

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



MAY 19 1987

FIRST COMMITTEE
34th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 12 November 1985
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

*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.34
12 November 1985
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 to 69 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. MIGLIORINI (Italy) On behalf of the delegations of Belgium, Canada, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of my own delegation, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.22 on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

The issue of the prevention of an arms race in outer space plays a crucial role in the debates of this Committee and of the Conference on Disarmament. It is also an important subject in the bilateral negotiations in Geneva. We believe that is rightly so, because arms control issues related to the military use of space have a very significant bearing on international stability and therefore a great importance for international peace and security.

We also reaffirm in this context our view that the exploration and use of outer space should be carried out for the benefit of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development.

The delegations sponsoring this draft resolution are convinced that space activities can make an important contribution to international peace and security, to arms control and disarmament. They also believe that questions concerning nuclear and space arms must be considered in their interrelationship in order to facilitate agreements that would really enhance strategic stability. They hope that recent developments at the negotiating table in Geneva have set the stage for a constructive discussion on specific issues and trust that progress will be forthcoming in spite of the complexity of the problems involved.

(Mr. Migliorini, Italy)

There seems to be no doubt that a great responsibility towards mankind as a whole falls on the two major space and nuclear Powers in the search for effective and verifiable agreements on the prevention of an arms race in space and its termination on earth, and that further efforts should be made in this direction.

(Mr. Migliorini, Italy)

That is why the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.22 believe that it would be appropriate for the General Assembly to express, at this particular juncture, its support for the agreed goals on space issues of the bilateral talks in Geneva and to emphasize the importance it attaches to early progress in those talks.

The General Assembly would play a constructive role were it to convey to the two leaders meeting in Geneva later this month the expectations of the international community for an early agreement in line with the objectives agreed upon in the bilateral communiqué of the foreign ministers of 8 January, that is, the prevention of an arms race in outer space and its termination on earth. We are therefore confident that draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.22 will meet with widespread support.

The relative emphasis that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.22 have placed on the bilateral talks should by no means be interpreted as detracting from the essential role the General Assembly and the Conference on Disarmament can and must play in identifying effective ways to prevent an arms race in outer space. On the contrary, our delegations are firmly convinced that the multilateral and the bilateral processes are mutually complementary, and that each can greatly help the constructive development of the other. We are convinced that the Conference on Disarmament, as the sole multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament, can make a major contribution in the consideration of issues related to the prevention of an arms race in outer space. In this spirit, the sponsors have welcomed the agreement reached this year on the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee to undertake substantive consideration of this question. In our view the Ad Hoc Committee should be re-established at the beginning of the session of the Conference on Disarmament in 1986, bearing in mind the terms of the agreement reached on this issue at the 1985 session and ensuring that all efforts are made to devise an adequate mandate that will allow for the continuation and intensification

(Mr. Migliorini, Italy)

of substantive work. We are convinced that the approach followed in 1985 was a constructive and realistic one that has yet to bear full fruit, and that the Ad Hoc Committee can make an important contribution to the solution of difficult questions concerning outer space.

Our delegations therefore intend to contribute actively to the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee and to its future activities through which it will fulfil the role that belongs to the Conference on Disarmament in preventing an arms race in outer space.

That is the background against which the sponsoring delegations would like the draft resolution to be viewed by other interested delegations. The draft resolution is not intended to conflict with other draft resolutions on this subject; rather, it is the expression of a sincere will to co-operate with a view to arriving at consensus formulations in a spirit of compromise and understanding. Our delegations have tried to identify the points on which controversy should not exist, and are fully prepared to consider positive suggestions by other delegations in a common search for ways to achieve progress in the field of arms control and disarmament.

I wish to conclude by expressing the most fervent hope that the efforts made by the sponsors and their intention to avoid controversy and promote co-operation and understanding will be favourably received, and that delegations will support draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.22. We are, at the same time, open to co-operative efforts by others aimed a single consensus resolution on the subject of preventing an arms race in outer space.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I wish to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.73, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty". The draft resolution is sponsored by New Zealand and Australia, in association with Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Kenya, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Samoa and Sweden.

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

The international community has been calling for an end to nuclear testing for many years. Over 20 years ago, the then three nuclear-weapon Powers agreed, in the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963, to stop their atmospheric testing. They also agreed to carry on negotiating to bring an end to all tests. That goal was reaffirmed in the NPT of 1968. Yet, 17 years after that reaffirmation, a comprehensive test-ban treaty has still not been achieved. International concern at this situation was given clear expression in the call issued by all the non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT earlier this year for the urgent negotiation and conclusion of a treaty banning all nuclear tests by all States in all environments for all time as a matter of the highest priority in the Conference on Disarmament.

That call issued by the Review Conference reflects the widely-held view that a nuclear test ban is an essential first step in stopping the arms race. A test ban would retard technical advances in nuclear weaponry and would restrict opportunities for the development of new and potentially more destabilizing weapons. It would limit the growth of the nuclear arsenals held by the present nuclear-weapon Powers. As such, it is an essential element in over-all efforts to reduce the number of nuclear weapons. If universally acceded to, it will help to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to countries that do not possess them at the moment. Above all, the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban would show more clearly than anything else could that the nuclear-weapon Powers are committed to ending the arms race and to reducing their own nuclear stockpiles, as well as to preventing other countries from acquiring nuclear weapons.

