again in the Declaration entitled "For the elimination of the nuclear threat and for a turn for the better in European and world affairs", adopted at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organization in Sofia on 23 October of this year. Another effective measure for limiting the arms race in all areas, as was stressed in that same Declaration, could be a reciprocal freeze, beginning with the regular fiscal year, of the military budgets of the USSR and the United States.

The attainment of practical agreement with regard to the reduction of military budgets would not require a great deal of time if States Members of the United Nations were to evince the necessary political will and a real desire to bring about an early solution to this extremely important and urgent problem. The USSR would of course be ready on the basis of reciprocity to make a major reduction, in percentage or in absolute terms, of its military budget.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.16, on defining the machinery for accounting and comparability of military expenditures, would, in essence, be a diversion from the actual task of reducing military expenditures.

We believe that draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.16 leaves the problem of reducing military budgets at a dead end, as have similar draft resolutions in the past. We will therefore vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no other delegations wishing to explain their votes before the votes are taken on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 1, we shall now proceed to the voting. To begin with, the Committee will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.5. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the First Committee's 36th meeting, on 13 November 1985. It has been requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.5 was adopted.

Mr. MAHBOUB (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.5 concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, which has just been adopted.

As was mentioned by my delegation yesterday, Iraq has consistently supported the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East, as well as all over the world. Had the draft resolution just adopted been put to the vote, Iraq would have voted in favour. However, in the meantime, we think that the position taken by Israel of stockpiling nuclear weapons completely prevents the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East. Therefore, the establishment of such a zone requires, in the first place, that Israel submit all its nuclear facilities to international safeguards and that it comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) concerning Israel's nuclear activities.

The history of Israel since its usurpation of Palestine puts it in a very peculiar situation and, therefore, its request to accede to the

(Mr. Mahboub, Iraq)

Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) should be seen within this framework. Moreover, an armed attack against peaceful nuclear facilities can also be considered as a nuclear-weapon attack and therefore the international community should take effective measures to prevent a repetition of such an attack or threat to use force in this field.

My delegation, in its statement yesterday, referred to the contents of the report of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (A/40/520), and to many other international sources. They all confirm the possession of nuclear weapons by Israel. Hence, the removal of nuclear weapons from the region is a prerequisite for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region.

The CHAIRMAN: I have departed from my own suggested procedure, where I appealed to members kindly to consider, that, to the extent possible, they should make statements in explanation of positions or votes after the decisions on a cluster have all been taken. Hopefully, this can still be done in the future.

We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.12. This draft resolution has 15 co-sponsors, and was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 31st meeting, on 7 November 1985. The sponsors are: Austria, Bangladesh, Colombia, Ecuador, Indonesia, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sudan, Sweden and Uruguay.

It has been requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objections, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to proceed accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.12 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: With regard to the next draft resolution listed in cluster 1, A/C.1/40/L.14, I have been given to understand that some consultations

(The Chairman)

are still going on. I therefore propose, if the Committee agrees, to take up that draft resolution at the end of this afternoon's meeting. If there are no objections to this procedure, we shall act accordingly.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.16, as orally amended. The draft resolution has 21 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 29th meeting on 6 November 1985. They are: Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Romania, Uruguay, Sudan, Samoa and Sweden.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burma, China, Congo, India, Iraq, Jordan, Nicaragua, Saudi Arabia, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.16, as orally amended, was adopted by 96 votes to 13, with 15 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now turn to draft

resolution A/C.1/40/L.19. It has 13 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 31st meeting on 7 November 1985. They are: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Ecuador, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.19 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft

resolution A/C.1/40/L.27. This draft resolution is sponsored by Australia, Czechoslovakia, Japan and Sweden. The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.27 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft

resolution A/C.1/40/L.28. It has nine sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 32nd meeting on 8 November 1985.

The sponsors are: Cameroon, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Mexico, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Yugoslavia. The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If there are no objections, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to proceed accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.28 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft

resolution A/C.1/40/L.29. It has 17 sponsors and was introduced by the

(The Chairman)

representative of Sweden at the 32nd meeting on 8 November 1985. The sponsors are: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bolivia, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Finland, Morocco, Philippines, Romania, Sweden, Uganda, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If there are no objections, I shall take it that the Committee decides to do so.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.29 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/40/L.32. It has 19 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 31st meeting on 7 November 1985. The sponsors are: Austria, Belgium, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Mongolia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Sweden, Yugoslavia and Viet Nam. It has been requested that this draft resolution too be adopted without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to comply with that request.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.32 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.41. It is sponsored by 12 delegations: Bahamas, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Ecuador, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan, Romania and Spain. The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. May I take it that the First Committee adopts the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.41 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.50. This draft resolution has five sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 33rd meeting on 11 November 1985. The sponsors are Burundi, Peru, Poland, Spain and Sri Lanka. The programme budget implications of this draft resolution are set out in document A/C.1/40/L.76.

