



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 44th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON 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.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/41/PV.44
11 December 1986
ENGLISH

55p.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: We shall continue hearing explanations of vote after the voting on the draft resolutions in cluster 10.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): I should like first to explain one aspect of the United Kingdom's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.72, adopted by the Committee this morning.

We believe that third parties could have a role to play in establishing adequate verification arrangements for a comprehensive test ban. Our interest in the proposal for an international seismic monitoring network should be seen in that light. However, the United Kingdom does not believe that all the technical and practical problems involved in establishing an international monitoring system have been resolved. Therefore, we believe that the proposal mentioned in paragraph 3 (a) of the draft resolution must be approached pragmatically, since, before outstanding technical difficulties have been solved, the establishment of such a network would require the commitment of significant resources and would carry no acceptable level of certainty that adequate verification would be the result.

In short, in this and other fields concerned with verification, the key issue is to resolve outstanding technical problems first. Therefore, we would welcome discussion at the Conference on Disarmament of the outstanding technical issues associated with adequate verification of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We also support the important work being done by the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts under the auspices of the Conference on Disarmament.

As regards the draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.67, the United Kingdom already routinely releases information about its nuclear test explosions.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): I wish to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.72 and L.67.

The United States was unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.72, because in some respects it is in fundamental conflict with United States policy. United States policy on nuclear testing limitations is clear. Our highest arms control priority in that area has been and remains to seek verification improvements to the existing threshold test-ban and peaceful nuclear explosions Treaties. President Reagan has said that, once the Soviet Union agrees to improvements which would permit effective verification, he is prepared to move forward on ratification of those two Treaties. If, however, the Soviet Union fails to agree to the needed verification improvements before the United States Congress reconvenes, the President will still seek Senate advice and consent regarding ratification, with an appropriate reservation to ensure that the Treaties do not take effect until they can be effectively verified. President Reagan has stated that once our verification concerns have been satisfied and those Treaties ratified - and in association with a programme to reduce and ultimately eliminate all nuclear weapons - the United States is prepared to engage in discussions with the Soviet Union on ways to implement a step-by-step parallel programme of limiting and ultimately ending nuclear testing.

The United States remains committed to the ultimate goal of the total elimination of nuclear testing, but only when we do not need to depend on nuclear deterrence to ensure international security and stability, and when we have achieved broad, deep and verifiable arms reductions, substantially improved verification capabilities, expanded confidence-building measures, and greater balance in conventional forces.

The United States and the Soviet Union are engaged in bilateral discussions at the level of experts on the entire scope of issues related to nuclear testing.

(Mr. Lowitz, United States)

For our part, we hope that the first fruits of those discussions will lead to the verification improvements we seek to the threshold test-ban and peaceful nuclear explosions Treaties.

The United States also believes that the Conference on Disarmament can make a valuable contribution on nuclear-test ban issues. We welcome the report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts and the plans of the Group to continue its work on more advanced forms of seismic data exchange. Moreover, we urge that the Conference, early in its 1987 session, agree to establish a committee to deal with the nuclear-test ban agenda item on the basis of the Western mandate proposal.

The United States still has concerns about parts of draft resolution A/C.1/41.L.72. Regarding operative paragraph 2, the United States remains fundamentally opposed to the idea that the Conference on Disarmament should itself begin work on a multilateral comprehensive test-ban treaty. For the reasons we have stated, that is a very counter-productive idea.

In addition, we believe that paragraph 5 of the draft resolution perpetuates the mistaken impression that a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is one of the most urgent arms control items. It is not. Reducing nuclear weapons and eventually ridding the world of the nuclear threat are far more urgent, far more critical. That is why President Reagan's proposal for a parallel plan for reducing and eventually eliminating nuclear testing is the most logical and only prudent way to proceed. As President Reagan said in his address to the General Assembly on 22 September 1986, a total ban on nuclear testing must be approached with practical steps. The position of the United States, which my delegation has set forth again today, points to those practical, necessary first steps towards that ultimate goal.

(Mr. Lowitz, United States)

As to A/C.1/41/L.67, the United States was unable to support that draft resolution, which, inter alia, has as its stated objective facilitating the early conclusion of a comprehensive test ban. As is well known, the United States routinely announces information about certain nuclear explosions. The United States does not, however, rule out the possibility of confidence-building measures that involve the reciprocal exchange of information concerning nuclear explosions. The modalities and specific content of such exchanges would need to be worked out in advance.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): The test-ban votes this morning gave a great importance to that meeting, perhaps the most important of our session this year, for we have witnessed significant movement forward on test-ban resolutions that strike at the heart of the nuclear-arms race. Certainly the outcome of the voting is a positive step forward from last year and opens up the possibility for even more movement next year and perhaps even convergence of test-ban resolutions. For the moment, we should take some satisfaction that we have given the Conference on Disarmament a strong message to proceed with the practical work programme on a test ban, particularly advancing the problems of scope and verification and compliance aspects of a comprehensive test ban.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.35, Canada is especially cognizant of and grateful for the forward movement by the sponsors, and we commend them for their positive attitude. Correspondingly, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.72 made advances in substance and support. We look forward to future consultations involving the sponsors of all resolutions on nuclear testing. An appropriate aim for such consultations, which should start at an early date, would be to strive for one resolution worthy of consensus that would advocate an end to all nuclear testing, in all environments, by all countries, for all time.

I repeat, positive gains on behalf of the disarmament process were made here this morning, and that is a message that should be conveyed around the world.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): At the outset I wish to thank the representatives of Australia and New Zealand for their kind words. Our two draft resolutions - that which they sponsored and the one introduced by the representative of Mexico and sponsored by Mexico and other countries - no doubt have the same goal. For that reason my delegation was able with great pleasure to support draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.72. We were very happy similarly to have their support for our draft.

