



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 41st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

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

*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.

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will take decisions on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 11 in the informal paper that has been distributed to the Committee, namely draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.5, L.34, L.36/Rev.1 and L.49. It is my intention that at this meeting the Committee will consider also the draft resolutions listed under cluster 2 - that is, draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.10 and L.73/Rev.1.

At this afternoon's meeting we shall, I hope, come to cluster 10 and a number of remaining draft resolutions such as L.37, listed under cluster 4, and if possible we shall take action on a number of drafts listed under cluster 12.

Before proceeding to take action on draft resolutions, including those in the first cluster, it is my intention to call upon those delegations that wish to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): The sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.53 and L.13 have conducted consultations aimed at submitting a single draft resolution on the question of the review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

I am pleased to inform the Committee that the consultations have been concluded successfully. May I be permitted, therefore, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.53/Rev.1. The text has been amended as follows.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

The following new sixth preambular paragraph has been inserted:

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

Secondly, the previous seventh preambular paragraph has been reworded to read as follows:

"Stressing once again that the active participation of Member States in effective disarmament negotiations is necessary for discharging their responsibility to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, that all States have the right to contribute to efforts in the field of disarmament, that it is more than ever imperative in the present circumstances to give a new impetus to negotiations on disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, at all levels and to achieve genuine progress in the immediate future, and that all States should refrain from any actions which have or may have negative effects on the outcome of disarmament negotiations,"

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

Mr. KAHN (German Democratic Republic): Now that the representative of Yugoslavia has introduced draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.53/Rev.1, my delegation would like to state that it does not insist on a vote on its draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.13.

Our thanks go to all sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.53, and in particular to Yugoslavia, for their willingness to combine the two drafts and for their constructive co-operation in that endeavour. By merging draft resolution L.13 and L.53, their sponsors have responded to the appeal to reduce the number of draft resolutions at the present session. This is possible if all concerned pursue the same objective and are guided by common sense and realism.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements or comments on draft resolutions listed in cluster 11.

Mrs. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to refer to the draft resolutions on the prevention of nuclear war, which we are now considering in cluster 11.

The stage has already been set for world war; the main protagonists are already known, as indeed are those who are selling the tickets. For the time being, we are observing the show from a distance; but if a nuclear war breaks out, we would all be annihilated. That is why the prevention of nuclear war is everyone's business and that the matter is the priority item in this Committee.

All countries, rich and poor, of the East, West, North and South are watching to see how the situation is developing and also what steps are being taken by the main protagonists, the main actors, to avoid a world catastrophe.

The draft resolutions before us on the prevention of nuclear war recognize the urgent need to define measures with that goal in view and the possibility that the resolutions of the General Assembly, going beyond recommendations, might have a

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

positive effect on disarmament and lead to the conclusion of specific agreements on disarmament.

Hence Colombia has co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.34, which in paragraphs 2 and 3:

"Reiterates its conviction that, in view of the urgency of this matter and the inadequacy or insufficiency of existing measures, it is necessary to devise suitable steps to expedite effective action for the prevention of nuclear war".

and

"Again requests the Conference on Disarmament to undertake, as a matter of the highest priority, negotiations with a view to achieving agreement on appropriate and practical measures which could be negotiated and adopted individually for the prevention of nuclear war and to establish for that purpose an ad hoc committee on the subject at the beginning of its 1987 session".

As to the intent in draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.5 that we accept as a guarantee a declaration not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, we cannot see that confidence can rest in proposals that would limit solely to the nuclear field the scope of a fundamental Charter stipulation which is so frequently violated today, that is, the non-use of force. We consider it important to reach a consensus on guaranteeing the security needs of the world in general through effective disarmament measures and not simply by adopting proposals that would only bring the process of disarmament down to the level of more declaratory intentions. On the contrary, it is necessary to continue adopting resolutions on nuclear disarmament, the need for which is recognized by everyone. However these will not be productive if they do not lead to effective disarmament measures.

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

The United Nations Charter condemns not only nuclear war; it condemns all wars, whatever kind of weapons are involved. For that reason, the idea of not being the first to use nuclear weapons as it appears in this draft resolution simply weakens the prohibition of the use of force as defined in the Charter. Also, it would not effect nuclear arsenals, the inherent threat of which would persist. Instead of promoting their total elimination, it retains the military option of the nuclear-weapon States and the potential to threaten to use them.

