



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 37th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

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

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued at the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the programme of work and time-table, this morning the Committee will begin taking action on the draft resolutions and the draft decision submitted under agenda items which appear in cluster 1. These draft resolutions and the draft decision are listed in the informal paper which was distributed to the Committee on Thursday, 6 November 1986, as follows:

A/C.1/41/L.7, L.11/Rev.1, L.30, L.57, L.62, L.63, L.70 and L.74.

(The Chairman)

Before proceeding to take action on them, I should like to remind delegations once again of the following procedures. As far as action on each individual cluster is concerned, delegations will first have the opportunity to make any statement they regard as necessary with respect to the draft resolutions in that cluster, other than explanation of vote. Subsequently, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on any or all of the draft resolutions in a particular cluster before a decision is taken will be able to do so. After the Committee has taken a decision on the draft resolutions contained in a given cluster, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes will be able to do so.

I urge delegations, to the extent possible, to make a consolidated statement and explanation of vote or position on draft resolutions in a given cluster.

Most of the draft resolutions submitted under disarmament agenda items have already been introduced. However, it is my understanding that the sponsors of some of the remaining draft resolutions may wish to introduce them. Accordingly, it is my intention, at each meeting, before proceeding to the stage of taking action on draft resolutions, to allow delegations wishing to introduce any remaining draft resolutions to do so.

Mr. HUSSAIN (Maldives): It was only last year that the United Nations marked its fortieth birthday. The theme chosen by the Organization to celebrate that important event was "United Nations for a better world". Heads of State or Government and other dignitaries who participated in that commemorative session expressed their firm commitment, on behalf of Member States, to strengthen our Organization and make it a more viable body.

(Mr. Hussain, Maldives)

We believe that we must see that important undertaking as a collective responsibility. We are aware that our Organization derives its strength and inherits its weaknesses, if any, from the decisions of its Member States. Therefore the important responsibility undertaken by the Secretary-General as the executive head of the Organization must surely also derive from the decisions of the Assembly.

My delegation is convinced that the vital task for the membership of this body must be to endeavour to strengthen the Organization through its decisions in order to achieve the fundamental objectives for which the United Nations was founded. Our decisions, therefore, must be relevant, and the action Member States are expected to take must be possible and realistic. The effective functioning of this body depends entirely on the wisdom and clear-sightedness of Member States.

In the light of those crucial undertakings and our commitment to forge ahead with the agenda of our Organization, my delegation believes that there is a need for rethinking and rectification. The fact is that most of the important topics of our deliberations have been repeated over a number of years. Similarly, the numerous decisions and resolutions have also been repeated over a number of years, for reasons that are clear to us all.

Maldives believes it is therefore not inappropriate to focus our attention more directly on the wisdom enshrined in most of these draft resolutions. It is also important for us to gear our action towards more fruitful ends. The wisdom that a situation remains constant that is reflected in our repeated draft resolutions ought not to be accepted. Changing political situations, geographical regroupings and new political confidence-building measures must be accommodated, as a progressive measure, in our subsequent draft resolutions.

(Mr. Hussain, Maldives)

The subject of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia has always been an important question, to my delegation in particular, to the peace-loving countries of our region and to the rest of the world in general. My country, a small and peace-loving nation, is vulnerably situated in the heart of the South Asia region. We derive our strength from our firm resolve to remain non-aligned and peace-loving. We fortify our stand through adherence to universally accepted principles and norms. We believe that our clear record stands as testimony to our positive contribution to peace.

The vital subject of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, which we have followed very closely, is a long-standing proposal. Maldives believes that the experience gained in its 20-year membership of the United Nations has taught it that the time is now ripe to look again at the draft resolution on this subject, which originated as long ago as 1974. Although draft resolutions on the subject have continued to be adopted by an overwhelming majority, there is ample room for revision and improvement. The strength of support for these draft resolutions has continued to provide clear testimony to the importance attached to an issue which is crucial both to the region and to the world.

We subscribe to the view that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia would go a long way towards strengthening the security of the States of the region against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We cannot afford to be complacent about the nuclear future with which the world is threatened.

In this connection, my delegation finds that certain parts of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.20 do not conform to the overall objectives and purpose of the draft resolution. Our understanding is that the draft resolution is aimed at enhancing the region of South Asia and making it a zone of peace and security, free from nuclear weapons. We feel that the achievement of such a broad objective

(Mr. Hussain, Maldives)

requires the development of a concept which is simple, straightforward and at the same time general in its application.

At this stage, when differences of opinion exist among some of the Governments concerned, the option of consultations on the issue must be kept open. Some of the amendments submitted by Maldives are therefore aimed at removing those parts of the draft resolution which in our opinion are impediments to the wider application of the draft resolution. Those parts also sometimes cause misinterpretation of the purpose of the draft resolution and act as obstacles to closer consultations among the countries concerned.

(Mr. Hussain, Maldives)

Some of the amendments, on the other hand, are merely editorial improvements, which, we believe, would make the text factual and more precise. More specifically, in operative paragraph 4 the suggestion is made that the Secretary-General should communicate with the States in the region and other concerned States in order to find out their views on the matter and explore the best possibility for promoting efforts towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. That suggestion is made because we feel that the present text does not provide sufficiently ample scope for any positive efforts to rescue the concept from its stalemate.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour to introduce three draft resolutions. The first, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.18, deals with agenda item 61 (c), "World Disarmament Campaign," and is sponsored by the delegations of Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Mexico.

The draft resolution begins by recalling that in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament it was stated that it is essential that

"not only Governments but also the peoples of the world recognize and understand the dangers in the present situation," S-10/2, para. 15) and it stressed the importance of mobilising world public opinion on behalf of disarmament.

The following preambular paragraphs refer to all the main resolutions of the General Assembly and reports of the Secretary-General on the subject.

The nine operative paragraphs are self explanatory, and I shall therefore simply commend them to delegations and stress the statement made by the Secretary-General on 24 October 1984 that the co-operation and participation of all

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

States, as expressly recommended by the General Assembly, required having adequate funds made available for the Campaign, and that, consequently,

"the criterion of universality also applies to pledges, since a campaign without world-wide participation and funding will have difficulty in reflecting this principle in its implementation."

Thus the draft resolution repeats the terms of General Assembly resolutions adopted in 1984 and 1985, reiterating the Assembly's regret

"that most of the States which have the largest military expenditures have not so far made any financial contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign."

Those States, as well as those that have not yet announced any voluntary contribution to the Campaign, will have a new opportunity to do so at the fifth United Nations Pledging Conference for this purpose, which has been provided for in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

The second of the three draft resolutions I should like to introduce is contained in document A/C.1/41/L.64 and was sponsored by the delegations of India, Pakistan, Peru, Sweden and Mexico. The preambular portion recalls several General Assembly resolutions on the dangers of nuclear weapons, whose mere existence, as pointed out at the first special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, poses a threat to the very survival of mankind.