The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.50 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The First Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.55, as orally amended. It has 11 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 34th meeting held on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Cameroon, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Tunisia and Yugoslavia. The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. May I take it that the Committee agrees to that request?

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.55, as orally amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.59. It is sponsored by 26 delegations and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 35th meeting on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Cameroon, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia. The sponsors of the draft resolution have requested that it be adopted without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.59 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: With regard to the next draft resolution in cluster 1, A/C.1/40/L.69, I understand that consultations are still going on. It has been requested, accordingly, that action on that draft resolution be postponed. We hope that it will be possible to take action on the draft resolution tomorrow morning at the latest. May I take it that the Committee decides to postpone action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.69?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution

A/C.1/40/L.72. The draft resolution is sponsored by 44 delegations and was introduced by the representative of Cameroon at the 36th meeting on 13 November 1985. The sponsors of the draft resolution are Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Oman, Rwanda, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Zaire and Zambia.

The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If there is no objection I shall take it that the Committee decides to adopt the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.72 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus voted on all draft resolutions in cluster 1, apart from those upon which we have agreed to take action later on.

I shall now call on delegations wishing to explain their votes or positions after decision on the draft resolutions in cluster 1.

Mr. ISSACHAROFF (Israel): Unlike the representative of Iraq, I shall confine my comments in connection with agenda item 52, the item in question.

The delegation of Israel has joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.5, adopted under agenda item 52, as in recent years subject to the position of the Government of Israel, communicated by the Permanent Representative of Israel to the Secretary-General on 13 June 1985, as reproduced in document A/40/383 and incorporated by the Secretary-General in his report in document A/40/442.

(Mr. Issacharoff, Israel)

I should like to emphasize the position of my delegation that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East should be on the basis of arrangements directly and freely arrived at among the States of the region. That position is consonant with the recommendation contained in paragraph 5.3 of the recommendations and proposals of the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues - also known as the Palme Commission - reproduced in document A/CN.10/38 of 8 April 1983.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): I should like very briefly to explain the position and votes of my delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.5, L.12 and L.16.

Concerning draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.5, my delegation has joined the consensus on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, since the particular situation and characteristics of that region deserve, in our view, a specific approach. Moreover, the draft resolution has the support of the States directly concerned. Regarding operative paragraph 1, however, it is my Government's considered opinion that the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones should not in any way be related to adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, an instrument which, besides being discriminatory and unbalanced, has allowed nuclear proliferation by nuclear-weapon Powers to proceed unchecked. We believe that, on the contrary, such zones ought to be established on their own merits, according to the interests of the parties directly concerned, as stated in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

Regarding draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.12 and L.16, I should like once again to express my Government's views on the question of the reduction of military budgets, which is addressed by those two draft resolutions. As I had the opportunity to stress before this Committee on 5 November, the military expenditures of nuclear-weapon Powers have consistently risen in the past few years, while in most countries such expenditures have been reduced. In South America, for instance, the latest available data show a marked decline in expenditures on armaments. One should note in this connection that in absolute terms the total military expenditure for the whole of South America is about 40 times smaller than that of the major military alliances. It is, thus, obvious that it must be incumbent upon the nuclear-weapon Powers and their allies to be the first to take measures conducive to the concrete reduction of their own military budgets. In my delegation's view, that concern is not adequately reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.16, and for that reason we abstained in the vote on that text.

Brazil continues to attach importance to the goal of making available for development purposes, and particularly for the benefit of developing countries, whatever resources may be reallocated from the enormous amounts currently being spent on armaments by the nuclear-weapon Powers. That concern, among others, including the procedural aspects of the consideration of the question in the Disarmament Commission, is duly covered by draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.12, the terms of which we continued to support by joining the consensus on it, as we have done on similar texts in the past.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connection with the Committee's adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.29, on a study on concepts of security, the Soviet delegation wishes to point out that this year's study contains many useful elements, both general approaches to strengthening security through disarmament and concrete measures for curbing the arms race. We therefore supported the adoption by consensus of that draft resolution.