Given the importance of a comprehensive test ban, which all countries have acknowledged, it is disheartening to note that, for the past two years, the Conference on Disarmament has been unable even to agree on how to tackle the issue. The essence of the disagreement has been the difference of view between

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

those who argue that the Conference should begin negotiations on a treaty and those who argue that before negotiations can begin agreement must be reached on the essential questions of the scope of a test-ban treaty and its methods of verification. The draft resolution that New Zealand and the other sponsors have submitted attempts to resolve that problem. It calls upon the Conference on Disarmament to set up an Ad Hoc Committee at the beginning of its session next year to begin negotiations on a test ban in accordance with a detailed programme of work. That programme of work has already been put before the Conference this year. Central to it are the issues of scope, verification and compliance. In other words, we are proposing that the Conference should address these fundamental questions in the context of a clear commitment to begin negotiating a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The scope of a comprehensive test ban is one of the first issues that must be addressed. New Zealand and the other sponsors hold the view that, for a treaty to be effective, it must cover all nuclear explosions - that is, not only nuclear-weapon-test explosions, but also the so-called peaceful nuclear explosions, which are virtually indistinguishable in their technical aspects from a nuclear bomb. We are pleased, therefore, that the call issued by the Third Review Conference on the NPT applied to all nuclear-test explosions. We are also happy to note that the other two draft resolutions on this subject that have been submitted in the First Committee this year have also addressed the question of scope directly.

If a treaty is to be truly effective it must also have adequate verification provisions. States must be confident that any nuclear explosions carried out in contravention of a treaty will be detected. A number of countries already have a highly developed capacity in this field. But questions remain about whether it is possible to detect small nuclear explosions, which today can be of considerable military significance.

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

The risk of undetected tests must be weighed against the greater risk involved in the continuation of nuclear testing. But since the possibility exists that a test ban could be circumvented, it is important that the whole question of verification be thoroughly examined. That is what we have proposed in the programme of work contained in operative paragraph 4 of our resolution.

It is also the reason why we have recommended in operative paragraph 5 of our draft that the Conference on Disarmament should take immediate steps to establish, with the widest possible participation, a global seismic monitoring network to determine the capabilities of such a network for monitoring and verifying compliance with a comprehensive test ban treaty. In that task the Conference will be able to build on the valuable work undertaken by the Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events.

Nuclear testing has long been an issue of deep concern in New Zealand and other countries of the South Pacific because one of the nuclear Powers insists on testing its nuclear weapons in our part of the world. We recognize, however, that if this problem is ever to be finally resolved it will require a comprehensive treaty banning all nuclear explosions by all nuclear-weapon States. For that reason New Zealand and Australia, together with other countries of the South Pacific and from other regions of the world, have been consistent advocates of the urgent conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty.

To conclude, the draft we have put forward takes proper account of the strong call issued by the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty for the urgent negotiation and conclusion of a test ban. It sends a firm direction to the Conference on Disarmament to get on next year with practical work on a test ban and to do very much better than it has been able to do on this most urgent question in the past two years. We trust that this Committee will adopt the draft resolution with as large a majority as possible in order to lend clarity and authority to that message.

Mr. TONWE (Nigeria): I wish to introduce the draft resolution (A/C.1/40/L.54) on the United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament. The draft resolution is derived, in substance, from the provisions of resolution 39/63 B of 12 December 1984, adopted by consensus. Its co-sponsors are: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Greece, Indonesia, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Senegal, Somalia, Swaziland, Tunisia, Uganda, Venezuela, Zaire, Zimbabwe, and of course Nigeria.

As representatives will recall, the fellowship programme was established in 1978. The primary objective was to promote expertise in disarmament which would enable its beneficiaries to gain knowledge and competence that would enhance their ability to deal with disarmament questions. It is pertinent to note that the programme has generated continued interest among Member States, as demonstrated by the ever-larger number of nominations received each year. Of the 68 nominations in 1985, only 25 could be admitted. This was based on the number approved by the General Assembly in its decision contained in annex IV to document A/S-12/32, the Concluding Document of the twelfth special session. The limited number of fellowships has been the main reason why several Member States nominating fellows have not been satisfied.

It may be mentioned that the programme will have trained 155 government officials from 88 countries by the end of this year. Former fellows are now occupying responsible government positions in various countries. Many are with us here in the First Committee. That is an achievement for the Under-Secretary-General of the Department for Disarmament Affairs. We commend his positive role and his drive in the organization of the programme. We assure him of our continued co-operation as he accomplishes his tasks.

I express appreciation also to all those Governments that have contributed, in one way or another, to the success of the programme - and in particular all those

(Mr. Tonwe, Nigeria)

Governments that have invited the fellows to their various countries for study visits.

The text of the present draft resolution is identical in several respects with the resolution on the subject which was adopted by consensus in 1984. The preambular paragraphs are not altered. The contents of operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 derive from operative paragraph 3 (c) of resolution 39/63 B of 12 December 1984, adopted by consensus. The main purpose is to have advisory services and training courses, similar to those already implemented in the Commission on Human Rights and the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, designed to meet the increasing requirements of Member States. The costs to the Department would be very minimal since a substantial part would be borne by countries making requests. Similarly, the costs to receiving Governments should be manageable, as their contributions would be in their local currencies. That is clearly stated in the draft resolution. We envisage that the existing United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament and all the new programmes would be consolidated under the office of the Under-Secretary-General of the Department for Disarmament Affairs.