It goes without saying, as the draft resolution specifically states, that the nuclear-arms freeze we wish to implement is not an end in itself but, in its own wording,

"would constitute the most effective first step to prevent the continued increase and qualitative improvement of existing nuclear weaponry during the period when the negotiations take place".

We believe that the third preambular paragraph deserves particular attention.



(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

It quotes from Declarations adopted by the six leaders who joined in the special initiative in the interests of peace and disarmament represented by the Declarations of Delhi and Mexico. The Delhi Declaration of 28 January 1985 states, as the draft resolution notes:

"A halt to the nuclear-arms race is at the present moment imperative. Only thus can it be ensured that nuclear arsenals do not grow while negotiations proceed."

With regard to the Mexico Declaration of 7 August 1986, the draft resolution notes that in that Declaration it was stressed that the six leaders

"continue to urge that what has so far been a unilateral moratorium by one of the two major nuclear States should soon become at least a bilateral moratorium."

The third and last draft resolution I am introducing this morning appears in document A/C.1/41/L.36, sponsored by the delegations of Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, Sweden and Mexico. The draft resolution refers to agenda item 62 (c), and is entitled "Climatic effects of nuclear war, including nuclear winter".

The draft resolution notes that the conclusions of some of the studies compiled by the Secretary-General in conformity with General Assembly resolution 39/148 F confirm that nuclear winter and other climatic effects of nuclear war pose an unprecedented danger to all nations, even those far removed from the nuclear explosions, which would add immeasurably to the previously known dangers of nuclear war.

In the operative section of the draft resolution the General Assembly, after reiterating to the Secretary-General its appreciation for the compilation of excerpts on the climatic effects of nuclear war, regrets the fact that, because of the current financial crisis of the United Nations, the Secretary-General has had

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

to defer to 1987 the meeting of the Group of Consultant Experts called for in resolution 40/152 G. In operative paragraph 3 the draft resolution

"once again requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of consultant experts chosen by him, bearing in mind the advisability of wide geographical representation and of their qualifications in a broad range of scientific fields, to carry out a study on the climatic and potential physical effects of nuclear war, including nuclear winter, which will examine, inter alia, its socio-economic consequences. That study would take into account the Secretary-General's compilation and the source documents from which it was prepared, together with any other scientific studies which may be relevant".

The last two operative paragraphs request the Secretary-General to transmit the study concerned to the General Assembly in due time for consideration at its forty-second session in 1987 and decides to include in the provisional agenda of that session the item entitled "Climatic effects of nuclear war, including nuclear winter: report of the Secretary-General".

Mr. AKPLOGAN (Benin) (interpretation from French): I have the honour to introduce two draft resolutions on behalf of the African Group.

The first, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.25, concerns the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. It reflects the desire that has been expressed by African States since the beginning of the 1960s that the African continent be made a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

At its first ordinary session, held in Cairo from 17 to 21 July 1964, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity adopted the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and appealed to all the States of the world to abide by it. In its resolution 2033 (XX), adopted at its annual session in 1965, the General Assembly endorsed that Declaration and urged all States not to transfer nuclear weapons, scientific data or technological assistance to the national control of any State, either directly or indirectly, in any form which might be used to assist such States in the manufacture or use of nuclear weapons.

For some years the denuclearization of Africa has been on the agenda of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. There is not yet unanimity on the subject in that Commission. The principal difficulty is the very worrying matter of the nuclear capability of South Africa and the co-operation of certain Western countries with the racist apartheid régime of South Africa in the nuclear field. South Africa's nuclear capability is a real threat to the achievement of the objective of the denuclearizing of Africa and constitutes a serious danger not only to the security of African States but also to international peace and security. Therefore draft resolution A/41/L.25 has two parts: part A, "Implementation of the Declaration", and part B, "Nuclear capability of South Africa".

In the first preambular paragraph of part A the General Assembly recalls the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa adopted by the Assembly of Heads of

(Mr. Akplogan, Benin)

State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its first ordinary session, held in Cairo from 17 to 21 July 1964.

In operative paragraph 1 it calls urgently upon all States to consider and respect the continent of Africa and its surrounding areas as a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

In paragraph 5 it calls upon all States, corporations, institutions and individuals to desist from further collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa that may enable it to frustrate the objective of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

In paragraph 9 it requests the Secretary-General to render all necessary assistance that the Organization of African Unity may seek towards the implementation of its solemn Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

In the preamble to part B, the General Assembly takes note of the report of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research entitled "South Africa's nuclear capability", undertaken in co-operation with the Department for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat and in consultation with the Organization of African Unity. It expresses regret that despite the threat South Africa's nuclear-weapon capability constitutes to international peace and security and, in particular, to the realization of the objective of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, the Disarmament Commission has, once again, in 1986 failed to reach a consensus on this important item on its agenda.

In the operative part the General Assembly notes the actions taken recently by Governments with regard to South Africa's nuclear capability, calls upon all States, corporations, institutions or individuals to terminate forthwith all forms of military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime, and demands once again that South Africa submit forthwith all its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

(Mr. Akplogan, Benin)

We believe that, in the light of the importance of the denuclearisation of Africa, draft resolution L.25 should be examined seriously by all delegations.

I also have the honour of introducing on behalf of the African Group draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.32, on the creation of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa as part of the mobilization of the support of world public opinion for the World Disarmament Campaign.

In the second preambular paragraph the General Assembly takes note of the report of the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries held at New Delhi from 16 to 19 April 1966, in which the Ministers reaffirmed the need to strengthen the role of regional bodies in mobilizing support for the World Disarmament Campaign and the realization of its objectives and, in that context, welcomes the establishment at Lomé, Togo, of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa.

In operative paragraph 1 the General Assembly welcomes the establishment on 1 January 1966 of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa. In paragraph 2 it welcomes also the promptness with which the Secretary-General has taken the necessary administrative steps to ensure the functioning of the Centre and requests him to continue to give the Centre all necessary support. In paragraph 4, it appeals again to States Members and international, governmental and non-governmental organisations to make voluntary contributions to the Centre.

In the light of the importance of this question, we think that draft resolution L.32 should be approved by consensus by the Committee.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): I am speaking to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.45, on naval armaments and disarmament. I do so on behalf of Australia, Austria, China, Finland, France, Iceland, Indonesia, Mexico, the Netherlands, Peru, Sri Lanka, Yugoslavia and my own country, Sweden.

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

Last year the General Assembly requested the Disarmament Commission to consider the issues contained in the United Nations study on the naval arms race (A/40/535) with a view to facilitating the identification of possible measures in the field of naval arms reduction and disarmament, pursued within the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament, as well as confidence building measures in this field. In so doing, the Disarmament Commission was asked to take into account also all other relevant proposals.