With those comments, we wish to indicate our support for and indeed co-sponsorship of draft resolution L.34, and our abstention in the vote on L.5.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes before the voting on all draft resolutions in cluster 11.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The title and the content of the cluster of draft resolutions we are now considering speaks for itself. All these draft resolutions - A/C.1/41/L.5, L.34, L.36/Rev.1 and L.49 - are replete with warranted alarm about nuclear armaments and have a unity of purpose on the urgent need for action to save civilization on Earth and to get rid of the nuclear threat from the life of society. We highly commend this position, since the turn of events in the world is making it even more urgent for political will to be evidenced and for decisive and specific steps to be taken to curb the nuclear-arms race and prevent nuclear war.

In connection with the adoption of draft resolutions on various aspects of nuclear disarmament, many delegations pointed out the significance of the Reykjavik meeting and the current situation on American-Soviet negotiations on space nuclear weapons. In this regard we wish to emphasize that the Soviet leadership is energetically resolved to do everything it possibly can to ensure that by the beginning of the next century peace triumphs without nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Issraelyan, Union of Soviet
Socialist Republics)

The platform of interrelated proposals we set forth in Reykjavik - proposals that were carefully balanced to take account of the interests of those participating in the talks themselves and the entire community of nations - has taken the concrete form of a new approach, the need for which is dictated by the realities of the nuclear missile age.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

Accord has been virtually reached on some of the major problems in world politics. Unfortunately, it has been impossible to embody this in binding agreements, owing to the aspiration of the United States to carry out its "star wars" programme and thus to create a race in new forms of weapons.

Reykjavik resulted in a qualitatively new international situation, where nuclear disarmament issues have been raised to a higher level; descending from that level is unacceptable and, indeed, inadmissible. We should not miss the opportunity that has been identified to settle questions of war and peace in the interest of mankind.

In our view, the draft resolutions the Committee is considering now are oriented precisely along those lines. The Soviet delegation will vote in favour of them, and appeals to other delegations to do the same.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on the draft resolutions in clusters, beginning with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.5, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, held on 31 October 1986, and is sponsored by the following delegations: Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary and Romania.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Bahamas, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Ireland, Israel, Paraguay, Samoa, Saudi Arabia

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.5 was adopted by 93 votes to 19, with 10 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: We turn next to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.34, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Prevention of nuclear war". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, held on 5 November 1986, and is sponsored by the following delegations: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia,

*Subsequently the delegation of Cyprus, Malawi and Rwanda advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(The Chairman)

Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Sudan, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.34 was adopted by 113 votes to 3, with 14 abstentions.*

*Subsequently the delegation of Cyprus, Malawi and Rwanda advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: We take up next the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.36/Rev.1, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Prevention of nuclear war: Climatic effects of nuclear war, including nuclear winter". The draft resolution, the programme budget implications of which are set out in document A/C.1/41/L.79, was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 37th meeting of the First Committee, held on 10 November 1986. The sponsors of are as follows: Bangladesh, India, Mexico, Pakistan and Sweden.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.36/Rev.1 was adopted by 119 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.*

*Subsequently the delegation of Cyprus, Malawi and Rwanda advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: The last draft resolution in cluster II now before us is A/C.1/41/L.49, entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly: convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons".

That draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee, on 4 November 1986. The sponsors are as follows: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Romania, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Greece, Ireland, Israel, Japan

Draft resolution was A/C.1/41/L.49 adopted by 107 votes to 17, with 4 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote after the vote on all draft resolutions in cluster 11.

Mr. FAN GUOXIANG (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.49 because we support its thrust on the non-use of nuclear weapons. However, certain formulations used in the preamble and the main part of the draft convention should undergo further exploration. We have our own views on those matters. In spite of this, we voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Here I should like to clarify China's position on the non-use of nuclear weapons.

China has consistently held that, before the realization of nuclear disarmament, in order to reduce the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war, the first task is to prevent any State from using nuclear weapons to engage in acts of aggression. For that purpose, all the nuclear-weapon States must undertake the obligation not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against any States or under any circumstances. On the basis of that undertaking on the part of the nuclear-weapon States, an international convention should be drawn up with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

*Subsequently the delegation of Cyprus, Malawi and Rwanda advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

In addition we feel that today, when nuclear weapons continue to pile up, the mere prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons cannot safeguard security, nor can it safeguard world peace for States. There must also be a drastic cut in nuclear weapons. Only the ultimate elimination of all nuclear weapons can completely remove the danger of nuclear war.