It is our hope that various Governments will find these advisory services and training courses beneficial, as is the case with the similar courses implemented in the Commission on Human Rights and the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. It is also our hope that in view of the significance of the proposals contained in the draft resolution, especially in regard to meeting the requirements of more Member States, this draft resolution will be adopted by consensus, as similar ones have been in previous years.

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/40/L.55 is the outcome of the recommendations of the Disarmament Commission at its 1985 substantive session, as contained in document A/40/42, paragraph 32, and its annex VII, which was adopted by consensus. The subject itself is derived from the Declaration of the 1980s as

(Mr. Tonwe, Nigeria)

the Second Disarmament Decade, annexed to General Assembly resolution 35/46 of 3 December 1980. The co-sponsors of the draft resolution are: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Cameroon, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Romania, Tunisia, Yugoslavia and of course Nigeria.

The preambular paragraphs of the present draft resolution are predominantly the same as those of the 1984 resolution. The only addition is the second, seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs, which, respectively, refer to the 1984 resolution on the subject; note the views and suggestions from Member States; and express appreciation of the report of the Disarmament Commission. The operative paragraphs also derive from the report of the Disarmament Commission on its 1985 substantive session.

(Mr. Tonwe, Nigeria)

Permit me to emphasize paragraph 10 of annex VII, which calls upon all States, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, to:

"(a) Reaffirm their commitment to the Declaration of the Second Disarmament Decade;

"(b) Reaffirm their commitment to the attainment of the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control;

"(c) Adopt concrete and practical measures for preventing the outbreak of war, in particular nuclear war;

"(d) Take appropriate steps to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race with a view to improving the international climate as well as enhancing the efficacy of disarmament negotiations;

"(e) Exert greater effort in the implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign." (A/40/42, annex VII, para. 10)

We hope that this draft resolution will also be adopted without a vote.

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): On behalf of the sponsors, I wish to introduce the following draft resolutions: "Nuclear weapons in all aspects" (A/C.1/40/L.13); "Prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon" (A/C.1/40/L.47); and "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war" (A/C.1/40/L.7).

These three draft resolutions share a common objective, namely, to help stave off the danger of nuclear war, stop the nuclear-arms race and proceed to disarmament. They are designed to bring about concrete and realistic measures that could be speedily implemented. The call for such measures has been dominant in the debate of the Committee - a call which today is raised all over the world. In their declaration adopted in Sofia on 23 October 1985, the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty submitted quite a number of proposals towards this end; this declaration is contained in document A/C.1/40/7.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

Permit me now to make a few remarks on these draft resolutions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.13, on nuclear weapons in all aspects, is aimed, in the first place, to get off the ground the negotiations on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, which are long overdue in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. The relevant call is made in paragraph 1. With that call we strongly oppose all attempts to bury that significant agenda item.

The preamble of the draft resolution substantiates in detail the need for and the urgency of multilateral negotiations. It refers, among other things, to the relevant obligation contained in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament - a document which, and this should be recalled time and again, was adopted by consensus. Specific reference is also made to the Delhi Declaration of 28 January 1985.

In addition, may I quote the following from the final document of the recent Luanda Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned States:

"Bilateral negotiations should not in any way diminish the urgent need to initiate multilateral negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament and on the prevention of an arms race in outer space."

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.13 welcomes the bilateral negotiations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, as agreed on 8 January last. There is absolutely no doubt about their crucial importance for preventing an arms race in outer space and terminating it on Earth. However, this does not mean that the other States should remain passive. Quite on the contrary, bilateral and multilateral negotiations should be mutually complementary and beneficial. May I add that this conclusion is implicitly recognized also in the aforementioned agreement of 8 January, as follows:

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

"Noting the belief expressed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America that ultimately their negotiations, just as efforts in general to limit and reduce arms, should lead to the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere."

Given the rules of logic, it follows that the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, where all the nuclear-weapon Powers are represented, must undertake great efforts in making a distinctive contribution towards halting the nuclear-arms race and towards nuclear disarmament. Suitable and concrete proposals are on the table in Geneva.

Let me, finally, mention that the German Democratic Republic will endorse draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.65, initiated by Argentina. Both draft resolutions have the same thrust and complement each other in major aspects of substance.

The second draft resolution, on the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon, is contained in document A/C.1/40/L.47. It is basically identical with the resolution on the same subject adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session. In paragraph 1 the Geneva Conference on Disarmament is again requested to start negotiations with a view to concluding a convention on the prohibition of the neutron weapons

"as an organic element of negotiations, as envisaged in paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly".

In our view, the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon is inseparably linked with the cessation of the nuclear-arms race in general. This would be an effective step aimed specifically against the qualitative refinement of nuclear weapons, which could well blaze a trail. The prohibition would relate to a weapon which, if planned deployments in a number of countries should materialize, would be suited to lower the nuclear threshold and increase the danger of nuclear war. The

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic
Republic)

call for a prohibition of the neutron weapon in terms of an agreement is not selectively directed against one or another State. Rather, all States, and especially the nuclear-weapon States, are called upon to banish the neutron weapon from military arsenals.