During its 986 session the Disarmament Commission began consideration of the issue. The work resulted in a number of substantive findings and recommendations on the subject.

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

These are contained in the working paper by the Chairman. They met with the approval of all delegations participating in the substantive consultations and in their view could form the basis of further deliberations on the subject. From this report I wish to quote the following:

"Participants in the consultations concurred that efforts in the areas under examination should be governed by certain basic principles. It should be understood that the accumulation and qualitative development of naval forces and naval arms systems were part of the overall arms race; therefore any efforts directed towards arms limitation, disarmament and confidence-building measures at sea should proceed as an integral part of the overall objective of halting and reversing the arms race in general and in accordance with the disarmament strategy set out in the Final Document ..."

(A/CN.10/83, para. 9).

However, this should not preclude the possibility of trying to resolve specific problems of naval disarmament or to agree on confidence-building measures in the naval environment that might be identified and would be generally acceptable. Furthermore, it was understood that, inter alia, the following principles should guide future work.

First, disarmament measures should be balanced and should not diminish the security of any State. As naval forces were not independent of other military forces, they should be considered in the general military context. There was no such thing as an independent naval balance of parity. Disarmament measures in the maritime field should thus be balanced in that general sense.

Secondly, these facts, combined with the differing geographical situation of States, could require multilateral measures of restriction of naval forces and weapons to be numerically asymmetrical in order to maintain an overall military situation in balance.

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

Thirdly, because of the comprehensive nature of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, such measures should not take the legal form of amendments to the Convention; they should be embodied in separate legal instruments in harmony with the Convention.

Fourthly, as in all arms control and disarmament, appropriate, universal and non-discriminatory verification and complaints procedures were essential for the proper implementation of agreed measures.

Against that background participants began consideration of measures of naval arms limitation and disarmament as outlined in the study and grouped under the following headings: quantitative restraints, qualitative or technological restraints, geographic and/or mission restraints, and confidence-building measures.

Varying views were expressed in the written submissions of Governments and in the statements of delegations on the desirability and practicability of such measures. Specific mention was made of certain possibilities for measures in the regional context and the positive prospects for extending confidence-building measures at sea. In this context the possibility could be pursued of negotiating a multilateral agreement corresponding to the existing bilateral agreement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the prevention of incidents on and over the high seas. Among other issues raised was the need to consider the updating of the laws of sea warfare.

The question of appropriate forums in which further action and eventual negotiations might take place, whether at the bilateral, regional or multilateral level, including consideration by the Conference on Disarmament, was also raised. Participants felt that the Disarmament Commission should give further consideration to this item at its next substantive session.



(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.45 is of a procedural nature. It requests the Disarmament Commission, under an agenda item entitled "Naval armaments and disarmament", to continue, at its forthcoming session in 1987, the substantive work it has at last begun and to report on its deliberations and recommendations to the General Assembly at its forty-second session.

Therefore I wish, on behalf of my own delegation and the delegations of the other sponsors, to commend this draft resolution for the full support of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 1. First, I call on the Secretary of the Committee, who has an announcement to make.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I have to inform the Committee that the following delegations have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/41/L.2, the German Democratic Republic; A/C.1/41/L.30, Liberia; A/C.1/41/L.43, Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany; A/C.1/41/L.58, Philippines; A/C.1 .60, Argentina; and A/C.1/41/L.27, Greece.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those delegations that wish to make statements on draft resolutions in cluster 1.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Since we now have to vote on the draft resolutions, I should like to express very briefly Mongolia's views on the matters dealt with in draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.7 and L.57.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

Draft resolution A/41/L.7 concerns the prohibition of radiological weapons and the protection of nuclear targets against attack. This subject has long been ripe for discussion and the solution of this problem is long overdue. The idea that it is a secondary, purely academic matter should not be allowed to serve as a pretext for further delay. Recent events, particularly the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, have made that task a very urgent, high-priority one. That accident has shown the threat posed by the energy of the atom if it gets out of control even temporarily. The recent special session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) adopted an important decision that reflected broad support for the programme proposed by the Soviet Union for the creation of an international régime for the safe development of nuclear energy. A major contribution to the development of practical measures for the establishment of such a régime should be made by the convention approved at the special session on early notification of nuclear accidents and any other dangerous situations.

However, that is just one aspect of the matter. There is another very important aspect of the problem, and there the Conference on Disarmament must make a weighty contribution. That is precisely what the draft resolution appeals for. I refer to the prohibition of the use of radioactive materials for hostile purposes both by the use of radiological weapons and by attacking nuclear targets.

Our approach to solving those problems remains flexible and constructive. We are ready to agree to any kind of solution to these problems provided that there is no further delay. We want to see serious businesslike negotiations on those topics at the Conference on Disarmament. Therefore we support draft resolution A/41/L.7

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

As for draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.57, Mongolia supports it also. It is our belief that the strengthening of international security, as well as disarmament, is seriously threatened not only by nuclear armament but also by the production of other means of mass destruction and the build-up of conventional weapons - all of which are dangerous phenomena.

Mongolia has taken an active part in the work on the conclusion of a Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. It was among the first to sign and ratify it, as well as its annexed Protocols. We believe that this Convention should serve as an effective instrument for the limitation of armaments and should facilitate the holding of negotiations, in accordance with the provisions in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, for further steps to limit or prohibit other forms of conventional weapons.

In essence, this is being hindered by foot-dragging on the part of many States, including nuclear States, in the process of ratifying the Convention. They should heed the appeal contained in paragraph 3 of this draft resolution.

Mongolia has traditionally been in favour of ensuring the effectiveness and universality of international treaties. We think that the more States are covered, the more these treaties and agreements will be consolidated and will do a great deal to facilitate work to conclude new agreements in the field of limiting the arms race and disarmament.

Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): In the very broad context of 74 draft resolutions on which this Committee is to decide, it is of priority importance for our delegation to lend support to and to sponsor endeavours for the consideration of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament - a question that has been recast on the basis of the very happy

(Mr. Fischer, Uruguay)

initiative of the delegation of Cameroon. We understand that that draft resolution has a direct bearing on all the other initiatives to be considered here. In this regard, we wish to highlight the four ideas that led to our co sponsoring it.