Mr. OKELY (Australia): In explaining Australia's vote on the resolution in document L.5, I would observe that the prevention of nuclear war is an objective of the highest priority. For this purpose, inter alia, all wars should be prevented. The aim of the prevention of nuclear war is not advanced by a priori and unverifiable declarations about the use of nuclear weapons. What is required is nuclear disarmament and until that occurs, other arrangements, including deterrence of the use of nuclear weapons.

Turning to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.34, my delegation voted in favour of it. We support strongly the objective of the prevention of nuclear war by all means. However, my delegation would have preferred to see the resolution drafted in such a way as to give due recognition to the fact that the issue of the prevention of nuclear war cannot be dealt with in isolation. One of the most important ways to prevent a nuclear war is through the prevention of all wars. My delegation also supports the establishment of an ad hoc committee on this issue at the Conference on Disarmament.

Although my delegation is not certain that such an ad hoc committee could undertake negotiations on the matter at this stage, we should like to see the Conference on Disarmament consider and identify possible areas for its detailed examination of the issue similar to the ad hoc committee established for the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

(Mr. Okely, Australia)

Accordingly, my delegation urges the Conference on Disarmament to establish at its 1987 session an ad hoc committee so that it can begin discussion of an issue of priority concern in the field of disarmament.

Mr. FYFE (New Zealand): In general, New Zealand supports resolutions that propose disarmament and arms control measures that are mutual, balanced and verifiable, and that would promote stability at a lower level of armaments, taking into account the need of all States to protect their security. We will not support resolutions that lack balance and are of a vague and declaratory nature.

Accordingly, New Zealand has voted against the draft resolutions contained in L.5 and L.49. The New Zealand Government has made clear its view that New Zealand cannot be defended by nuclear weapons. However, it recognizes that different strategic circumstances make inevitable differences of approach in the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Pyfe, New Zealand)

The drafts in documents L.5 and L.49 promote the renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons, ignoring the need for balancing reductions in conventional forces. Such reductions and the renunciation of the first use of force are in the modern age essential to the avoidance of conflict that could escalate into a nuclear war.

Mr. JAEGER (Denmark): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution L.5, on the non-use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war.

As the Danish representative stated in the general debate of the First Committee on 16 October 1986,

"... Denmark calls upon the parties to ongoing negotiations - that is, those in Vienna on the mutual and balanced reduction of armed forces and armaments and associated measures in Central Europe, in the Conference on Disarmament, and in the bilateral talks in Geneva - to reach early agreements in order to create the conditions necessary for a reduced dependence on nuclear weapons, which should pave the way for negotiations with a view to reaching an international agreement not to be the first to use nuclear weapons".

(A/C.1/41/PV.4, p. 7)

Draft resolution L.5 has been introduced under agenda item 62, "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". The validity of the Final Document of the tenth special session and the priorities and objectives laid down in it is reaffirmed annually by the General Assembly. According to that document disarmament measures must be well-balanced if they are to further international stability. No single State or group of States should at any stage of the disarmament process be able to obtain military advantages. Disarmament measures must be implemented with the

(Mr. Jaeger, Denmark)

amount of international verification necessary to ensure that all parties live up to their commitments.

Denmark supports resolutions which respect these fundamental principles. In our view draft resolution L.5, though put forward under the heading "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session", does not live up to those fundamental principles but advocates a biased and simplistic solution instead.

The concept of deterrence has been developed as an integrated part of a defence strategy and as an answer to a certain actual situation in which a group of States find themselves. The singling out of the first-use option does not serve to create an improved situation of mutual security. A mere declaration not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, in itself, without adequate follow-up measures to show and ensure that adherence to the declaration is intended, is of very limited value.

Given the right conditions, a mutual agreement between the nuclear Powers not to be the first to use nuclear weapons could, however, make a positive contribution towards greater security, but it is the attainment of adequate conditions that is essential, and not the declaration in itself.

For the reason I have just given, Denmark could not support draft resolution L.5 and therefore voted against it.