The third draft resolution, regarding the non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war, is contained in document A/C.1/40/L.7. Paragraph 2 expresses the hope that all nuclear-weapon States will pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, while in paragraph 1 reference is made to the example of the Soviet Union and China which have already taken such a significant step.

Its preamble reaffirms, among other things, the conviction that removing the threat of a world war - a nuclear war - is the most acute and urgent task of the present time. It also reaffirms that the renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons is a most important and urgent measure for the prevention of nuclear war.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

The sponsors of the draft resolution are agreed that the danger of nuclear war can be removed once and for all only if and when nuclear weapons themselves are removed. They believe, however, that it is imperative, and indeed possible, to take early and effective measures to lessen considerably this danger and, moreover, to stimulate the disarmament process. Since there are already bans on the use of various types of weapons, why should that not be possible for the most menacing of all weapons of mass destruction which threaten the very survival of the human race?

We hope that with the adoption of the draft resolution just introduced the Committee will help counter the danger of nuclear war through specific action.

Mr. NOWORYTA (Poland): I have the honour to introduce under agenda item 57, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", and agenda item 145, "International co-operation in the peaceful exploitation of outer space under conditions of its non-militarization", the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/40/L.45.

I believe that it is fairly obvious to any objective observer of this year's disarmament debate in the Committee that the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space is drawing the particular attention of and causing extreme concern to Member States.

We hope that this question will occupy top place on the agenda of the forthcoming Soviet-American summit in Geneva. Yet at the same time we believe that it is not the concern solely of the two great Powers. No country on Earth should be indifferent to it. The consequences of yet another round in the arms race, including militarization of outer space, would increase the threat to all and ultimately add to the economic problems of all. Hence all have to contribute to averting once and for all the danger of death and destruction descending on our planet from outer space.

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

Of singular importance in enhancing our resolve to promote efforts in that direction would be our becoming fully cognizant of what is actually at stake.

Concretizing the idea put forward by General Wojciech Jaruzelski in his address before the General Assembly on 27 September, draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.45 is my country's contribution to that task.

It is motivated by our serious concern over the real prospect of outer space becoming an arena of military confrontation and our deep commitment to the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes.

It would also be a worthy addition to the series of expert studies conducted under the auspices of the Secretary-General on Poland's initiative, namely, that of 1962 concerning the economic and social consequences of disarmament, that of 1966 on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and that of 1968 on the possible use of chemical and bacteriological means of warfare.

While we of course realize that the core of the problem would have to be addressed urgently through negotiations, we believe that the study we are proposing would in no way delay or impede such negotiations, but quite to the contrary, as a measure undertaken in parallel, it could well provide them both with informative data and with a further stimulus.

We are aware that research is already being conducted in the broad area in question. Yet we think that without in any way diminishing or undercutting the value of the study already undertaken by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), whose goal according to the report of the Director of UNIDIR is

"to identify the different issues relating to disarmament in outer space as well as the possibilities for peaceful use in new space technologies".

(A/40/725, para. 50),

the study we are proposing would, because of its different scope and main line of interest, broaden, deepen and enrich our knowledge of all the issues involved.

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

Similarly, we fully share the opinion of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies

"that the purposes of studies, namely, to assist in ongoing negotiations, to identify possible new areas of negotiation, and to promote public awareness of the problems involved in the arms race and disarmament, remained valid within the overall objective of enhancing the role of the United Nations in disarmament." (A/40/744, para. 5)

The purposes of the study proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.45 are virtually identical with the three purposes mentioned by the Advisory Board, and their implementation would certainly go quite a distance towards enhancing the role of the United Nations in disarmament.

Turning now to the text of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.45, the preamble is virtually self-explanatory and I do not think it needs much introduction. Among other things, it speaks about the concern over the danger posed to all mankind were the arms race to be extended into outer space and the overriding objective of preventing the militarization of outer space and brings into play the proposal presented in this respect to the General Assembly by Member States.

As for the operative part, paragraph 1, mandating the study, is worded in a completely neutral way. We give no directions, guidelines or hints. It would be entirely up to the consultant experts mentioned in paragraph 2 to decide what to include in the study and what conclusions, observations and recommendations to draw.

Paragraph 2 intends also to strengthen to the maximum the objective and independent character of the study by recommending to the Secretary-General that he employ "eminent consultant experts of various nationalities". We also recommend that the study be prepared on the basis of accessible material - and I would certainly include the UNIDIR study, when finished, in that category - having also in mind the financial implications. The rest of the paragraph is modelled after

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

operative paragraph 2 of resolution 2454 A (XXIII) on the study on possible use of chemical and bacteriological weapons in warfare.

Likewise, paragraph 3 uses wording similar to that of paragraph 3 of the same resolution, and its intention is to give the experts access to the widest possible range of pertinent information.

Paragraph 4 sets a time frame for the study. While we would most certainly like to see it completed as soon as possible, we believe that the experts should be allowed sufficient time to discharge their task. That is why we chose a nominal two-year period, which - as the Secretariat tells us - in terms of actual time available would in fact be one of 15 to 16 months.

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

The date of 1 July 1987 has been chosen to allow the Conference on Disarmament - one of the chief recipients of the study - to consider it during its summer session of 1987 and, it is hoped, offer its comments on it to the General Assembly at its forty-second session. The transmittal to the Security Council has been requested because of the importance of the subject matter and also because of the competence, yet virtually untried, of the Council in disarmament matters.