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

As regards the moratorium that has been referred to here - by the representative of Australia, if I remember correctly - I would share his view that a moratorium is quite obviously a transitional matter. At every opportunity we have stated in this Committee that a moratorium is not an end in itself but merely an instrument, a tool, for the creation of the appropriate conditions in which to achieve our ultimate goal.

The statement made a few minutes ago by the representative of the United States reminded me of an ancient anecdote about a king who would grant any wish of someone who had been condemned to death. When the king told a particular condemned man that he could make such a wish, he replied that he wanted to be hanged from a tree he liked. He was taken throughout the kingdom, but years went by and he never found a tree he particularly liked.

I think that, as far as the present Administration of the United States is concerned, it will be very difficult to find an appropriate procedure for putting an end to nuclear tests.

In any case, the groups that have been submitting draft resolutions over the years, among them the groups to which Mexico and Australia belong, have year after year - as in the future, perhaps - put forward dozens of draft resolutions. For more than 30 years such drafts have been adopted at the United Nations. Only extreme pride could cause anyone to think that the General Assembly has been wrong throughout those 30 years and that one State alone has a monopoly on reason.

Mr. DHANAPALA (Sri Lanka): The Sri Lanka delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.67 and L.72, adopted this morning.

A comprehensive test-ban treaty has been a consistent objective of the United Nations since 1954. As the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.35 states, it is "the litmus test of the real willingness to pursue nuclear disarmament".

(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

Thus Sri Lanka sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.35, which we consider to represent the best approach to the subject. This year the draft resolution has as usual attracted wide support, for which we are grateful. We have also sponsored a parallel draft resolution, A/C.1/41/L.61, which represents a viable alternative way of achieving our objective of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.67, requiring the notification of nuclear tests, addresses a peripheral issue, which may give the impression that we are putting the emphasis on procedures to monitor tests rather than on efforts to ban them completely. My delegation has noted, however, that the second preambular paragraph states categorically and clearly that this is an exercise to be adopted pending the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban-treaty. It in no way legitimizes testing. Indeed, the information provided should give the international community more evidence as to why we should ban testing comprehensively. We therefore supported L.67 on this understanding of the objective of the notification procedure.

In the past we have had no difficulty in supporting other draft resolutions on a comprehensive test-ban treaty despite their advocacy of a mandate for the Conference on Disarmament that was inadequate from our point of view. Our hesitation this year arises over the formulation of operative paragraph 2 of L.72, which, in its prescription of work for the Conference on Disarmament, does have as its objective a comprehensive test-ban treaty but appears to dwell too much on interim measures. We have grave reservations about this approach, although the thrust of the draft resolution is in favour of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. In the separate vote on operative paragraph 2, we demonstrated precisely that, while voting in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. KUSUMO PRIYO (Indonesia): The delegation of Indonesia would like to explain its vote on draft resolution L.72, on the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. My delegation shares the view of the sponsors of that draft resolution that the achievement of a comprehensive test ban should retain the highest priority. However, as we are aware, progress has long been stymied. It

(Mr. Kusumo Priyo, Indonesia)

has been very clear that what has been lacking is the marshalling of the necessary political will to negotiate in order to bring about the early conclusion of the treaty banning nuclear tests.

Therefore, what is needed is not merely the commencement of practical work, as indicated in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, but concrete negotiations within the Conference on Disarmament. On the basis of those considerations, Indonesia abstained in the vote on draft resolution L.72 and co-sponsored draft resolution L.35.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 6, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. LUNA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to add to the remarks of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.68, on the creation of a United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America, in which we indicated our intention fully to utilize the resources, installations and facilities available at the United Nations Information Centre in Lima to get the Regional Centre started.

I would observe that in the achievement of this initial goal the Centre would require a very low-key structure in keeping with the present financial crisis.

As my delegation said when this draft resolution was introduced, the sponsors see this Centre as a project which would be relatively low-key at the outset, bearing in mind the serious financial difficulties which the United Nations is now experiencing. By this we mean that it is not our intention to promote a bureaucratic body which would have an ad hoc structure, but rather to try to utilize to the full its existing resources made available by the United Nations, including the infrastructure already present in Lima. In other words, the Regional

(Mr. Luna, Peru)

Centre in Latin America could very well serve as an example for the new efforts to make a better use of existing resources, to rationalize and to ensure cost-benefit optimization.

Concerning operative paragraph 1, which refers to the establishment of the Centre, it is important to point out that, without prejudice to the use of existing resources, particularly with regard to the United Nations infrastructure in Lima, the sponsors believe that the basic financial resources for the Centre would come from voluntary contributions made by Member States and interested organizations, governmental or non-governmental.

In specific terms, the Government of Peru would agree that United Nations staff appointed to manage the Centre would do so in accordance with criteria established with appropriate flexibility and that necessary additional secretarial staff would be provided by the Peruvian Government. The cost of rents and the maintenance of premises added to the existing Information Centre to transform it into the Regional Centre would also be covered by the Peruvian Government, whereas the overhead cost would be covered by the United Nations, as at present.

(Mr. Luna, Peru)

Peru intends to contribute two hundred thousand intis in order to launch the initial phase. Consequently, and in keeping with consultations that have been held with various delegations, the text of paragraph 1, as amended with the elimination of the word "primarily" is a better reflection of the present situation, I would therefore be grateful if the Secretariat would bring document L.68 into line with the revised version.

Finally, I should be very grateful if the draft resolution now contained in L.68/Rev.1 could be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Director of the Budget Division of the Office of Financial Services.