Mr. GOUGH (United States of America): The United States delegation's negative vote on draft resolution L.36/Rev.1, as was the case with its negative vote on resolution 40/152 G last year, in no way signifies that we consider the issue of the climatic and potential physical effects of nuclear war, including nuclear winter, to be unimportant. On the contrary, we believe that the issue merits intense study by qualified investigators.

(Mr. Gough, United States)

Moreover, we believe that studies on the environmental effects of nuclear war should be pursued in a dispassionate way, and free of political overtones. In our view this would be difficult in a study such as the one proposed in this draft resolution.

In addition the draft has financial implications that also contributed to our decision to cast a negative vote.

In any event, the United States, together with other national and international bodies having competence in such matters, will continue to study the critical problems involved in this matter.

Mr. MOLANDER (Sweden): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolutions L.5 and L.49.

Let me first deal with draft resolution L.5. I should like to reiterate that the Swedish Government views unilateral declarations by nuclear-weapon States in which they make the commitment that they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons as an important concept in the efforts to reduce the dangers of an outbreak of nuclear war. We hope that all nuclear-weapon States will find it possible to make such declarations.

The establishment of a rough parity in conventional forces on a lower level would obviously facilitate such commitments. In the view of the Swedish Government, a firm commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, made through an international instrument of legally binding character, would make an important contribution to the success of efforts to prevent nuclear war. That is one reason for the support my Government has today given to draft resolution L.5.

However, such an international instrument should deal solely with the concept of non-first use of nuclear weapons and should not contain any further elements not directly related to it. In fact the Swedish Government considers that the

(Mr. Molander, Sweden)

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

Turning to draft resolution L.49, let me first reiterate that Sweden lends its support to the concept of prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in an international legal instrument. In this context I would like to quote the following from the statement of the late Swedish Prime Minister, Mr. Olof Palme, on the occasion of the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations:

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

My delegation was therefore, as last year, in a position to vote in favour of India's proposal contained in document L.49. However, in regard to the sixth preambular paragraph, my delegation has reservations as to the interpretation of the United Nations Charter. In fact, if the use of nuclear weapons were uncontestedly to be a violation of the Charter, there would be no obvious need for another international legal instrument in this respect.

Mr. TEJA (India): I wish very briefly to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.5. My delegation voted in favour of that draft resolution because we agree with its main thrust, which is directed towards the prevention of nuclear war.

We should like to state, however, that pending the achievement of complete nuclear disarmament the best course of action for preventing nuclear war would be to forswear completely the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in any circumstances whatsoever.

Mr. YAMADA (Japan): Japan voted in favour of the draft resolution on climatic effects of nuclear war, including nuclear winter, in document A/C.1/41/L.36/Rev.1, out of our deep concern on the subject. It is the firm belief of my Government that it is most important that such studies be conducted in a balanced, objective and scientific manner and that a clearer and correct understanding of the matter, based on scientific findings and analysis, be obtained and brought to the attention of the general public.

It is also the hope of my delegation that when the study in question is conducted due regard will be paid to the views of Japan submitted in response to General Assembly resolution 40/152 K on how the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament studies can best be further improved.

Mr. KEISALO (Finland): I have asked to speak in order to explain the vote of Finland on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.5 on non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war.

Finland believes that nuclear war is nowhere professed to be an element of rational policy. It is the declared policy of the Government of Finland that nuclear weapons should never, under any circumstances, be used. That is the reason why Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.5 and also for all other draft resolutions in cluster 11.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The Byelorussian SSR would like to make the following statement in connection with the votes we have just taken on a number of draft resolutions in connection with the prevention of nuclear war.

One of the swiftest ways of preventing nuclear war would be the refusal to be the first to use nuclear weapons, as proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.5. As mentioned in the draft resolution, the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons has already been made by two Powers, the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, thus proving that it is a perfectly feasible step. Such a commitment is not simply a declaration, since it involves quite realistic consequences in the field of military doctrine and practical military construction. The reference to the right of collective defence under the United Nations Charter cannot be regarded as warranted. This is clearly indicated by experts of the United Nations in the comprehensive study on concepts of security, published recently in document A/40/553.