The first idea is that the role of the United Nations in the area of arms limitation and reduction is framed within the greater problem of the effective operation of the entire collective security system at the international level. Throughout recent history, we have been noting that the function described in Article 26 of the Charter has gradually been relegated to a secondary role, giving rise to the very deficiencies preventing the Organization from playing a more decisive role in the maintenance of international peace and security. That is but a reflection of this latter point. Thus it is necessary to work with realism, determination and clarity of purpose in looking to the next immediate steps leading to a strengthening of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

The second idea is, in our view, a pre-condition for carrying out this task in future: the prior and urgent need to reform procedures and modalities for action in the competent organs of the system, in order to overcome the factors that have led it to become inoperative. It is essential that United Nations statements on disarmament, especially those of this Committee, have the greatest possible impact, be it on governments or, in particular, international public opinion. It is also essential for resolutions to be such as to lead to effective action. Hence we are greatly concerned over the multiplication and proliferation of draft resolutions on disarmament to be considered by the Committee from year to year. The fact is that we do not see this trend subsiding at all. There is repetition of ideas, overlapping initiatives, frequently competing one with another, but it is also of concern that so many of these initiatives - not to say all of them - are expected to be implemented according to a style that negates their effective impact, laden, as they are, with "Noting" and "Taking into account" in preambular paragraphs that

(Mr. Fischer, Uruguay)

lend them a formal structure going beyond the decision-taking power the Organization does not today enjoy in international relations. The large number of draft resolutions again this year further highlights the responsibility we all share in carrying out this necessary reform.

Thirdly, we think that in order to strengthen the role of the Organization in this field we shall have to broaden and deepen the information on disarmament and its various aspects, whether on the status of armaments or on arms negotiations. It is an undeniable fact that to date such information is sporadic and incomplete; hence, in order to have a better understanding of these vital issues, we must resort to experts and to specialized private sources, some of which, may I say in passing, do undertake laudable efforts, as in the case of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI).

If the United Nations wishes to play a more significant role in this field, it must have more accurate and precise knowledge of it, and it must begin taking effective decisions.

States participating in the most decisive negotiations must report on a regular basis on those negotiations and on all those aspects that do not directly affect their progress or viability.

My delegation expressed the hope in the Disarmament Commission this year that the Secretary-General in future should be able to present annual reports on the disarmament process as a whole and on its various aspects - on negotiations being carried out in the relevant organs of the United Nations, as well as elsewhere.

Lastly, we understand that, given its very nature and mandate, the United Nations is in a position immediately to broaden its role with regard to international verification of compliance with the obligations States may agree on at different levels and in various circumstances with regard to the limitation and reduction of armaments.

(Mr. Fischer, Uruguay)

In the light of the historical experience of the last 40 years, States Members of the Organization must now dedicate themselves to ensuring the definitive incorporation into the system of the principle of verification and its integral part in any disarmament agreement.

(Mr. Fischer, Uruguay)

It is important to affirm this principle more strongly in practice and through specific activities. We believe that the Secretariat, and its various sections, and the expert consultants, should make a systematic study and compilation of the various verification mechanisms and procedures that could be established according to the nature, scope and purpose of the various disarmament measures, with an indication of their feasibility and their advantages and disadvantages.

In addition, we believe that the United Nations should participate actively in multilateral provisions and arrangements for international verification. We fully support the suggestions made by the Secretary-General in his annual reports of the last two years. Serious thought should be given to extending the Organization's activities to include mechanisms and specific procedures for effective international control, such as the establishment of seismic stations, and participation in on-site inspections or in satellite observations.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I have just been informed that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.2.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 1, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.7, entitled "General and complete disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Cuba at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 5 November 1986. The sponsors are: Australia, Cuba, Hungary, Japan and Sweden.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.7 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall next take up draft resolution

A/C.1/41/L.11/Rev.1, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". 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. The sponsors are: Cameroon, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Norway, Portugal and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

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

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The third draft resolution before us in cluster 1 is A/C.1/41/L.30, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 34th meeting of the First Committee on 5 November 1986. The sponsors are: Australia, Burma, Cameroon, Ecuador, Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, Liberia, Peru, Poland and Uganda.

Again it has been requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.30 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We now come to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.57, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate



(The Chairman)

Effects". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 5 November 1986. The sponsors are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Sweden, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.57 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come next to the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/41/L.62, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". This draft decision was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 34th meeting of the First Committee on 5 November 1986. The sponsors are: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bulgaria, China, Hungary, Indonesia, Mexico, Mongolia, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

It has been requested that the draft decision be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

The draft decision in document A/C.1/41/L.62 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Next we come to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.63 entitled "World Disarmament Conference". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 35th meeting of the First Committee on 6 November 1986. The sponsors are: Peru, Poland, Spain and Sri Lanka.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.63 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.70, entitled "General and complete disarmament: Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Cameroon at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1986. The sponsors are: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Uruguay, Vanuatu and Zambia.

It has been requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.70 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The final draft resolution in cluster 1 is in document A/C.1/41/L.74. It is entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Study on deterrence". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1986. Its sponsor is India.

(The Chairman)

It has been requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.74 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope we shall be able to go through the draft resolutions in other clusters with similar speed.

I call now on delegations wishing to explain their position after the adoption of decisions on all draft resolutions in cluster 1.

Mr. TEJA (India): With reference to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.11/Rev.1 on United Nations disarmament studies, which has just been adopted, my delegation would like to place on record its reaffirmation of the value of those studies as a useful means by which important issues in the field of disarmament can be addressed in a comprehensive and detailed matter.

Paragraph 96 of the Final Document adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, stated that taking further steps in the field of disarmament and other measures aimed at promoting international peace and security would be facilitated by carrying out studies. The Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies has identified three specific objectives for such studies, namely, to assist ongoing negotiations, to identify new areas for negotiations, and to promote public awareness of the problems involved in the arms race and disarmament.

Those objectives continue to be relevant. We believe that the appraisal of the subject of studies referred to in draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.11/Rev.1 will be conducted with a view to enhancing the value and relevance of United Nations studies in the field of disarmament and to further improving their content.

(Mr. Teja, India)

I wish now to speak about draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.30. The delegation of India supported the consensus in the Committee on the report of the Disarmament Commission referred to in that draft resolution on the understanding that the Commission should, as a deliberative body subsidiary to the General Assembly, continue to consider and make recommendations on various problems in the field of disarmament and to follow up the relevant decisions and recommendations made by the General Assembly at its special sessions devoted to disarmament. While we appreciate the progress made by the Disarmament Commission on a few of the items on its agenda, it is a matter for regret that, on a large number of other priority issues on its agenda, such as the consideration of various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, there has been little progress.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.70, on the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, just adopted by the Committee, we note that no substantive progress has been made in disarmament, especially in recent years. My delegation would like to underline that the absence of progress in disarmament has resulted from political problems encountered by various multilateral disarmament forums under the aegis of the United Nations, and not from any institutional limitations. For any positive, forward movement in this area, apart from the collective commitment of an overwhelming majority of the States Members of the Organization, a commitment from the militarily significant States, particularly the nuclear-weapon States and members of military alliances, is an absolute prerequisite.