Mr. ANNAN: (Office of Financial Services): I should like to clarify that the funding in connection with the creation of the Centre will, as we understand it, come from voluntary contributions. As far as the activities are considered complementary to the work of the Department of Disarmament Affairs, the Secretariat would assist in the establishment of the Centre and, during the initial stages, assign staff on a periodic basis or at the initial stage to help ensure that the Centre was properly set up. Besides that involvement, and perhaps an exchange of other technical data and materials, the Centre would be financed by voluntary contributions and would not be charged to the regular budget. I understand this confusion has disturbed some members, who thought that the figures we provided in our vote in document A/C.1/41/L.77 were intended to be charged to the regular budget. That is not the case. The funding will be by voluntary sources.

The CHAIRMAN: Although this morning I announced that we would commence action this afternoon with respect to the draft resolutions in cluster 6, it is my understanding that the Committee is in a position, first, to dispose of draft

(The Chairman)

resolution A/C.1/41/68/Rev.1. just now introduced by the representative of Peru, in order to complete the consideration of draft resolutions in cluster 5.

If there is no objection, we can therefore proceed to take action on that draft resolution, there being no delegation wishing to make a statement or to explain its position before the draft resolution - a decision is taken on it. The draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.68/Rev.1 is entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly: World Disarmament Campaign: United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America". It was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November, and has the following sponsors: Argentina, the Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela. In connection with this draft resolution, I wish to draw the attention of the Committee to the note by the Secretariat contained in document A/C.1/41/L.71 and the oral clarification thereto provided by the Director of the Budget Division at the Committee's meeting this afternoon.

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.68/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position after the adoption of L.68/Rev.1.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): The United States delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution L.68/Rev.1, upon which we just joined consensus, and on L.32, both of which relate to the establishment of United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament. As representatives are aware, the United States engages in and supports regional approaches to arms limitation. In keeping with that position my delegation has been pleased to join in the consensus adoption by the First Committee of draft resolution L.32 on the Regional Centre for Peace in Lomé, and draft resolution L.68/Rev.1 on the Regional Centre for Peace in Lima.

Nevertheless, I wish to remind representatives that my Government continues to have serious concerns about the establishment of new United Nations institutions away from Headquarters.

The United States has been able to support those regional initiatives for peace because both draft resolutions indicate clearly that the two Centres will be supported solely by voluntary contributions from Member States and on the basis of existing resources. My Government takes this commitment seriously. In addition, the United States expects that the two Centres will be supported equally.

Ms. LETTS (Australia): I wish to draw attention to Australia's support for draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.68/Rev.1, on the proposal to establish a Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America. My delegation joined consensus on the draft resolution but harbours some concerns with the tendency we have noted to establish Regional Centres the functions of which would seem to duplicate those carried out at present by the Secretariat here in New York, particularly in respect of the dissemination of World Disarmament Campaign

(Ms. Letts, Australia)

materials. The idea that such Centres serve to use more efficiently non-convertible local currencies contributions to the campaign is one we support. However, if the establishment of these Centres is in the future to involve the need for additional voluntary contributions to those already made to the World Disarmament Campaign, or for funds to be diverted from the Campaign's wider activities through the act of tying pledges by certain countries, or for funds from the United Nations regular budget, my delegation would have grounds for great concern.

Our marked preference is for the World Disarmament Campaign to function in the most efficient possible way and for Campaign funds to be allocated by the Secretariat where they are most needed and are most effective. We would be concerned if significant proportions of available Campaign funds were to be channelled into duplicated administrative and overhead costs involved in the maintenance of Regional Centres.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded taking action on all draft resolutions in cluster 5.

The Committee will now take action on all draft resolutions in cluster 6 in the informal paper distributed to the Committee - draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.17/Rev.2, L.29 and L.66/Rev.1. As far as draft resolution L.26 is concerned, I have received a request to postpone action on it because of ongoing consultations.

I shall now call on those delegations that wish to comment on the draft resolutions in cluster 6.

Mr. FAN Guoxiang (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation, introduced draft resolution L.29 on 4 November. Today I should like to make a few additional comments.

First, the main point of this draft resolution is the significance of conventional disarmament, which is mentioned in reference to all spheres of disarmament. Nuclear disarmament has priority and should be given first consideration. At the same time, conventional disarmament is important also. Therefore nuclear and conventional disarmament should be carried out simultaneously and complement each other, while negotiations are under way on both.

Secondly, while carrying out conventional disarmament consideration should be given to the different circumstances in different countries.

Our draft resolution proceeds mainly from the perspective of a global view of conventional disarmament, because regional disarmament has already been proposed by other countries. Therefore in our draft resolution, though the word "regional" is used several times, regional disarmament is mentioned only once. All other references are to global disarmament.

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

Those are the additional clarifications I wanted to make.

After consultations with the various parties, very favourable comments have been made on this draft resolution by many delegations. The Chinese delegation has taken the views of the parties into consideration to the maximum possible extent. This draft resolution, on which there have been consultations among the various parties, may be compared with the earlier one. We have revised it extensively to meet the requirements of all the parties to the maximum possible extent.

We therefore hope that our draft resolution will receive the widest possible support.

Ms. L. MITS (Australia): My delegation believes that there is a pressing need to halt and reverse the conventional-arms race and therefore intends to vote in favour of both draft resolutions on conventional disarmament contained in documents A/C.1/41/L.29 and L.66/Rev.1.

My delegation believes that the high priority justifiably attached to nuclear disarmament should not preclude the need for concurrent measures in the field of conventional disarmament. Both nuclear and conventional disarmament need to be looked at in their interrelationship and their concurrent impact on global and regional security.