The continuation of the Western nuclear Powers' policy of relying on their being able to be the first to carry out a nuclear strike as a basis of their strategic doctrines involves an increased risk of nuclear war. The assertion that it is impossible to agree on not being the first to use nuclear weapons in the absence of a balanced reduction of conventional weapons is also very far from being in contact with reality. In fact, the Budapest message of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty appeals for a radical reduction of conventional weapons and armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Nor can we regard as serious the reference to an absence of disarmament in the nuclear field as a pretext for refusing to give up the first use of nuclear weapons. It is well known that one of the nuclear Powers that has made the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons - the Soviet Union - has put

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

forward a step-by-step programme for nuclear disarmament which, if there was political willingness on the part of other nuclear Powers, could be initiated and implemented immediately.

The implementation of the agreements to which we were very close in Reykjavik - and not shirking them - could also help to further the process of nuclear disarmament.

Finally, the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons could be enshrined in a legally binding document, thereby considerably strengthening it.

In view of the foregoing, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR supported draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.5. We also voted in favour of all the other draft resolutions in the cluster, since they are aimed at promoting the prevention of nuclear war in practice. In particular, we welcome the urgent appeal contained in draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.34 on the creation of a subsidiary body in the Conference on Disarmament to consider measures to prevent nuclear war.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded our action on all draft resolutions in cluster 11.

In accordance with what I said earlier, we return now to draft resolutions in cluster 2. I should like to inform members that because of ongoing consultations the following draft resolutions in cluster 2 will not be taken up this morning; action upon them is postponed: draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.2 and L.43.

I call now on delegations wishing to make statements or comments on draft resolutions in cluster 2.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): I have the honour to introduce a revised draft resolution under agenda item 62 (n) (iii), contained in document A/C.1/41/L.73/Rev.1, and entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session; Verification in all its aspects". I do so on behalf of the delegations of Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and, of course, Canada.

This revised draft resolution is the product of many long and intensive, but always positive and co-operative, sessions of consultations and negotiations. It is the belief of the sponsors that the numerically low, but qualitatively high, improvements which have been incorporated not only will permit the terms of the draft resolution to be implemented in a more expeditious manner but will also permit the draft resolution to enjoy universal support.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

When, on 4 November, I introduced draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.73, I noted that the importance of verification for successful arms limitation agreements was not lessening. On the contrary, it is becoming more immediate. I also noted that the draft resolution provided a practical means of engaging the United Nations and all its Members, especially those with experience and technology relevant to verification, in defining and making invaluable the sound and practical means by which successful and lasting arms control measures could be achieved. Those words apply equally well to the revised draft resolution in A/C.1/41/L.73/Rev.1.

The expanded number of sponsors, which now reflects the very composition of the United Nations itself, testifies that with positive political will conflicting points of view can be harmonized, competing draft resolutions can be merged, and consensus can be reached. Our goal throughout this exercise has been to deepen our consideration and understanding of verification and to continue the consensus achieved at the fortieth session of the General Assembly. We believe we have all succeeded in the accomplishment of that aim.

To you, Mr. Chairman, my delegation extends its thanks. Your advocacy of honest compromise and merger and your willingness to use your good offices in the attainment and furtherance of consensus certainly paved the way for this accomplishment.

We must also thank, and pay a tribute to, the delegations of Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia for their positive co-operation during our consultations, and the delegation of India for its help. We look forward to working with them closely during our future consideration of verification.

Finally, it is our expectation that when action is taken on this text, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.73/Rev.1 will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. HALACHEV (Bulgaria): In connection with the successful outcome of the unofficial consultations with a view to merging the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/41/L.1 and L.73, on the issue of verification, I should like to say that the delegations of Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia express their satisfaction with the agreement on a joint draft resolution under agenda item 62 (n) (iii). From the very outset we have deemed that idea to be well advised and we have focused our efforts to that end.

I wish to extend our gratitude to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.73, and especially to the delegation of Canada, which undertook very serious and constructive efforts towards reaching agreement. I should like to convey our thanks also to the delegations of India, Yugoslavia, Sri Lanka and other countries for their important contribution and valuable co-operation.

The delegations of Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria are grateful to you personally, Comrade Chairman, for your skilful guidance and your support for the consultations.