At the same time, the Soviet delegation has certain reservations on the study. We do not wish to enumerate them now, since our assessment of the study will be set out in our reply to the questionnaire provided for in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. But to give one example, I shall mention the insufficiently accurate wording of the second sentence of paragraph 174 of the cited study, which could be taken to mean that there is an absence of parity in Europe at present, which, of course, does not correspond to the facts. Moreover, the Soviet Union does not consider it appropriate to carry out a study on the security problems of small States as recommended in paragraph 231 of the report.

In this regard, I would recall that the Expert from the Soviet Union made comments on the study which, unfortunately, were not reflected in that study.

Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.5, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, was adopted without a vote. The Argentine delegation wishes to observe that the scope of that draft resolution, as indicated by its text, comprehends all parties directly concerned and that, therefore, the recommendations of the draft resolution should not be understood as being addressed to countries that are not part of the region.

(Mr. Campora, Argentina)

It should be understood that specific circumstances in a region may justify calls or proposals being addressed to and accepted by the countries of the region, calls or proposals that might not be as timely or appropriate for other regions or other countries.

(Mr. Campora, Argentina)

In this respect we should like to recall that Argentina has well-known reservations on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the imposition of full-scope safeguards by the International Atomic Energy Agency, to which reference is made in A/C.1/40/L.5.

Mr. ELBE (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation had no difficulty in agreeing to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.41 on the report of the Disarmament Commission. However, there is one minor ambiguity in the draft resolution's text which it might have been useful to eliminate.

In operative paragraph 4, the Disarmament Commission is requested to submit a substantive report on its 1986 session containing specific recommendations on the items inscribed on its agenda. However, General Assembly resolution 37/78 H, which is appropriately cited in operative paragraph 3, provides that the Commission at the outset of each annual session should select from among its agenda items those on which specific recommendations can be elaborated. I take operative paragraph 4 to mean that specific recommendations should be issued only on the items so selected. My interpretation is compatible with the text as it stands.

Mr. GONSALVES (India): The delegation of India has, as in the past, accepted the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.5. However, we should like to place on record that our support for this consensus is without prejudice to our established position on the inefficacy of partial measures in the field of nuclear disarmament and our consistent position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and application of so-called full-scope safeguards.

India abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.16 and, although we accepted the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.12, we cannot endorse the proposition that all States are equally responsible for rising military expenditure. Since it is a very few militarily significant States which account for

(Mr. Gonsalves, India)

80 per cent of global military expenditure, the onus for reducing military expenditure obviously lies almost exclusively on those States. The arms race between the most powerful nations and their allies is the prime mover that escalates the spiral of global armaments and arms expenditure.

So long as the political will on the part of the major military Powers is wanting, exercises such as the one recommended in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.16 may not only prove futile but also divert attention from the central task in the field of disarmament, namely, nuclear disarmament.

Mr. MIGLIORINI (Italy): My delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.29. However, I wish to place on record that we have certain reservations about the study on concepts of security. We shall inform the Secretary-General of our views regarding the study requested in that draft resolution.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to make a statement after the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.29, entitled "Study on concepts of security".

My delegation is not satisfied with a good part of the analysis and the recommendations of the study. I realize that its deficiencies are due largely to its insufficiently balanced membership, which was in no way the fault of the experts themselves or, for that matter, the United Nations Secretariat. The Group's Chairman thus had a particularly difficult task.

Yet, even if those difficulties are taken into account, the study covers the field of current security concepts very unevenly. If the security concept on which the Western military alliance is based is subject to a rather cursory treatment,

(Mr. Wegener, Federal
Republic of Germany)

that deficiency will, it is hoped, be remedied as soon as the companion United Nations study on the implications of deterrence is available in 1986.

But other security concepts are also explored in a less than balanced manner, and on the whole the study does not convey the impression that the underlying necessities and constraints of the nuclear age have been fully seized by the authors of the study. It is therefore important and helpful that the draft resolution open the way for Governments to give their full views on the study. My Government certainly intends to do so.

Notwithstanding its reservations on the present study, my delegation expresses its appreciation and thanks to the Chairman of the Group of Governmental Experts, Ambassador Anders Ferm of Sweden, for the seriousness of his approach and his competent and professional guidance.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): The United States has joined in the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.32 on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. We do not consider the adoption of this draft resolution as prejudging the ultimate decision of any State regarding adherence or ratification of that Convention, and the United States action in supporting this consensus is not indicative of any decision by the United States under its constitutional procedures regarding the Convention.