For example, my delegation believes that significant measures of conventional disarmament would make an important contribution to the prevention of nuclear war. Accordingly we should like to point out that the emphasis on nuclear disarmament in the fourth preambular paragraph of L.29 and operative paragraph 2 of L.66/Rev.1 have, in my delegation's view, the effect of somewhat diluting the recognition contained in both drafts of the concurrent priority that needs to be attached to conventional disarmament.

My delegation would also like to comment on the implicit endorsement given to unilateral disarmament in paragraph 4 of L.29 and its explicit endorsement in

(Ms. Letts, Australia)

operative paragraph 3 of L.66/Rev.1. We do not believe that durable measures of disarmament are likely to be achieved through unilateral action.

Australia also attaches special importance to qualitative and quantitative limitations on conventional arms transfers and to reductions in military budgets and expenditures. In this respect we fully support the endorsement given in L.66/Rev.1 of the important contribution regional initiatives can make to the realization of conventional disarmament on a regional scale, since we believe that one of the best prospects for action on limiting arms transfers occurs at the regional level.

Mr. KORSGAARD-PEDERSEN (Denmark): I should like briefly to introduce our draft resolution, A/C.1/41/L.17/Rev.2. In the course of recent days my delegation has had extensive consultations with different groups of countries. The changes in the original draft resolution are the result of those consultations, and we sincerely hope that in its present form, in document L.17/Rev.2, it will meet with the approval of all the members of this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on delegations wishing to explain their votes before the voting on draft resolutions in cluster 6: A/C.1/41/L.17/Rev.2, L.29 and L.66/Rev.1.

Mr. ALASANIA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.29 and L.66/Rev.1. In June this year, at the Budapest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty, the socialist States members of that Treaty, adopted a statement addressed to the countries members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), in which they set out a programme for the reduction of conventional weapons and forces in Europe. The aim of that programme is to reduce the danger of sudden attack, to strengthen political and military stability and to build confidence. It provides for safe verification of reductions through national measures and international measures of verification, including on-site inspection. I note in passing that inspections to be carried out beginning early in 1987 in keeping with the Stockholm agreement on confidence-building measures will make it possible to verify measures of conventional disarmament in Europe.

That proposal by the socialist countries refutes the argument according to which Western European countries would be in a disadvantageous position as a result of the programme. We have proposed a new outlook on all these questions. A given type of weapon more numerous in a given part of the world would be reduced; where the numbers are higher on the other side, the surplus would be eliminated without hesitation. The Stockholm agreement augurs well for the future and should make it possible to bring about reductions in armed forces and weapons in Europe, as well as other types of reductions, without awaiting formulation of a mandate for the Conference on Disarmament concerning reductions of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe.

(Mr. Alasania, USSR)

It would be possible, as proposed by Mikhail S. Gorbachev, to establish contacts between working groups representing NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries.

An agreement should be reached speedily on the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Central Europe. Another important proposal concerns withdrawal of all foreign forces to their own territories - obviously, on the basis of reciprocity. We would hope that in the Asian and Pacific regions reductions in weapons and armed forces could be effected.

For those reasons, the Soviet Union will support draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.29 and L.66/Rev.1.

Mr. TEJA (India): I wish to speak briefly about the draft resolution on conventional disarmament presented by China in document A/C.1/41/L.29. My delegation is gratified to note that the delegation of China has incorporated in the text of that draft resolution several changes based on the suggestions of several delegations, including my own, in the earlier text of the draft resolution, previously made available informally. Those changes have served to redress somewhat the balance between nuclear and conventional disarmament on the one hand and a global and universal, as opposed to a regional approach, on the other hand.

My delegation notes, however, that this is the first time in the history of the United Nations that a nuclear-weapon State permanent member of the Security Council has put forward a draft resolution on conventional disarmament. We should like to reiterate, in keeping with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, that the primary objective of disarmament is to end the nuclear-arms race. Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.29 and the four other draft resolutions on conventional and regional disarmament before this Committee serve in their totality to detract from the accepted priorities of disarmament.

(Mr. Teja, India)

My delegation has already expressed the view that disarmament measures, to be universally acceptable, must be comprehensive, both in technical and spatial terms. Disarmament measures must encompass all parts of the world and must include all initiatives proposed unilaterally, bilaterally or in a regional or other multilateral context. A regional disarmament agreement, by definition, is difficult to negotiate because each potential adversary will be conscious of the political and military relationship within and outside the agreement. If conventional disarmament is to be pursued in a regional context, it should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and should take into account the characteristics of each region. Such a qualification is absent in the context of the possible regional initiatives referred to in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.29.

For those reasons, my delegation will be constrained to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.29.

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation thanks the authors of document A/C.1/41/L.83, containing proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.26. These considerably improve the text of the draft resolution. If those amendments are adopted, my delegation will be able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.26. If not, Venezuela will be obliged to abstain.

We wish at the same time to point out that we are concerned about the practice of incorporating in draft resolutions to be adopted by the General Assembly documents still in draft form, as is the case of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.26, which includes as an annex draft guidelines for confidence-building measures and for the implementation of such measures on a global or regional level.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we take action on draft resolutions

A/C.1/41/L.11/Rev.2, L.29 and L.66/Rev.1, I call on the representative of Mexico to introduce the amendments contained in document A/C.1/41/L.83.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The amendments contained in document A/C.1/41/L.83 are co-sponsored by the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Nigeria and Yugoslavia. They are very simple amendments and certainly ones that could be considered self-explanatory. My introduction will therefore be very brief.

The first amendment I wish to introduce suggests that in the second preambular paragraph, the last words of which read: "of arms control and disarmament", the word "control" should be replaced by the word "limitation". That is the word that has been generally used in dealing with arms control and it is the word generally used by the Group of 21.

In the first preambular paragraph, before the word "co-operation", the word "justice" should be introduced so that the last words of the paragraph would read "promotion of international relations based on justice, co-operation and solidarity. Obviously, justice takes precedence over co-operation and solidarity.