(Mr. Halachev, Bulgaria)

We are hopeful that fruitful co-operation on the issue of verification will continue in the future. We also consider agreement on a joint draft resolution as a positive step towards achieving a concerted and constructive approach to the major question of verification. That joint approach is now of great importance in view of the urgent need for a speedy achievement and implementation of substantive and effective measures for arms limitation and disarmament.

We view the implementation of the recommendation to be adopted as a valuable step towards that goal. We are also convinced that our ultimate objective has to be that comprehensive and adequate verification, far from creating obstacles, should facilitate the adoption of concrete disarmament measures.

Since such agreement has been reached, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.1 have decided not to put it to a vote. The delegations of Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.73/Rev.1 and call upon all delegations to give it their support.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Bulgaria for his statement informing the Committee that the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/41/L.1 do not insist on a vote.

I also thank the representative of Canada and the representative of Bulgaria for their kind words addressed to me.

Since no other representative wishes to speak on the draft resolutions in cluster 2, I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. ISRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connection with the decision we are about to take on draft resolutions in cluster 2, the Soviet delegation would first recall that in its statement of 10 November we stated that the Soviet delegation would abstain in the

(Mr. Issraelyan, (USSR))

vote on draft resolution L.10, objective information on military matters. At that time we explained the reasons for that position and called upon other delegations to act likewise.

With regard to the agreement achieved between the delegations of Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, on the one hand, and Canada, on the other, on the question of verification, we welcome this agreement and offer cordial congratulations to those delegations. Naturally, the Soviet delegation will support that draft resolution since the Soviet Union is a confirmed protagonist and champion of verification measures, beginning with national forms of verification and embracing the whole range of international forms of verification, from constant on-site inspections to systematic inspections on demand. I think we have demonstrated our devotion to stricter verification in negotiations on various disarmament matters, in particular at the negotiations on the banning of chemical weapons and also in proposals on negotiations to prohibit nuclear tests.

We join in the request that draft resolution L.13/Rev.1 be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin voting on draft resolutions in cluster 2. As I have already said, we shall take up first the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.10, entitled "General and complete disarmament: Objective information on military matters".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland at the 28th meeting of the First Committee on 31 October 1986. It has the following sponsors: Australia, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iceland, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Samoa, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Oman, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.10 was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 30 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: Next we come to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.73/Rev.1, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session. Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session; Verification in all its aspects".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 31st meeting of the First Committee on 4 November 1986 and has the following sponsor: Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa,

(The Chairman)

Sierra Leone, Singapore, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

A request has been made for the draft resolution to 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.1/41/L.73/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded action on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.10 and L.73/Rev.1, listed in cluster 2.

I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their positions or votes after the decisions or votes on the draft resolutions in cluster 2.

Mr. TEJA (India): My brief remarks will relate to the draft resolution on verification in all its aspects contained in document L.73/Rev.1.

We are gratified that the sponsors of that resolution, in particular the delegation of Canada, have accommodated some of the concerns of other groups in order to have only one draft resolution on this subject and to secure a consensus on it.

There is no doubt about the critical importance of effective verification arrangements in all disarmament agreements. My delegation would, however, like to emphasize that a separate discussion of the aspects of verification should not be used to distract our attention from specific and concrete disarmament measures. The draft resolution to which I refer does reiterate the principle contained in the Final Document of the the first special session on disarmament that the formulation or modalities of verification systems depend on the purpose, scope and nature of the corresponding agreement. It follows therefore that the requirement of a verification system acceptable to all parties should be considered in the context of actual negotiations.

India abstained in the vote on draft resolution L.10, on objective information on military matters, since we consider that progress in disarmament is a matter of the exercise of political will by the major Powers, and lack of progress cannot possibly be attributed to lack of information on military matters or to the absence of an international system of standardized reporting on military expenditure.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution L.10 since it represents a continuation of the action my country

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

supported on the occasion of its initiation during the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. Objective information on military matters is indeed an important element which might, together with some other more important prerequisites, such as sincere political determination, contribute to the effectiveness of negotiations on disarmament issues. But, on the other hand, one should not overestimate the effects of a lack of objective information on the armaments programmes of States on the acceleration of the arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race, and on the heightening of international tension, which is implied in this draft resolution.

However, bearing in mind the intention of the sponsors to point to one possible way of contributing to the promotion of relations and confidence among States with a view to achieving general and complete disarmament, my delegation voted in favour of it.