(Mr. Teja, India)

Along with the absence of progress in disarmament there has been a corresponding increase in tension and conflicts. There has been a resurgence of the arms race and an overall deterioration in the situation relating to international peace and security. The latter aspect is related not only to the disarmament machinery of the United Nations but also to the entire United Nations system and the international climate itself. The role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament would necessarily have to be reviewed in this context.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): The United States delegation is pleased to join in approving the draft resolutions in cluster 1, on which the First Committee has just voted.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.7, concerning the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons of the Conference on Disarmament, my delegation has again joined in the consensus adoption of that draft resolution. In doing so, I want to recall that the objective of the United States Government is an effective ban on radiological weapons. As we indicated at the Conference on Disarmament, the United States is seeking to identify verification measures that will deter a potential violator and will enable parties to verify compliance with a radiological-weapons ban. The United States is continuing to study possible measures. Our substantive position is still embodied in the 1979 United States-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics joint elements as modified by the agreed compliance provisions introduced in 1983.

(Mr. Lowitz, United States)

We continue to believe that the question of additional legal protection against attacks on nuclear facilities should be considered separately from the question of a radiological-weapons ban.

Concerning draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.30, transmitting the report of the Disarmament Commission, my delegation notes that at this point the Commission's agenda is not yet set. There may eventually be one or more items inscribed on it that are not acceptable to my delegation. For example, last year we opposed inclusion of the naval-arms race item. Consequently, my delegation believes that each agenda item should be addressed on its own merits.

With regard to the draft decision dealing with the comprehensive programme of disarmament, contained in A/C.1/41/L.62, we have joined in the consensus adoption of that draft resolution, as the United States has done in previous years. The United States will continue to work in the Conference on Disarmament towards the goal outlined in the draft decision set out in L.62. My delegation appreciates that when the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament at the Conference on Disarmament, the representative of Mexico Ambassador Garcia Robles, introduced draft resolution L.61 in the First Committee, he reiterated the common understanding that there would not be a special resumed forty-first session of the General Assembly exclusively for the consideration of this item. Thus, additional financial implications would be avoided.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation takes note of the procedural nature of the draft resolution on the study on deterrence we have just adopted and we joined in the consensus in favour of that draft resolution. Nevertheless, we should like to comment on it briefly.

The study on deterrence reflects the views of various separate experts who submitted individual papers, and we think that this makes the study richer, putting as it does before Member States a full picture of all the ideas on deterrence.

(Mr. Nuflex Mosquera, Cuba)

However, some of those ideas claim to regard deterrence as a guarantee of peace and security, whereas nothing could be farther from the truth. Deterrence emerged as a result of the policy of those who, at the end of the Second World War, had acquired the capability of producing nuclear weapons and had drawn up schemes to use that capability as a means of intimidating others and pursuing and imposing on others their own policies based on strength. That is tantamount to guaranteeing the security of a few to the detriment of the security of all.

However, there is no alternative to nuclear disarmament and nuclear deterrence is an extremely dangerous concept, as was mentioned by the Heads of State or Government of countries members of the Non-Aligned Movement at their recent summit meeting at Harare, when they recalled that:

"The idea that world peace can be maintained through nuclear deterrence, a doctrine that lies at the root of the continuing escalation in the quantity and quality of nuclear weapons and which has, in fact, led to greater insecurity and instability in international relations than ever before, is the most dangerous myth in existence." (A/41/697, p. 24)

My delegation fully shares that view.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded our consideration of draft resolutions under cluster 1.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolutions in cluster 2. Before taking up that cluster in its entirety, however, I should like to inform members that because of ongoing consultations the following draft resolutions in cluster 2 will not be taken up and the Committee will postpone action on them: draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.1 and L.73. We shall defer action on those draft resolutions for the time being.

Before calling upon those delegations that wish to make statements on draft resolutions in cluster 2, I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I have a further announcement to make with regard to additional sponsors in connection with the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/41/L.2, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and Poland; A/C.1/41/L.73, Malaysia; and A/C.1/41/L.61, Bolivia.

Mr. DOLEJS (Czechoslovakia): The main purpose of my brief statement today is to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.2, under agenda item 60, "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements," which is sponsored by the delegations of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Czechoslovakia.

The fundamental importance of full implementation and strict observance of agreements on arms limitation and disarmament has been generally recognized. Similarly, there has been unanimity of views within the United Nations as to the crucial role of arms-limitation and disarmament agreements in the strengthening of international peace and security as well as increasing confidence. It was on that basis that General Assembly resolution 40/94 L was adopted last year with considerable support by delegations belonging to all groups.

Since last year, however, the reasons for keeping the issue of compliance high on the agenda of the United Nations have become even more convincing. It is the firm view of the sponsors of draft resolution L.2, as reflected in their draft, that at the present critical juncture, when the goal of concluding new disarmament agreements is especially urgent and real prospects are opening up for significant progress in that direction, there is an increasingly urgent need for strengthening the legal basis of the arms-limitation and disarmament process.



(Mr. Dolejs, Czechoslovakia)

That must include, above all, strict compliance by States Parties with the existing treaties and agreements in this area. Faithful observance of disarmament treaties derives, of course, from general principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. Notwithstanding that, the sponsors of the draft resolution believed it justified to underline the particular importance of strict compliance with arms-limitation and disarmament agreements as an essential element of trust in the nuclear and space age.

One of the fundamental approaches to disarmament consists, therefore, in securing full confidence in the reliability of compliance with whatever obligations the States Parties may assume under specific agreements. Such confidence, in our view, has to be engendered through adequate procedures for redress, first of all those contained in the agreements themselves, as well as through the clear awareness of the importance attached to the issue of compliance by the whole international community. Accordingly, in paragraph 1, draft resolution L.2 urges all States parties to arms limitation and disarmament agreements to implement and comply with the entirety of the provisions subscribed to, in accordance with the procedures envisaged by the respective agreements.

Another key provision of the draft resolution contains an appeal to all States parties to arms limitation and disarmament agreements, regardless of their scope, to refrain from any actions which would lead to undermining or circumventing such agreements.

(Mr. Lulejs, Czechoslovakia)

Furthermore it appeals to all States to support efforts aimed at strengthening the status of arms limitation and disarmament agreements and ensuring their full implementation and strict observance.

After consulting a number of delegations, the sponsors have agreed to delete in its entirety operative paragraph 4, which is not directly related to the issue of compliance with disarmament agreements. It is therefore requested that action be taken with regard to draft resolution L.2 as now amended.

Thus, as can be seen, the sponsors of the draft resolution have exerted genuine efforts to elaborate a rational and positive approach to the issue of compliance under present conditions which, if adopted, would constructively serve the goal of securing the full implementation of arms limitation and disarmament agreements by all States parties without unduly interfering with the operation of those agreements or with the sovereign rights of States, both those that are parties to them and those that are not. It is consequently our belief that delegations might consider adopting this draft resolution without a vote.