A suggestion has been made - of a pro forma nature - that in the third preambular paragraph before the word "objective" the word "additional" should be added - "additional objective". The reason for this is quite obvious, because this is not the sole purpose but rather one among others.

In the fourth preambular paragraph, we suggest that the word "war" be replaced by the words "all wars, in particular nuclear war". That terminology stems from the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and it seems to us, therefore, that this fourth preambular paragraph should become the first, with the other paragraphs to follow accordingly:

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

placing the existing first, second and third preambular paragraphs as the second, third and fourth preambular paragraphs.

As regards the last paragraph of the draft resolution, the operative paragraph, we suggest that instead of the present text it should read:

"Notes the 'Draft guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for the implementation of such measures on a global or regional level', reproduced in the report of the Disarmament Commission (A/41/42)."

Those are still draft guidelines, but we believe that, if the Disarmament Commission turns its attention to them at its next session, they will most probably become formal guidelines. Hence that will be the time to recommend their implementation by Member States.

Mr. von STUELENAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): We have before us the proposal for an amendment which has three different elements, so to speak, of justification. There is, first, the first four paragraphs which concern language. The intention of the co-sponsors in submitting the draft resolution was to give expression to their conviction, widely shared by others, that confidence-building measures should fulfil the important purpose of preventing the outbreak of armed conflict because of a miscalculation or misinterpretation of actions of a political adversary.

When faced with the tedious task of editing the text of a draft resolution in 20 lines reproducing some important, uncontroversial findings of the Disarmament Commission running to 20 pages, we were convinced that in using the general notion of the prevention of war - and that is an example - we were faithfully reproducing the consensus as just described. We very much doubt that the use of the more

(Mr. von Stuelpnagel, Federal
Republic of Germany)

general formulation implicitly encompassing a particular case - namely, the prevention of nuclear war - could be construed as an attempt to diverge from consensus.

We actively defend the right of every sponsor of a draft resolution to seek the formulation of his text he thinks right. I have cited this case of "all wars, in particular nuclear war", because this seems to be the more important element of these four points.

Concerning paragraph 5 of the draft amendments in document A/C.1/41/L.83, here we have an arbitrary selection of order. In our text we kept strictly to the sequence of the guidelines as drafted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission. The sequence proposed to us now is an arbitrary one and has not been justified by the authors.

Despite the problems we have with the amendments in paragraphs 1 to 5, the co-sponsors are ready to accommodate the authors of document A/C.1/41/L.83. The co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.26 are ready to accept the first five paragraphs of document A/C.1/41/L.83. I should like to read out these co-sponsors: Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. We hope that might make it easier for the authors of the amendments to accept the next point, and that is the sixth preambular paragraph in our draft resolution.

(Mr. von Stuelpnagel, Federal
Republic of Germany)

What we propose is contained in the second paragraph of the draft guidelines and consensus approved by the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which states that:

"the overall thrust of the guidelines and the possibility of their widest possible implementation is not impaired by the continued existence of these alternative texts".

By that is meant the two differences which still exist. The United Nations Disarmament Commission wishes consensus to facilitate the widest possible implementation despite the existence of differences of opinion on two points.

If adopted, the amendment by Argentina, Brazil, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Nigeria and Yugoslavia would result in those draft guidelines being put into the archives and not gaining life as they should. What this Committee is doing is working for the prevention of any war, and in our opinion the heart of the prevention of war is confidence-building measures, the building of confidence between all nations. We feel that to consign this important consensus document to the archives would not be the right way to deal with it.

Mr. HOANG (Singapore): It seems that there is a problem with paragraph 6 of document A/C.1/41/L.83: the sponsors of A/C.1/41/L.26 are not able to accept the amendment it contains. Perhaps it will help if I propose a sub-amendment to that paragraph.

I should like the third line of paragraph 6, which reads "reproduced in the report of the Disarmament Commission (A/41/42)", to be replaced by the words "to all Member States with a view to their preliminary implementation".

The CHAIRMAN: In view of the statements we have just heard on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.26 and document A/C.1/41/L.83, I would ask the delegations involved kindly to continue their informal consultations, as announced at the beginning of our consideration of cluster 12, and to be good enough to report to me when they are ready to take action on the draft resolution before us and the amendments to A/C.1/41/L.26.

We shall now take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 6 which I have mentioned. If there are no objections, that is how we shall proceed. We shall have to change the order in taking decisions on cluster 6 because I have been requested to wait a few minutes before taking action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.17, the first draft listed in cluster 6, because of continuing consultations.

With the permission of the Committee, we shall begin voting on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 6. The first draft resolution ready for action is A/C.1/41/L.29.

I should like to repeat that because of the change in the order in which we are taking action, we have before us now draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.29, entitled "General and complete disarmament: Conventional disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of China at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 4 November 1986, and is sponsored by China. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, 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, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, 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 Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: India, Iraq

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.29 was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We come now to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.66/Rev.1, entitled "General and complete disarmament: conventional disarmament on a regional scale". It was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1986, and has the following sponsors: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guyana, Jamaica, Liberia, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Romania, Thailand, Togo, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

(The Chairman)

The sponsors have requested that this draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

I call on the representative of Ghana who has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. DUMEVI (Ghana): Mr. Chairman, my delegation is very sorry to interrupt the procedure at this stage, but I do not think the request for a consensus you have just conveyed to us is acceptable to my delegation. We would therefore ask for a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.66/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, 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, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, 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, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Ethiopia, Ghana, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.66/Rev.1 was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We now turn to the first draft resolution listed in cluster 6, A/C.1/41/L.17/Rev.2.