Mr. SALLES (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation could not vote in favour of draft resolution L.10, on objective information on military matters, for, as was the case with its predecessors, it addresses issues and problems extraneous to the crucial questions of disarmament proper and which pertain mainly to the relationship between the two military alliances. Therefore in our view it does not contribute to the adoption of concrete multilateral disarmament measures.

Mr. EFFENDI (Indonesia): My delegation fully endorses the main thrust of the draft resolution in document L.73/Rev.1, namely that disarmament and arms-limitation agreements should provide for adequate measures of verification satisfactory to all parties concerned in order to create the necessary confidence and to ensure compliance by all parties. We have therefore joined in the consensus.

However, it remains our basic view that paragraph 4, which requests the Disarmament Commission, inter alia, to consider at its 1987 session verification in

(Mr. Effendi, Indonesia)

all its aspects including principles, provisions and techniques, can only be effectively undertaken while taking into account ongoing negotiations and in the light of the provision contained in preambular paragraph 6 (b), which states that

"The form and modalities of the verification to be provided for in any specific agreement depend upon and should be determined by the purpose, scope and nature of the agreement."

Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): We wish to say that we believe that the consensus that has been reached on the question of verification is perhaps one of the most important events of this session. This consensus, between blocs, this increasing convergence of ideas, might in fact open up a historical stage with regard to verification. It is closely associated with all other disarmament matters and could be extended to all other areas of the limitation and reduction of weapons.

We hope we shall be able to continue consolidating this principle as a policy of the international community.

Mr. TONWE (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation would like to explain its acquiescence in the adoption of resolution A/C.1/41/L.73/Rev.1, on verification in all its aspects.

The Nigerian delegation appreciates the importance of verification in disarmament negotiations and congratulates the delegations that have brought about the consensus on L.73. But we remain concerned by any action which might have the effect of diverting attention from the substance of negotiations on this important question, and we should like to express the hope that, though the present consensus draft resolution in our view contains contradictory themes, its stipulations will not hamper progress in disarmament negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded action for today on draft resolutions listed in cluster 2. As I have already informed members, the two remaining draft resolutions, A/C.1/41/L.2 and L.43, will be the subject of decisions at a later stage because of continuing consultations.

There is an opportunity this morning to take up the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.37/Rev.1, listed under cluster 4. Although it was distributed only this morning, I understand that the Committee is in a position to take action on it now.

Accordingly, if there is no objection, it is my intention to proceed to take action on this draft resolution.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Accordingly, I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements or comments on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.37/Rev.1.

Mr. TINCA (Romania): The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.37 was intended, as I stated in introducing it at one of our previous meetings to permit the Disarmament Commission to take a short recess in considering the principles that should govern the further actions of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military budgets.

Nevertheless, at the suggestion of a number of delegations, we have re-examined our proposal, and consequently, we have made the necessary changes to that draft resolution.

The new version, which is now contained in document A/C.1/41/L.37/Rev.1, which I have the honour to recommend to the Committee on behalf of the delegations of Australia, Colombia, Finland, Indonesia, Ireland, Nigeria, Senegal, Sweden, Romania and Uruguay, envisages a solution that might be adopted by consensus.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

The preambular part of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.37/Rev.1 is more elaborate and borrows paragraphs from previous consensus resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on this subject. In its last preambular paragraph, it notes that the Disarmament Commission at its substantive session in 1986, agreed upon the principles that should govern further action of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military budgets:

"except one on which various alternatives were proposed by Member States".

The operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.37/Rev.1 is also similar to the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in the past. Paragraph 4 of the draft resolution - and this is where the main changes come:

"Requests the Disarmament Commission to continue the consideration of the item entitled 'Reduction of military budgets', and in the context, to conclude at its substantive session in 1987, its work on the last outstanding paragraph of the 'Principles that should govern further actions of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military budgets', and to submit its report and recommendations to the General Assembly at its forty-second session".

It was suggested to my delegation that another chance given to the Disarmament Commission to have a new try in order to resolve the only one remaining principle might be worth while.

The sponsors understood that in organizing its work at its 1987 substantive session, the Disarmament Commission would take fully into account the limited nature of the mandate entrusted to it by draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.37/Rev.1, which in fact calls for elaboration of only one paragraph.