Paragraph 5, using again the pattern of resolutions 2152 A (XXI) and 2454 A (XXIII) and to a large extent also that of resolution 37/95, would give the study all the publicity it deserves.

We have already received some very interesting and useful comments and suggestions concerning draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.45. For technical reasons we have been able to include only one of them in this draft resolution before we had to submit the text to meet the deadline. The remaining suggestions are still being actively considered - as would be any new ones - with openness and accommodation foremost in our minds. We shall be acting in the spirit of genuine co-operation and compromise, guided by our common objective of promoting tangible progress in disarmament and arms control.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): The purpose of this brief intervention is to speak in support of the Permanent Representative of New Zealand, Mr. McDowell, who a short time ago this morning introduced draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.73, of which Australia is privileged to be a sponsor.

The Australian Government is convinced that an end to all nuclear testing would constitute a nuclear arms control measure of great importance.

Since the first revelation of the awful power of nuclear explosions the world community has sought to control the spread of nuclear weapons and to make available the benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. That effort has contained those two distinct but strongly related parts. As a result we have a partial

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

nuclear test ban régime and a non-proliferation régime. But what is required, in order to see to it that an end to all nuclear testing plays its correct part in containing the nuclear arms race and in preventing any further spread of nuclear weapons, is a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty banning all nuclear tests, by all States, in all environments, for all time.

It is sometimes argued that such a comprehensive treaty can be brought into existence only after distinct progress has been made towards reducing existing nuclear-weapon systems. My Government has doubts about that view, but what we are certain about is that the work towards making such a treaty available should proceed now, concurrently with negotiations on existing nuclear-weapon systems.

It is also sometimes suggested that a comprehensive test-ban treaty cannot be adequately verified. Again, my Government is aware of this argument and of the differences of opinion on the issue but, in this case too, we believe that work on the verification issue should proceed now. There should be no further delay.

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/40/L.73 has, as its core, a specific practical proposal for such work to be carried out in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva starting at the beginning of its session in 1986. Operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution asks that this be done and proposes a relevant programme of work. This is the work that must be done in order to answer the genuinely felt and practical problems involved in a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have taken this stand because practical work was not started in the Conference on Disarmament during the last two years and in the light of the Final Declaration of the Third Review Conference of Parties to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation. The relevant part of the Declaration of that Conference is noted in the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Some States entered a reservation to that part of the Declaration, but in the view of my delegation it is significant that even in that reservation they expressed their commitment "to the goal of an effectively verifiable comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty". We must resume work towards that goal now.

It is encouraging too that another nuclear-weapon State - a State not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, that is, China - has indicated that, if practical work of the kind we envisage were to be started in Geneva, then it would take part in that work.

This is our appeal: it is for the practical work on a comprehensive test ban to be started at the beginning of 1986 in Geneva. We are all committed to the goal of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. There are differences of view with regard to verification and some other aspects of such a treaty. But what is required is that the work - negotiations - should be started now, and I submit to this Committee that a single and clear voice of the whole Assembly in support of the approach outlined in this draft resolution would represent a compelling step towards ensuring that that work starts next year.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): I have the honour to introduce in the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.62, entitled "Verification in all its aspects". It is sponsored by ten other Member States, Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Costa Rica, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

This is a new draft resolution but certainly not a new subject of interest to Member States. At the first special session devoted to disarmament, in 1978, the General Assembly agreed by consensus in paragraph 91 of the Final Document that:

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

"In order to facilitate the conclusion and effective implementation of disarmament agreements and to create confidence, States should accept appropriate provisions for verification in such agreements."

(resolution S-10/2, para. 91)

In paragraph 92 of the Final Document, the General Assembly agreed that:

"In the context of international disarmament negotiations, the problem of verification should be further examined and adequate methods and procedures in this field be considered." (ibid., para. 92)

Following the adoption of the Final Document, the Canadian Government gave very serious thought to this aspect of the consensus document. Our review of twenty years of arms control and disarmament negotiations confirmed that verification was a central problem which was often misunderstood.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

At the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in 1982, the former Prime Minister of Canada expressed the view that the international community should address itself to verification as one of the most significant factors in disarmament negotiations in the 1980s. As he pointed out at the time, the work on verification should prepare the way for arms control agreements that still lay ahead.

In 1983 the Government gave practical expression to those views when it announced the establishment of a verification research programme with an annual budget of \$1 million. I shall not on this occasion outline the broad range of activities which we have already undertaken within the context of that programme. The essential point here is that efforts must be made, and are being made, to try to come to grips in very practical ways with the essential reality of the situation today, which is the continuing sense of mistrust.

It is clear that there is a need for an improved climate of confidence, for concrete disarmament commitments and respect for them. The Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, stated to the Canadian Consultative Group on Disarmament and Arms Control just a few days ago:

"Without the knowledge that one's partners in an arms control agreement are actually honouring their obligations, the whole purpose of the agreement and, by extension, the arms control process itself, is called into dispute. Verification is not an end in itself. Verification enhances the confidence of the parties. In so doing it creates a sense of predictability, and predictability is one of the most important outcomes of effective arms control."