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to explain my country's position with regard to the decision on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.5, under agenda item 52, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

My delegation participated in the consensus on the premise of its constant position with regard to the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the world as a first step on the path to general and complete nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

However, had that draft resolution been put to the vote, my delegation would have had a different position, of which we have informed the Secretary-General as contained in his report (A/40/442/Add.1).

This position is that the international community has to oblige Israel to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and that Israel must accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

As for what the representative of the Zionist entity claims that it is necessary to follow the approach of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, we say that that Treaty has been signed by the States of the Latin American region without there being any occupation of the territories of certain countries of the region by another, as is the case with regard to the Israeli occupation authorities, and without violation of the rights of other peoples, as are violated the rights of the Arab Palestinian people by Israel.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): My delegation would like to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.29, which has just been adopted by consensus.

We have joined in the consensus in appreciation of the valuable work that has been done, as reflected in the Secretary-General's report. However, we have considerable reservations on some of the views and on the approaches to the concept of security as they appear in the report, and we wish to put this on record.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: Members will recall that I have already informed the Committee that, due to the urgency of the subject-matter involved, the Committee would proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60 at an early date. This has also been indicated in the informal working paper on the clusters of draft resolutions which was circulated yesterday.

(The Chairman)

I have now received a request that the Committee proceed to take action on this draft resolution at this stage. I presume the Committee agrees with this request, and I suggest we now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60. First, I shall call on those delegations wishing to make statements on the draft resolution.

Mr. van SCHAIK (Netherlands): Although my delegation has not been involved in the informal consultations on this draft resolution, we have been informed that at this stage a consensus cannot be reached.

My delegation would very much regret the Committee's not being able to reach consensus. We think the subject is of great importance, and we owe it to the First Committee's prestige and the importance of the subject to make a further effort to arrive at consensus.

So I wish, through you, Sir, to ask the sponsors of the draft resolution whether they would be prepared to consider postponing, until tomorrow morning, a decision on it, so as to enable you as Chairman of the Committee perhaps to play a mediation role with a view to ensuring that we could in fact reach consensus tomorrow.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would also like draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60 to be adopted by consensus, and we have no objection to deferring a decision on it.

However, I would refer to rule 78 of the rules of procedure, which gives the right to any delegation to request postponing a vote on any text for 24 hours. Should a new text be submitted tomorrow, then, of course, action on the draft resolution could be taken only after a lapse of 24 hours - that is, either Saturday or any later day.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Naturally, we are ready to take part in a decision on the existing text - and do so even tomorrow, if necessary. But if any other text is presented - or any amendment - on a question which we all understand affects primarily the two States referred to in the draft resolution, then, of course, the decision will have to be postponed until Saturday.

The CHAIRMAN: To come back to the suggestion made by the representative of the Netherlands, I am of course in the hands of the members of the Committee. Perhaps the time is now such that it may physically be good for us to postpone our work until the afternoon meeting, at 3 p.m., when we shall resume.

As to his suggestion that perhaps further consultations should be held in which I could play a mediation role, I can only say to him that in my capacity as Chairman I am of course always available to all delegations or groups of delegations to perform such a task. But the Chairman may assume that role only if it is indeed the wish of all the delegations concerned.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): I hope that I shall be interpreting the wish of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60 when I say that we should make every effort, as they have all done during the past two days, to achieve a consensus on this draft resolution.

Hence I am sure that all the sponsors would not object to our making an additional effort with a view to reaching a consensus. However, as you have just said, Mr. Chairman, there is very little time for us to do so, since action in the General Assembly should take place at least on Monday, 19 November. Therefore, if postponement is to be accepted, then it should not be until tomorrow morning but no later than at the end of this afternoon's meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to suggest to the Committee that we make use of the time available during the lunch interval and postpone taking any decision until I and other members can hold further consultations.

However, I wish to stress again that there are certain time constraints involved in whatever decision we take. There is the time constraint which as Chairman I am duty-bound to inform the Committee with regard to the mechanics of sending to the General Assembly whatever decision we take on that draft resolution. As the representative of the USSR pointed out, there are other time constraints.

Hence I propose that this afternoon we take a decision on when to consider draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60 - and, of course, we have just heard the view of one of its sponsors.

I shall leave it at that for now. I shall now adjourn the meeting, since it is nearly one o'clock. We shall resume our work this afternoon at 3 p.m., when we shall continue action on the draft resolutions in the clusters as indicated in the informal working paper.

If I hear no objection, I shall proceed accordingly.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.