I have also to specify that draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.37/Rev.1 will have no annexes.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

I take this opportunity to express my delegation's gratitude to those other delegations which co-operated in finalizing the draft resolution, and I submit that it might be adopted without a vote.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): On behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community, I should like to make some comments on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.17 as revised and just introduced by the representative of Romania, which is entitled "Reduction of military budgets".

In the statement of the Twelve on this subject on 31 October, we reaffirmed that all countries have a mutual interest in finding ways to reduce military expenditure while maintaining undiminished security. It is because of the priority the Twelve attach to the search for such reductions that we have participated actively in work related to this at the United Nations, and I have in mind here in particular the work which has been accomplished at the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

It is gratifying to be able to note that at the 1986 session of the Commission it proved possible to make considerable headway on this question. Work remains to be done, however, and the progress made so far remains incomplete until the outstanding issues are fully resolved.

Therefore, the Twelve consider that we must not shy away from the final hurdle in front of us. Now is not the time for the United Nations Disarmament Commission to pause in its consideration of this issue. The Commission this year decided, in the light of the progress achieved, to recommend to the Assembly that discussion of the item at the Commission should be continued and a fully agreed text reached. We consider that the Commission, on which all Member States are represented, should be firmly supported in this recommendation, which is found in paragraph 28 of document A/41/42.

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

For that reason, the Twelve, in voting in favour of, or perhaps joining in the consensus on, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.37/Rev.1, particularly welcome the recommendation now contained in paragraph 4, and just introduced by the representative of Romania, that discussion of the item be continued at the 1987 session of the Disarmament Commission, and we look forward to the opportunity for further useful work there.

Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): I merely wish to confirm that Uruguay wishes to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.37/Rev.1, as we did similar drafts in previous years, since that had not yet been recorded.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to make statements or comments on the texts of the draft resolution before us, I shall now call on delegations that wish to explain their position before a decision is taken on L.37/Rev.1.

Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Since it favours the implementation of real steps to curb the arms race and bring about disarmament in close connection with the resolution of the problem of world economic and social development, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have consistently sought a reduction of military expenditure on the part of States. Representatives are familiar with the proposal made by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to undertake negotiations in order to reach tangible agreements not to increase, and subsequently to reduce, military expenditure, as well as with other initiatives taken by the socialist countries aimed at finally making some headway in this matter.

During the session of the Disarmament Commission this year it was possible to achieve substantial new progress in agreement on a set of principles for the freezing and reduction of military budgets. Regrettably, it was impossible to reach final agreement in the Commission on this set of principles since some Western countries continued to make demands related to the comparability and transparency of military expenditure as a preliminary prerequisite, I would stress, for the commencement of negotiations on their reduction. This demand can only be regarded as a pretext for refusing to tackle the problem of how to cut down on military allocations and consequently to liberate funds for development purposes.

(Mr. Timerbaev, USSR)

The Soviet Union is convinced that there is an urgent need to achieve practical agreements on the real reduction of military expenditure. Furthermore, we believe that if such an agreement were achieved we could set up an international fund to render assistance to developing countries.

On the whole, the Soviet Union supports draft resolution L.37/Rev.1 and we shall vote in favour of it.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.37/Rev.1, entitled "Reduction of military budgets". It was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November 1986, and has the following sponsors: Austria, Colombia, Finland, Indonesia, Ireland, Nigeria, Romania, Senegal, Sweden and Uruguay.

There has been a request for the draft resolution to 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.1/41/L.37/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position on this draft resolution after the decision on it has been taken.

Mr. TEJA (India): My delegation decided to support the consensus on draft resolution L.37/Rev.1, which we have just adopted. My delegation would like to state, however, that we do not believe that all Member States are equally responsible for the very high level of global expenditure on the arms race. Since it is just half a dozen or so militarily significant States that account for the overwhelming proportion of world military expenditure, the reduction of military budgets is their primary responsibility. The progressive qualitative and quantitative escalation of the arms race, including the nuclear-arms race, can only be arrested by an exercise of the political commitment of the States engaged in such a race.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded action on all draft resolutions listed in cluster 4, and I congratulate members on this progress.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: It is my intention to take up this afternoon the consideration of and action upon the draft resolutions listed in cluster 10 and, it is hoped, the remaining draft resolutions in cluster 9, A/C.1.41/L.3 and L.52, and also a number of draft resolutions listed under cluster 12.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.