We have carefully studied also the other draft resolution on this subject contained in document A/C.1/41/L.43, which, with one or two minor exceptions, repeats the text of last year's resolution 40/94 L. This draft, while not reflecting some of the ideas contained in L.2, puts greater emphasis on consideration of the implications of non-compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements for international security, as well as for the prospects for further efforts in the field of disarmament. Although there are necessarily several overlapping provisions, such as those stressing the particular importance of strict compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements, it would in our view seem rational and justifiable to consider both draft resolutions on a mutually complementary basis, rather than a competitive one.

(Mr. Dolejs, Czechoslovakia)

In view of this possibility, we think it regrettable that our readiness to strive for a balanced and full-fledged joint approach to the issue of compliance has not been reciprocated so far.

Mr. HALACHEV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from Russian): I had intended to speak in connection with the concrete results of the consultations going on between the sponsors of the two draft resolutions on agenda item 62. As you Sir, have said, those consultations are still under way.

In connection with their possible outcome, my delegation wishes to reserve its right to make a statement before the voting on the two draft resolutions.

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish briefly to comment on draft resolutions L.2 and L.43, which are, in a way, parallel drafts.

My delegation intends to join in the consensus on the two draft resolutions so that they may be adopted without a vote. I must say that the announcement just made by the delegation of Czechoslovakia that paragraph 4 has been deleted from that draft makes this easier for us.

I would observe that the two drafts are of particular importance because, as we all know, difficulties have arisen with regard to the application of certain bilateral treaties on disarmament as a result of the interpretation some have made of certain of their provisions. In our view those treaties should be strictly observed and should not be weakened through unilateral interpretations concerning the scope of some provisions.

We should also like to stress the view we voiced last year when considering draft resolution L.66, which later became resolution 40/99. On that occasion we said that our delegation felt that the scope of that draft, which is today L.43, was not limited to bilateral agreements or treaties relating to disarmament and that it also covered all agreements, treaties or other international instruments on disarmament, including, of course, those agreed upon multilaterally.

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

With reference to the latter, we know that some of their provisions have not been fully complied with by certain States parties to them; an example is the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty, some of whose provisions continue to be dead letters owing to lack of compliance by some States that have ratified it.

That explains the importance we attach to draft resolution L.43. We are pleased to note that draft resolution L.2 expressly refers not only to bilateral treaties but also to multilateral, regional and world-wide multilateral treaties.

In conclusion I would observe that, while we also appreciate the spirit in which the drafter of L.2 worked, we have some doubts as to the statement made in the second preambular paragraph, according to which at the present critical juncture there are prospects of concluding agreements on reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons. I think that that is overly optimistic bearing in mind the existing situation.

However, as indicated at the outset, Venezuela will join in the consensus on the two draft resolutions so that they may be adopted without a vote.

Mr. ZHARKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connection with the voting on draft resolution L.10, the Soviet delegation would make the following points.

The Soviet Union is convinced of the need for an exchange of information and data about armaments and armed forces in the process of negotiations and the implementation of concrete measures on the basis of agreements that have been concluded. Such an exchange of data is not included, although it is desirable and feasible, as is shown by our experience regarding a number of agreements in the field of the limitation and reduction of armaments and confidence-building.

The USSR is in favour of the consideration of mutually acceptable solutions to the problem of openness. Recent evidence of that has been provided by the successful conclusion of the first stage of the Stockholm Conference.

(Mr. Zharkov, USSR)

As Members know, there was agreement in particular on major military measures, in such spheres as early notification of military activities, land troops, exchange of annual plans for such activities, invitations for observers, verification of the implementation of agreements achieved, which included holding on-site inspections. An important contribution to the achievement of agreement on those problems was made by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

We should not forget that that group of countries which has paid lip-service to openness in military activities did not in Stockholm give its consent to confidence-building measures of independent military activities for air and naval forces -- that is, for two major forms of armed forces which represent a particular threat to the security of European States. As far as draft resolution L.10 is concerned, unfortunately the providing of information about military potential in practice is not linked with concrete measures for disarmament. We do not agree with that approach and we shall therefore abstain in the vote on L. 10.

We are convinced that the exchange of information should not be dissociated artificially from concrete disarmament measures and the strengthening of security, especially since it cannot be represented as an individual pre-condition, as was stated wrongly in paragraph 3, which discusses machinery for reporting of military of expenditures. We are against those matters being exploited for non-productive purposes, as a pre-condition for progress in other areas with regard to strengthening security, limiting armaments and disarmament.

The reason for the lack of progress in the field of disarmament is by no means because of the lack of information about military potentials; rather, it is because of the absence of political will for limiting and reducing armaments.

(Mr. Zharkov, USSR)

When the political will for easing tensions and improving the international climate comes to exist, with regard to questions of disarmament, it will then be possible to come to agreement even in difficult circumstances, as Stockholm proved once again.

The CHAIRMAN: There are no other representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

I wish to inform the Committee that I have received requests from the sponsors of the other draft resolutions under cluster 2 as well to defer taking a decision on them because of ongoing consultations.

Therefore, we are not in a position today to take decisions on the draft resolutions in cluster 2. In this connection, I would kindly request delegations to speed up informal consultations. If on the very first day of our beginning to take action on draft resolutions we start by deferring a whole cluster, then I fear we might not be in a position to conclude our work as agreed when we began our substantive work.

Hence I appeal to sponsors to conclude consultations as soon as possible this afternoon, so that we may be in a position to take up action on cluster 2 tomorrow.

The Committee will now take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 3. Before doing so, I should like to inform members that, because of a note that should be prepared by the Secretariat concerning the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/41/L.9/Rev.1, we have to defer taking a decision on that draft resolution.

I shall now call on those members who wish to make statements on draft resolutions in cluster 3.

Mr. de la BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): I have the honour to refer to the draft resolution submitted by my delegation in A/C.1/41/L.38, on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons.

(Mr. de la Baume, France)

In introducing this text, the French authorities have two main concerns in mind: formally to mark the fundamental importance we attach to strict observance of the 1925 Protocol, of which France is a depositary, and to stress the usefulness of inquiry procedures available to the Secretary-General under previous resolutions in the case of alleged use of chemical weapons.

As we highlighted in our text, the international community is at present faced with the risk of proliferation of chemical weapons. We must prevent that danger while awaiting the conclusion of the negotiations at Geneva on a convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. Efforts to that end have already been undertaken at the national level, and it seemed useful to us both to take note of them and to support them. Hence the emphasis in our text on national measures on controlling the transfer of chemical substances, which have already been adopted by several Member States, and on the institution of co-operation between the principal chemical-producing States aimed at drawing up and publishing itemized lists of products that especially lend themselves to use in the production of chemical warfare agents.