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

It is obvious that verification provisions will always have to be tailored to the purposes, scope and nature of any specific agreement to which they apply. That was recognized in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and it is recognized in our draft resolution. We believe, however, that work should and can be done in advance on certain principles, procedures and techniques. As the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament itself has demonstrated, there are a number of those basic principles which can be easily identified and which are included in our draft. They are contained in paragraphs 31 and 92 of the Final Document and I mention as examples, first, that verification measures must be satisfactory to all the parties concerned; secondly, that verification methods and procedures must be non-discriminatory and must not unduly interfere with the internal affairs of other States or jeopardize their economic and social development; thirdly, that the form and modalities of verification should be determined by the purposes, scope and nature of the specific agreement concerned; and, fourthly, that the parties should participate in the verification process either directly or through the United Nations system.

Other principles which would apply generally to various agreements can undoubtedly be brought together to serve as guidelines in specific negotiations.

As for procedures and techniques, we have been working on those in various areas in advance of a specific agreement, not only in the Conference on Disarmament but also on our own. To mention only a few examples of this Canadian activity there are, first, the seismic data exchange within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament; secondly, a manual of procedures for investigating allegations of the use of chemical weapons; thirdly, the technique of space-to-space remote sensing by satellites; and, fourthly, the technique of ground-to-space remote sensing by instruments of astronomy.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

The proposal made by France at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1978, concerning an international satellite monitoring agency, which most Members of the United Nations agreed should be studied further, is another example of the conceptual development of verification techniques in advance of specific agreements.

The scope of our draft includes the question of the role of the United Nations in verification, which requires some examination by the United Nations itself since all Member States have an interest in this aspect of the subject. This, I might add, is a subject in which Canadians concerned with questions of arms control and disarmament expressed considerable interest at the recent meeting that reviewed the activities of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

We believe that our proposal would enable some useful groundwork to be initiated on this subject. Such work could be accomplished without detracting from the work being done on other arms control and disarmament issues in any of the multilateral forums involved. The proposal will permit Member States to make their views and suggestions known to the Secretary-General and to relate them to very specific areas of arms control and disarmament which might be of concern to them. Those could include the verification of a comprehensive test ban, an agreement on chemical weapons, an arms control régime in outer space, an agreement relating to conventional weapons or any other specific issue.

Canada hopes this draft resolution will be carefully and sympathetically considered by all members of this Committee and that it will enjoy the broad support which we believe this subject deserves.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from French): I have asked to speak in order to introduce the draft resolution on Disarmament Week (A/C.1/40/L.20) which is being considered under item 65 (i) of our agenda. The sponsors are Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mozambique, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam and my own country.

Seven years ago the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed the week beginning 24 October - the anniversary of the foundation of the United Nations - a week for the promotion of the goals of disarmament. Since then that week, which is now usually called "Disarmament Week", has become an integral part of world-wide efforts to alert and mobilize world public opinion in order to halt and reverse the arms race, more particularly the nuclear-arms race, and to prevent the mounting danger of nuclear war. Disarmament Week is now observed throughout the world and has given rise to some very important demonstrations and ceremonies of various kinds in a number of countries, as well as in the United Nations.

The report of the Secretary-General (A/40/552) and the statements made at the solemn annual meeting devoted to Disarmament Week two weeks ago are eloquent testimony to that fact.

The Mongolian delegation, like many others, is pleased that the Nobel Peace Prize was recently awarded to the International Association of Physicians Against Nuclear War. That is a clear example of the acknowledgement and high esteem of the increasing role played by non-governmental organizations in strengthening peace.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

We should like to pay a tribute to the work of numerous non-governmental international and national organizations, particularly the World Peace Council, with headquarters in Helsinki, in the promotion of disarmament and peace. It is our hope that the United Nations will continue to act as a useful instrument for the mobilization of public opinion in order to consolidate peace and bring about disarmament and to make even closer in the future the close relations which exist with the principal organizations representing public opinion. This is all the more important since 1986 has been proclaimed the International Year of Peace.

The draft resolution which we have submitted basically restates last year's resolution and earlier resolutions. I shall therefore refer only briefly to certain new provisions and highlight the principal points which have been introduced into it.

While expressing grave concern over the escalating arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race, the draft resolution stresses the vital importance of eliminating the threat of a nuclear war, ending the nuclear-arms race and bringing about disarmament for the maintenance of world peace. It also stresses the important role of the mass media in acquainting the world public with the aims of Disarmament Week and measures undertaken within its framework, while at the same time inviting the Secretary-General to use the United Nations mass media as widely as possible to promote better understanding among the world public of disarmament problems and the objectives of Disarmament Week.

The draft resolution expresses appreciation to all States and international and national governmental and non-governmental organizations for holding the 1985 Disarmament Week in close connection with the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War, the foundation of the United

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

Nations and International Youth Year. It invites all States and international non-governmental organizations, and the relevant specialized agencies of the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency, within their areas of competence, to take an active part in Disarmament Week, to intensify their efforts towards disarmament and to report to the Secretary-General accordingly.

The draft resolution recommends that all States observe Disarmament Week in 1986 in close connection with events organized in connection with the International Year of Peace. It requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its forty-first session a report on the implementation of the provisions of the present resolution.

In conclusion, it is my hope that draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.20 will, like its predecessors, find broad support among the members of the First Committee.