I call on the representative of Democratic Yemen, who wishes to explain his vote before the voting.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen): At the outset I should like to thank my neighbour, the representative of Denmark, for the co-operation he has extended to us throughout the consultations in which we have been engaged regarding draft resolution L.17/Rev.2.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

Having heard the request that this draft resolution be decided upon by consensus, without a vote, we do not wish to obstruct such a consensus, although we have some reservations regarding the draft resolution's contents.

We should like to stress our understanding that this draft in no way prejudices the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission or implies acceptance of all the recommendations in the study on conventional disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.17/Rev.2, entitled "General and complete disarmament: Conventional disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Denmark at the thirty-first meeting of the First Committee, on 4 November 1986. It was sponsored by Denmark, which has requested that it 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.17/Rev.2 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We come now to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.26, entitled "Review and implementation of the concluding document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly: Consideration of guidelines for confidence-building measures". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany at the 37th meeting of the First Committee, held on 10 November 1986, and is sponsored by the following delegations: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom. We also have before us a number of amendments, contained in document A/C.1/41/L.83, as well as a sub-amendment to paragraph 6 of the latter document.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The sub-amendment proposed by the representative of Singapore was put forward during informal consultations held with the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany. I said then that, unfortunately, it was not possible for the sponsors of the amendments to accept his sub-amendment. But since then, through another member of my delegation, I have consulted with six of the eight sponsors of the amendments. All have responded in the same way. We believe that our amendments, as set out in document A/C.1/41/L.83, are extremely modest, and we hope they will be put to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the representative of Singapore that the Committee take a decision on his sub-amendment to the amendment proposed in paragraph 6 of document A/C.1/41/L.83?

Mr. HONG (Singapore): I would suggest that my sub-amendment stand as originally proposed.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting on draft resolution

A/C.1/41/L.26, taking into account the proposed amendments to that draft resolution. We shall begin by taking a decision on the sub-amendment proposed orally by the representative of Singapore to paragraph 6 of document A/C.1/41/L.83, which contains amendments proposed by the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Nigeria and Yugoslavia. I would request the Committee Secretary to read out the text of that sub-amendment.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): By the sub-amendment to paragraph 6 of document A/C.1/41/L.83, the words "reproduced in the report of the Disarmament Commission (A/41/42)" would be replaced by the words "to all Member States with a view to their preliminary implementation".

The CHAIRMAN: I now put the sub-amendment to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Botswana, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Djibouti, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining: Benin, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Niger, Paraguay, Peru, Senegal, Sudan, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia

The sub-amendment was rejected by 41 votes to 40, with 15 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.26, contained in document A/C.1/41/L.83.

Mr. von STUELPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): I request that a separate vote be taken on paragraph 6 of document A/C.1/41/L.83.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall thus vote first on the amendments contained in paragraphs 1 to 5 of document A/C.1/41/L.83.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: France

Abstaining: Bahamas

Paragraphs 1 to 5 of document A/C.1/41/L.83 were adopted by 125 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on paragraph 6 of document A/C.1/41/L.83.

I call on the representative of Mexico on a point of order.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to ask the Secretariat to shed some light on two questions.

First, if an amendment that has been introduced to a paragraph of a draft resolution is rejected, does that mean that the paragraph stands as originally drafted?

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Secondly, if the amendment is not to a paragraph of a draft resolution but to another amendment - in other words, if it is a sub-amendment - does its rejection mean that the original amendment is automatically adopted?

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

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I hope that I have correctly understood the questions put by the representative of Mexico.

The sub-amendment to paragraph 6 of document A/C.1/41/L.83 - containing the amendments proposed to the draft resolution - was not adopted. Accordingly, my understanding is that the Committee would be voting on the original version of the amendment, as contained in paragraph 6 of document A/C.1/41/L.83.

The CHAIRMAN: I agree with the explanation just given by the Secretary of the Committee.

We shall therefore now take a decision on paragraph 6 of document A/C.1/41/L.83, in its original version, the sub-amendment proposed by the representative of Singapore having been rejected.

A separate, recorded vote on that paragraph has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, 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, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Comoros, Senegal, Sweden

Paragraph 6 of document A/C.1/41/L.83 was adopted by 83 votes to 31, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.26, as amended, as a whole.

I call on the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, who wishes to explain his vote before the voting.

Mr. Von STUELPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): The Committee will understand that it is not easy for me to speak in these circumstances. As I have explained before, to my delegation confidence-building measures are the very key to the prevention of war. It pains me that we should be having a battle in the First Committee on precisely the subject of confidence-building measures.

Despite the efforts that some countries have made to prevent the guidelines for confidence-building measures from being adopted in the way we think they should be adopted, we shall vote for this draft resolution because the subject-matter is so important. The text has lost a lot of its value, including its moral value, but it would be unthinkable for us not to vote in favour of a draft resolution on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.26, as amended, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, 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, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.26, as amended, as a whole, was adopted by 130 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the voting on the four draft resolutions listed in cluster 6.

Mr. LE HDAY TRUNG (Viet Nam): My delegation's affirmative votes on two of the draft resolutions concerning conventional disarmament just adopted by the Committee under cluster 6 reflects Viet Nam's firm commitment to and unswerving support for the objective of general and complete disarmament, the achievement of which will free mankind from the danger of war, in particular nuclear war. The continuing arms race, both nuclear and conventional, to which mankind has been subjected for the past 40 years, stems from the policies of domination and aggression pursued by the imperialist forces. Taking advantage of their military supremacy, these forces have carried out numerous wars of aggression to suppress the national liberation movements in various parts of the world, bringing about enormous human and material losses.

During the war of aggression against the Vietnamese people from the late 1950s to the early 1970s alone, seven million tons of bombs were dropped. That was three times the tonnage used during the Second World War on the world's battlefields, not to mention napalm and phosphorus.