However, we note that those provisions have given rise to doubts and questions on the part of various Member States with regard to the appropriateness of emphasizing that aspect - which we believe essential - of strict monitoring of exports of chemical substances that especially lend themselves to use in the production of such weapons. We listened to those comments carefully; but we have made it clear that it was not our intention to attempt to establish a system of monitoring and control of chemical substances that might appear unbalanced.

(Mr. de la Baume, France)

Nevertheless, it seems to us that an additional effort at clarification on our part and consultation is necessary if we wish to ensure for our initiative the attention it deserves. Naturally, we shall pursue it vigorously in the coming months. For the moment, we believe it preferable not to put our draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.38 to a vote. Of course, depending on the circumstances we shall come back next year to this subject, which is of great concern to the international community.

Mr. KATEKA (United Republic of Tanzania): In our statement during the general debate, my delegation expressed its concern at the proliferation of draft resolutions in the First Committee. I wish to reiterate that concern. The representative of Australia made a very important statement, addressing the issue of draft resolutions, but nobody seems to have received the message. The irony of it all is that we all seem to complain about the many draft resolutions before the First Committee, but we do nothing about it. If anything, we compound the situation by sponsoring several draft resolutions on the same issue. An example is to be found in cluster 3 concerning chemical and bacteriological weapons, which we are now considering. Some sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.12 are also sponsors of A/C.1/41/L.56; some sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.55 are also sponsors of A/C.1/41/L.56. There is also draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.38, which was just introduced, and I wish to thank the representative of France for not insisting on its being put to a vote. That is a good example that should be emulated by other sponsors.

Why could not all the sponsors of draft resolutions on this question of chemical weapons get together and agree on one draft? Do we have to continue with competing texts on the same subject-matter? If genuine efforts had been made, we would have had 13 draft resolutions, if we go by clusters; or at most 20, if we go by agenda items - instead of a total of 74 draft resolutions.



(Mr. Kateka, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

As an expression of its disapproval of this absurd and untenable state of affairs, my Delegation has found it difficult to sponsor draft resolutions in the First Committee. We have made one exception by sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.33.

Tanzania had thought of not participating in the votes taking decisions on draft resolutions before the Committee. This would be a way of expressing our concern at what is going on in the Committee, that is, trivializing very important matters concerning the survival of mankind by trying to outwit one another at drafting unhelpful draft resolutions.

If the situation does not improve, we may be forced to carry out this protest at future sessions of the General Assembly, even if this sounds like a distant cry, or is a cry in the wilderness.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian.): The Soviet delegation would like to explain its views in connection with the adoption of the decision on the item on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons.

In Geneva the work of the Conference on Disarmament to come to an agreement on a convention banning chemical weapons has reached a stage that requires of States a particularly responsible but careful approach to negotiations, and also the necessary political will and readiness, not just in words but in actual deeds, to facilitate the early conclusion of a convention. Guided by this approach, the Soviet Union, as members will recall, put forward a number of very far-reaching proposals taking into account the positions and interests of a wide range of States and helping the Conference to reach the point of practical agreements on questions which only yesterday seemed irresolvable.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

This relates to questions of destroying stockpiles of chemical weapons and facilities for their production, the production of chemicals for civilian and commercial purposes and problems of verification, including the creation of appropriate machinery for establishing data within the framework of a future convention, and a number of other points.

The early conclusion of a convention on the total prohibition of chemical weapons was facilitated by efforts to prevent further spread of those weapons, including by means of carrying out national verification measures on the export of chemical substances that might lend themselves to use for military purposes.

The measures of the Soviet Government on this are well known. Thus the efforts of the Soviet Union have led to a considerable broadening of the basis for the adoption of mutually acceptable solutions and decisions.

With regard to the draft resolutions submitted on this agenda item, the Soviet delegation would like to say frankly that we see a clear imbalance, and sometimes an actual tendentiousness, in draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.55; and we are convinced that, for the purposes of an early solution to the problem of the prohibition of chemical weapons, the most appropriate are draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.12 and A/C.1/41/L.56. However, in the light of the urgent need for consolidating the progress that has emerged in resolving the problems of prohibiting chemical weapons and creating appropriate circumstances and conditions for further progress, the Soviet Union has deemed it necessary to vote in favour of all draft resolutions submitted on this agenda item.

However, we confirm our negative attitude towards General Assembly resolution 40/92 C and its provisions relating to the activities of a group of experts.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to explain its vote before the voting, we shall now proceed to take decisions on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 3, beginning with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.12, entitled "Prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons", under agenda item 59, "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons".

(The Chairman)

The draft resolution has 12 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 29th meeting of the First Committee on 3 November 1986. The sponsors are: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Finland, Haiti, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Malawi, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.12 was adopted by 83 votes to 12, with 31 abstentions.\*

\*Subsequently the delegations of Kuwait and Zaire advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegations of Greece and Gabon had intended to abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: As the representative of France has informed us, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.38 will not be put to a vote.

Therefore, the next draft resolution before us is A/C.1/41/L.55, under the item "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". It was introduced by the representative of the United States of America at the 26th meeting of the Committee on 30 October 1986 and has the following 28 sponsors: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Denmark, Ecuador, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Uruguay and Zaire.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.55 was adopted by 108 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.\*

The CHAIRMAN: The next draft resolution before us is A/C.1/41/L.56, under the item "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". This draft resolution has 23 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 35th meeting of the Committee on 6 November 1986. The sponsors are: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Kingdom, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

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.56 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes after the decisions have been taken on all draft resolutions in cluster 3.

Mr. LU HAI TRUNG (Viet Nam): The delegation of Viet Nam wishes to explain its votes on some of the draft resolutions contained in cluster 3, which have just been adopted by the Committee.

---

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

The Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare was signed as far back as 1925. Yet, for the past six decades since its signing, mankind has continued to be subject to the use of chemical weapons. Still fresh in our memory is the chemical warfare carried out against the Vietnamese people for more than a decade, from 1961 to 1971.

(Mr. Le Hoi Trung, Viet Nam)

What is more, at present there are dangerous plans not only to utilize the chemical weapons arsenals existing in the world, but also to deploy chemical weapons on the territory of other countries and to produce new types of chemical weapons, such as the extremely dangerous binary weapons. We share the universal view that completely to exclude the possibility of the use of chemical weapons requires, first, the conclusion and implementation at the earliest date of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. It requires, secondly, that all States refrain from any action that might impede the negotiation of such a convention, and, thirdly, strict observance of the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

As a victim of the barbarous use of chemical weapons, Viet Nam unreservedly and unequivocally supports the prohibition of the use of all chemical weapons and their destruction. Viet Nam is party to both the 1925 Geneva Protocol and the 1972 Convention on bacteriological weapons, and has scrupulously complied with those two legal instruments. We are among the sponsors of two draft resolutions on chemical and biological weapons, A/C.1/41/L.12 and L.56, just adopted by the Committee.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.55, it fails to address one of the essential requirements for promoting the process leading to the complete elimination of the possibility of the use of chemical weapons, namely, that all States should refrain from any action that might impede that process. Furthermore, the reference in paragraph 4 of that draft resolution to establishing facts in cases of reports on the use of chemical weapons without defining the criteria for determining the authenticity or reliability of the origins of such reports invites the danger of the draft resolution being misused to further slanderous purposes or to create artificial obstacles to negotiations on the elimination of chemical weapons. Therefore, we cannot go along with draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.55.



Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina considers that the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction is sufficiently broad, and we do not think it necessary at this stage to adopt machinery or principles that could confuse the talks under way in the Conference on Disarmament. We do not support initiatives that could involve a discriminatory or partial approach, such as those that would create outside the Convention non-proliferation régimes or areas of limitation. No countries should be authorized to carry out international policing of the transfer of chemicals; only international and national means of verification created under the Convention can monitor compliance with obligations undertaken by its States parties. We maintain that the Convention must be universal, comprehensive and permanent.

For those reasons the delegation of Argentina abstained in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.12 and L.55.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to explain its positive vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.12, just adopted by this Committee. My delegation considers the prohibition of chemical weapons to be a matter of urgency, and believes it necessary to intensify current negotiations to that end. In that context, we are deeply concerned at the obstacles to the achievement of that goal created by the development and production of new chemical weapons, such as binary weapons. We join in the draft resolution's appeal to States to refrain from any action that could impede negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons and to conduct negotiations on the subject in good faith.

While we praise the initiatives of some countries to establish chemical-weapon-free zones, where chemical weapons would not be deployed on the territory of States, we consider that the characteristics of each region should be

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

taken into account. Such measures are feasible in regions with a high concentration of chemical weapons. In the case of Latin America and the Caribbean we must consider not only the countries of the region but also other countries that are not part of the region but are very close to it, that have colonial Territories in the region, that possess large arsenals of chemical weapons, including binary weapons, and that pursue a constant policy of aggression and hostility against countries of the region, against which they could use or threaten to use chemical weapons. It was with that in mind that we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.12.

My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.55, because that text represents a partial approach to the problem of chemical weapons and, inter alia, because it makes no reference to certain basic difficulties encountered in the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons, specifically to the obstacles placed in the way of those negotiations by the production of binary chemical weapons.

Mr. STEPHANOU (Greece): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.12. As we have reiterated on various occasions, Greece advocates the conclusion of an agreement on the total prohibition of chemical weapons. Pending the conclusion of such an agreement, the Greek Government supports proposals and initiatives for the establishment of chemical-weapon-free zones, specifically in the Balkans, which we view as a step towards the conclusion of an international agreement.

Greece abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.12, because, taking into account the stage recently reached in the ongoing negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva, the wording of the operative part of the draft resolution seems to us to be exceedingly constraining on the negotiating parties to the Treaty, and therefore counter-productive.

Mr. SALLES (Brazil): I wish briefly to explain our vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.12, L.55 and L.56. My delegation joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.56 as proof of our full support for the on-going negotiations within the Conference on Disarmament on a multilateral convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and on their destruction.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.12, although some modifications, that improved the text were introduced, it favours concepts such as that of chemical-weapon-free zones, and singles out certain types of chemical weapons for restrictions.

(Mr. Salles, Brazil)

My delegation does not feel that those elements would facilitate negotiations. We have accordingly abstained in the voting on that draft resolution.

We have also abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.55. It is our considered judgement that the formulations which were added this year to its previous text would promote a régime which could end up having the same characteristics as those that have taken shape thanks to the discriminatory operation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We think in this regard that efforts should concentrate, first and foremost, on a comprehensive chemical-weapons ban and on the complete elimination of such weapons from existing arsenals, rather than highlighting partial measures.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): Australia abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on chemical weapons, A/C.1/41/L.12, introduced by the delegation of the German Democratic Republic. Australia is strongly in favour of and has actively worked for the prohibition of chemical weapons. Draft resolution L.12, however, does not meet our concerns in several respects. First, the draft resolution is, in our view, deficient in that it singles out new types of chemical weapons for non-production and non-deployment when, in fact, those weapons will be covered by the new convention. Indeed, the call in paragraph 3 for States to refrain from producing and deploying new types of chemical weapons is not a verifiable measure without a strict verification system of high standard, which will have to be negotiated as an integral part of a comprehensive chemical-weapons convention.

Secondly, the draft resolution, in specifying the prohibitions to be included in the scope of the convention, does not refer to the prohibition on the use of chemical weapons. In this respect, draft resolution L.12 is incompatible with the correct description of the scope of the convention contained in draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.55 and L.56.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Thirdly, we have taken careful note of the references in draft resolution L.12 to chemical-weapons-free zones, particularly in the light of recent proposals in this regard. We adhere to the view that the problems involved in negotiating an equitable and verifiable treaty establishing a chemical-weapons-free zone, particularly in relation to verification of compliance with such a treaty, are no less than those involved in negotiating a comprehensive global ban on chemical weapons. Negotiations on such a ban are under way in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

The Australian Government is encouraged by the increased pace which has been evident in the work of the chemical weapons Committee this year, and the progress which has been recorded. We believe that priority should be given to the conclusion of those negotiations, which offer the best hope for reaching international agreement on a comprehensive chemical-weapons convention and which would make regional chemical-free zones unnecessary.

For those reasons, Australia will continue to give its full support to the important endeavour currently under way in Geneva.

Mr. van BOHEMEN (New Zealand): New Zealand cosponsored draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.56 concerning the use of chemical weapons in violation of the Geneva Protocol of 1925. We were also pleased to join in the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution concerning the negotiation of a comprehensive chemical-weapons convention in the Conference on Disarmament.

I wish to explain New Zealand's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.12. New Zealand abstained in the voting on that draft resolution, as we have done in prior years. Many of the elements in the text are clearly unobjectionable - namely, the paragraphs seeking to encourage the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament. But those aspects of the draft resolution are already covered in draft resolution L.56, which was adopted by consensus.

(Mr. van Bohemen, New Zealand)

The main elements in draft resolution L.12 not covered in L.56 are the unbalanced references to the development and deployment policies of one of the major military alliances possessing large arsenals of chemical weapons. The draft resolution ignores the policies of the other major alliance that have led to the accumulation of extremely large stockpiles of chemical weapons. Accordingly, we regard the draft resolution as unnecessary and unbalanced, and hence, we abstained.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded taking action on draft resolutions listed in cluster 3, for today. We have deferred action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.9 for the time being. It is my understanding that this afternoon the first subject will be the consideration of and the taking of action upon the draft resolutions in cluster 4.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.