Mr. de KEMOULARIA (France) (interpretation from French): I have the honour to present to the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.69, which deals with the relationship between disarmament and development. This draft resolution is sponsored by the following delegations: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Gabon, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Italy, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

The purpose of our joint initiative is to lead to the implementation of resolution 39/160, which was adopted last year by consensus. By that resolution, the General Assembly decided to convene an International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, defined the purposes of the

(Mr. de Kemoullaria, France)

Conference and set up a Preparatory Committee to formulate and submit to the General Assembly at its fortieth session recommendations as to the provisional agenda, procedure, place, date and duration of the Conference.

The Preparatory Committee met in New York from 29 July to 9 August and complied with its mandate most satisfactorily. I should like here to pay a tribute to the remarkable manner in which its Chairman, Ambassador Dubey, conducted the work of that Committee and to the spirit of understanding and co-operation shown by participating delegations.

The report of that Committee, presented on 8 November by Ambassador Dubey, contains a double series of recommendations. The first concerns the points specifically addressed to the Preparatory Committee under the terms of resolution 39/160.

The draft agenda for the Conference follows, as far as the basic questions are concerned, the programme set out in the resolution: review of the relationship between disarmament and development in all its aspects and dimensions; examination of the implications of military expenditure for the world economy, in particular for the developing countries; and consideration of ways and means of releasing additional resources, through disarmament measures, for development purposes, in particular in favour of developing countries.

As for the site of the Conference, the recommendation of Paris met the intentions expressed by the French authorities and formally confirmed by the Foreign Minister of my country, who renewed to the General Assembly in September his offer to host the Conference in Paris. The Conference would meet for three weeks in June or July 1986. Since then the French authorities have given their agreement to its being held from 15 July to 2 August.

(Mr. de Kemoularia, France)

Finally, the provisions relating to procedure and participation are in keeping with the practice generally followed in international conferences meeting under the auspices of the United Nations. While thus fulfilling the mandate entrusted to it, the Preparatory Committee felt it necessary to broaden the scope of the recommendations by holding additional sessions devoted to consideration of the substantive questions included in the agenda of the Conference. In view of the scope and complexity of those questions, it was felt that a second session of the Preparatory Committee, open to all Member States, should be devoted to them and that, if necessary, a third session should be held.

On the other hand, in order to contribute to the consideration of substantive questions by the Preparatory Committee and later by the Conference, other recommendations were made concerning in the preparation of documents and the convening of a panel of eminent personalities qualified in the field of disarmament and development. The draft resolution being submitted to the First Committee thus faithfully reflects the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee, and its provisions in no way prejudge the future orientation of its work. It seeks merely in its proposed agenda to confirm the purposes of the Conference, while establishing the modalities felt to be the most appropriate for achieving the desired goal.

The purpose of the draft resolution is therefore at once modest and ambitious. It entails undertaking on the political level the multilateral consideration of the relationship between disarmament and development proposed two years ago by the President of France. We are aware, of course, of the difficulties of that undertaking. We realize that the present progress in efforts aimed at the reduction of armaments prevents us from expecting any immediate results. Nevertheless, we feel it necessary to carry out actions designed to give effect to relationship between disarmament and development. The consensus adoption of the two resolutions that resulted from our earlier initiatives in 1983 and 1984 and

(Mr. de Kemoularia, France)

the work of the Preparatory Committee evidence a spirit of co-operation that should be reaffirmed in the context of the more complex tasks to be undertaken next year and should enable us to arrive at conclusions acceptable to all and give more concrete expression to the relationship between disarmament and development. Implementation of the draft resolution will contribute not only to economic and social progress, especially in the developing countries, but will also reflect the interdependence of interests and joint solidarity for the benefit of all.

The sponsors of the draft resolution sincerely hope that the broad support given the initiative on disarmament and development at the Committee's two previous sessions will once again be expressed in the form of a consensus.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I have the honour to introduce, on behalf of the delegations of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.52, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Studies".

Operative paragraph 1 of that draft resolution reaffirms the value of United Nations studies, prepared with the assistance of governmental or consultant experts, as a useful means by which important issues in the field of arms limitation and disarmament can be addressed in a comprehensive and detailed manner. The Committee has before it several draft resolutions which underline the useful contribution that particular United Nations studies can make or are making by broadening understanding and discussion of complex disarmament issues. Since the system of United Nations studies was initiated, a considerable amount of experience has been accumulated in their operation. In the light of the consultations that my delegation has had with others it would seem an appropriate moment to take stock of the experience so far and to consider what lessons can be drawn from it in order to make the system of United Nations studies more fruitful

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

still. As the representative of Finland pointed out in his statement on 23 October, there is room for improving and refining the way in which studies are prepared.

Of course, each study is different, both in its subject matter and in the procedural problems it poses, and it must be for each group of experts to decide precisely how it tackles the task entrusted to it. Nevertheless, it would seem desirable to consider to what extent the experience that has been gained so far is generally applicable in order to assist in obtaining the best possible results in particular cases.

Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution invites Member States to communicate to the Secretary-General by 1 April 1986 their views and proposals on how the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament studies can be further improved. Operative paragraphs 3 and 4 request the Secretary-General to transmit the replies both to the General Assembly at its forty-first session and to the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, with an invitation to the latter to prepare a comprehensive report on these matters.