One can recall that just shortly after the end of the Second World War a number of military blocs or alliances were established throughout the world to encircle and intimidate the socialist and newly independent States. To cope with the increased threat to their independence, many peoples have had to devote a large part of their scarce resources to strengthen their defence capability at the expense of their own social and economic development.

Therefore, we believe that the success of conventional disarmament requires that the arms-race policy be given up and that the principles of national

(Mr. Le Hoai Trung, Viet Nam)

independence and self-determination, as well as the non-use or threat or use of force, be respected. Negotiations and measures on the limitation and gradual reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments should be undertaken within the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament the highest priority of which is accorded to effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war. Taking into account the need of all States to protect their security and the inalienable right of peoples to struggle for national independence and self-determination, these negotiations should be conducted with particular emphasis on the armed forces and conventional armaments of the militarily significant States, especially the nuclear weapon States. Regional conventional disarmament measures cannot play their potentially useful role of strengthening peace and stability in the regions concerned without being incorporated in a political process and without any outside threat being removed.

As the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.66/Rev.1 fails to address those two essential requirements, Viet Nam cannot yet go along with its text.

Mr. TEJA (India): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/41/L.17/Rev.2 and A/C.1/41/L.66/Rev.1.

With regard to L.17/Rev.2 we supported the consensus on this draft resolution on conventional disarmament on the basis of our understanding that the present agenda of the Disarmament Commission can accommodate the request contained in its operative paragraph 2, and that there is no need to inscribe this as a separate agenda item in the Commission.

(Mr. Teja, India)

As for L.66 Rev.1, we supported this draft resolution in view of the amendment made in incorporating operative paragraph 2 in the revised version, which reiterates the primary responsibility of the militarily significant States, especially the nuclear-weapons States, for halting and reversing the arms race, and the priority assigned to nuclear disarmament. We continue, however, to have reservations in discussing conventional disarmament in the regional context alone.

Mr. SALLES (Brazil): I wish to address the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/41/L.29 and L.66/Rev.1. My delegation was able to cast an affirmative vote on those draft resolutions, thanks to the co-operative attitude displayed by their sponsors, respectively the delegations of China and Peru. I should like to express our gratitude for their flexibility and goodwill in incorporating suggestions and amending their proposals in order to accommodate other delegations' concerns, including my own. I am convinced that the current version of their drafts reflects a more satisfactory degree of agreement on the issues involved.

Having said that, I should like to state my Government's views regarding the question of conventional disarmament in general, on which a larger number of draft resolutions were introduced this year than in previous years. As my delegation has repeatedly stated in this Committee and in other relevant forums, conventional disarmament measures and agreements should parallel progress in other fields, in accordance with the priorities unambiguously established by consensus in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, and the special responsibilities the nuclear-weapon States, together with other militarily significant States, have for halting and reversing the arms race and for nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Salles, Brazil)

It should be recalled that the Final Document, as far as conventional disarmament itself is concerned, laid down some basic principles, which it is useful to repeat. Negotiations in this area should be: first, carried out together with negotiations on nuclear disarmament; secondly, balanced and equitable; thirdly, based on the undiminished security of States; and fourthly, conducted with particular emphasis on the armed forces and conventional weapons of nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States.

As other delegations have already pointed out, the study on conventional disarmament, carried out under the auspices of the United Nations, clearly states that:

"Conventional disarmament in isolation would perpetuate existing asymmetries in the security of States in favour of those States which possess nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction." (A/39/348, para. 39)

(Mr. Salles, Brazil)

Furthermore, the same study emphasizes that about 70 per cent of the world's military expenditure can be attributed to six main military spenders - that is, the five nuclear-weapon States and one other militarily significant State. Thus it becomes clear that conventional disarmament cannot be pursued per se. In addition, it must be conducted first in the regions where there are the heaviest concentrations of arsenals and by those States most heavily armed. Otherwise, we would be preaching disarmament to the unarmed and acting in breach of the principle that no individual State or group of States should obtain advantages over others at any stage in the disarmament process.

Finally, conventional disarmament is first and foremost a global task which, in the view of my delegation, is to be pursued without ever losing sight of the realities with which we have to live, among them the overwhelming size, reach and might of the arsenals of the nuclear-weapon Powers and other militarily significant countries. Regional approaches may thus be of help to the disarmament process provided that they are freely agreed upon and worked out by the parties directly concerned if, and when, pursued in conjunction with the global task to which I have just referred, not the other way round.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): This explanation of vote is in connection with L.29. The United States welcomes the great attention to conventional disarmament embodied in resolutions L.17/Rev.2 and L.29. In voting for the draft resolution sponsored by the People's Republic of China, L.29, my delegation wishes to underscore two points:

First, this draft resolution maintains that real progress in the field of nuclear disarmament could create conditions for similar progress in the conventional arms field. My delegation believes that it is essential to point out that it remains critical for the conventional-force imbalance in Europe to be

(Mr. Lowitz, United States)

redressed as progress on nuclear weapons reduction is made. Were it not for the considerable conventional force advantage of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, the need for reliance upon nuclear weapons could be less.

Secondly, my delegation points out, with reference to operative paragraph 3, that member States of the NATO Alliance are engaged in the mutual balanced force reduction negotiations (MBFR), have been pursuing these negotiations in earnest, and have reaffirmed their position in the 6 November 1986 declaration of Foreign Ministers of NATO Governments in the MBFR negotiations as follows:

"We reaffirm our determination as set out in the Halifax statement of 30 May 1986 to achieve early agreement in MBFR. In line with the positive perspective recently noted in other arms-control talks, we continue to attach the highest importance to the task addressed by the MBFR negotiations. We hope that the East will demonstrate that it can match us in openness and imagination in the conclusion of an agreement which can give encouragement to the peoples of both East and West."