We are fortunate to have a very distinguished Advisory Board, which earlier this year began a timely review of the whole question of disarmament studies. We believe that the Board's discussion would benefit from the expression of views and comments from Member States about the system. The draft resolution is intended to give an impetus to the Board's deliberations. Its report, together with the compilation of the views of Member States, would stimulate broader discussion in the General Assembly. In the view of my delegation, such a discussion can only be helpful to the cause of United Nations disarmament studies and to the cause of disarmament they are designed to further, which is a subject to which we attach great importance.

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize that our intention in bringing forward this draft resolution is to enhance still further the value which we all derive from United Nations studies in the field of arms control and disarmament. We believe that this would be of advantage to all the countries represented in this Committee. We hope therefore that the draft resolution I have just introduced can be adopted without a vote.

Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): In this statement I shall be introducing the draft resolution in document A/C.1/40/L.60. Its sponsors had both general and particular grounds in mind when they drafted this text. I shall mention only the most salient ones.

First, the acceleration of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, increasingly threatens international security as well as the security of each particular country.

Secondly, one of the important lessons of the history of the 40 years of the existence of the United Nations is that the United Nations must be used as the best venue for unifying the efforts to achieve disarmament. The United Nations remains the best framework in which to obtain disarmament and higher levels of international security, through negotiations.

Thirdly, outstanding issues of our time can be solved only through dialogue and co-operation between States, and negotiations are the only answer to the challenges we are confronted with. All countries are entitled to participate in negotiations and to make a contribution.

Finally, the bilateral and multilateral negotiations should be complementary.

In working out this draft resolution, we also took account of the fact that there has been no agreement on a single disarmament measure for years. That is why the international community welcomed the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to start negotiations on nuclear and space weapons. More than 11 months have passed since then, and during that time attempts have been made to identify the areas of possible agreement. Precisely because exceptionally complex issues are involved, the only way to solve them is to persist in dialogue.

For those reasons, exceptional importance is attached to the forthcoming meeting of the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is hoped that their talks will give adequate impetus to a new, substantial phase in bilateral

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

negotiations. Issues important to all are going to be discussed in those talks. It is expected that they will present an opportunity for the expression of a readiness to halt the arms race and to launch the disarmament process, in accordance with the vital interests of the international community as a whole.

Therefore, as I indicated at the beginning of this statement, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60, on the bilateral nuclear arms negotiations, on behalf of the following sponsors: Algeria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Yemen, Zimbabwe and my own country, Yugoslavia.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

The sponsors have been guided by a genuine desire to express their support for the forthcoming meeting between the two leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union and for the negotiations between the two countries on space and nuclear weapons. They have elaborated a clear and realistic draft resolution in their wish to reflect the essence of the expectations of the General Assembly from the bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union as well as from the forthcoming summit meeting.

We have been guided also by the desire to help in finding a way out of the current impasse in the negotiations, in preventing a new phase in the nuclear-arms race, in banning the deployment of weapons in outer space and in initiating concrete disarmament measures. The sponsors felt that it was necessary that the General Assembly expressed its opinion on these issues.

Finally, some members of the Assembly may have difficulties with certain formulations in the draft resolution. However, the sponsors earnestly hope that the draft resolution will achieve sufficient understanding to be adopted by consensus, which it deserves.

The CHAIRMAN: At our meeting yesterday I informed the Committee that it was my intention to bring to the Committee's attention the draft resolutions to be included in cluster 2. Following discussions with the other officers of the Committee, I am now in the happy position of being able to announce the draft resolutions to be included not only in cluster 2, but also in cluster 3.

Since it will be my intention, in so far as possible, to move from one cluster to another in sequence, at the conclusion of action on each cluster, I thought this advance notice would facilitate the work of delegations in carrying out the necessary consultations and in seeking instructions from their respective capitals.

(The Chairman)

I should like also to inform members that, in keeping with my announcement yesterday, a comprehensive list of all the clusters will be circulated in the Committee tomorrow. On that occasion I shall try to give the Committee some further explanations and guidelines concerning the clusters and the period which is to be devoted to taking action on the draft resolutions on disarmament as a whole.

I shall now read out the draft resolutions in clusters 2 and 3:

Cluster 2: Draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/40/L.2/Rev.2, A/C.1/40/L.48, A/C.1/40/L.51, A/C.1/40/L.53 and A/C.1/40/L.57.

Cluster 3: Draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/40/L.15, A/C.1/40/L.24 and A/C.1/40/L.31.

May I take it that the Committee agrees with the procedures I have just outlined?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Committee Secretary.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to inform the Committee of some additional sponsors to the following draft resolutions:

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.8: Rwanda;

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.12: Ivory Coast;

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.16: Uruguay;

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.17: Togo;

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18: Ecuador;

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.19: Togo;

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.24: Greece;

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.27: Japan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.28: Cameroon;

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.30: Cameroon, Cuba and Greece;

(Mr. Kheradi)

- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.31: Spain;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.32: Ecuador;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.46: Libyan Arab Jamahiriya;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54: Ecuador, Greece, Swaziland and Zimbabwe;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.57: Swaziland;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.59: Cameroon;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.60: Ecuador and Zimbabwe;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.62: New Zealand;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.63: Djibouti and Saudi Arabia;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.64: Greece and United Republic of Tanzania;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.65: Viet Nam;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.67: Mongolia and Swaziland;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.69: Swaziland and Uruguay;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.70: Fiji;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.71: New Zealand;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.72: Canada, Djibouti and Japan;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.73: Kenya.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.