Mr. CLERCKX (Belgium) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to explain its vote on resolution L.66/Rev.1. My delegation welcomes the fact that a certain number of countries have again this year submitted draft resolutions that highlight the concept of disarmament at the regional scale and recall the initiatives that could be undertaken in this respect, especially with regard to conventional disarmament. During the fortieth session of the General Assembly my delegation stressed its keen satisfaction over the adoption of the draft resolution then submitted by Peru, and I should like to repeat it here.

As members know, my country has for many years been dedicated to promoting a regional approach to disarmament questions. It will be recalled that on several

(Mr. Clerckx, Belgium)

occasions the General Assembly adopted unanimously draft resolutions to this end that had been sponsored by Belgium.

Draft resolution L.66/Rev.1, submitted by Peru, illustrates significantly the large extent of the potential field of action for regional disarmament. My delegation voted for that draft resolution. We welcome the fact that the question here will once again be on the agenda of the next session of the General Assembly. However, in the version submitted to the vote in L.66/Rev.1, we find in operative paragraph 2 statements placing the responsibility in halting the arms race on the militarily significant States, in particular the nuclear-weapon States, as defined by the resolution, and statements regarding the priority assigned to nuclear disarmament - which my delegation could not fully endorse.

In order to avoid any misunderstanding, my delegation would like to make it clear that on those two points it prefers the precise language found to this end in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Aside from that comment, my delegation supports fully draft resolution L.66/Rev.1, just as it has supported the other draft resolutions in this area.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): My delegation was glad to support draft resolution L.29, adopted by the Committee earlier. The United Kingdom welcomes the increased emphasis given at this year's session of the First Committee to the problems of the conventional-arms race and the possibilities for balanced and verifiable measures of conventional disarmament in this and other draft resolutions that have been adopted, as well as in the statements made.

We hope that this represents the start of a concerted effort by the States Members of the United Nations to accord to this vital issue the attention it merits. The countries that form the alliance to which my country belongs have

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

pledged collectively never to use any of their weapons except in self-defence. The countries of the alliance consider that collective security, as provided for by Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, is the best means available for their defence.

Mr. DARMOSUTANTO (Indonesia): I should like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution L.17/Rev.2, just adopted by consensus. My delegation's position on the issue of conventional disarmament has been stated in the past and it is clear. I would further recall that Indonesia had the honour to participate in the Group of Experts that assisted the Secretary-General in carrying out the study on conventional disarmament. Reflecting Indonesia's concurrence in the findings and recommendations contained in that study, my delegation supported last year's resolution 40/94 C.

(Mr. Darmosutanto, Indonesia)

This year, however, the substance of draft resolution L.17/Rev.2 is different from that of last year's and, consequently, it poses some difficulties to my delegation, particularly as regards operative paragraph 2. If the intent of this paragraph is to suggest that the question of conventional disarmament be dealt with as a separate item on the agenda of the Disarmament Commission, my delegation would not be able to agree, as this would not be in conformity with the Commission's ongoing work under its agenda item 4.

It should be recalled that the Commission's report on its 1986 session has clearly called for the continuation of efforts with a view to reaching agreement on a complete set of recommendations relating to agenda item 4. It is on the basis of this understanding that my delegation has joined in the consensus.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to explain its vote in favour of the draft resolutions we have just considered, which deal with conventional disarmament, including conventional disarmament on a regional scale.

My country recognizes the importance of conventional disarmament in this context, that is, as part of a process leading to general and complete disarmament. My country believes that, as provided for in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the achievement of progress in the field of conventional disarmament would be facilitated by real progress in the field of nuclear disarmament.

Nuclear-disarmament measures have the highest priority and urgency today, as do measures aimed at preventing an extension of the arms race into outer space. In our view, conventional disarmament cannot be regarded separately from those priorities.

(Mr. Nufez Monquera, Cuba)

At the regional level, it is absolutely necessary to take into account the characteristics of each region. It is necessary to bring about the ending of acts of hostility and aggression against developing countries and military manoeuvres of a threatening and intimidating nature directed against those countries, the dismantlement of foreign military bases, the elimination of the colonial situations that still persist, the halting of coercive economic measures engaged in for political reasons and the cessation of hostile or aggressive actions of any kind, military, political or economic, which represent a significant obstacle to the adoption of conventional-disarmament measures in certain regions and which force the developing countries to make considerable investments to ensure their defence.

We cannot speak of conventional disarmament for the developing countries which are suffering from these situations, any more than we can speak of measures aimed at encouraging confidence-building, as long as these situations persist. In the specific case of Cuba, as we have already pointed out, we shall not renounce our sovereign right to defend ourselves with the weapons that seem to us necessary as long as the United States policy of hostility towards our country continues to exist, as long as the economic and trade blockade imposed on us continues, as long as provocations and intelligence flights continue and as long as part of our territory, against the will of our people, continues to be usurped, along with a military base which directly affects us.

For these reasons, and because of the threats we have to face, we have the right not only to refrain from disarming but to step up our defence capability to defend what we have achieved. On this understanding, we voted in favour of these draft resolutions.

Mr. ALASANIA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.26, the Soviet delegation wishes to draw the attention of representatives to the important provision that

(Mr. Alasania, USSR)

reflects the degree of consent achieved this year in the United Nations Disarmament Commission in the course of its work on these principles. Specifically I have in mind here the following provision contained in the report of the Disarmament Commission:

It is understood that Member States reserved their final assent to the guidelines until such time as they are completed and can be assessed in their entirety." (A/41/42, p. 26)

In the light of this, the Soviet delegation voted in favour of draft resolution L.26, as amended.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.29, L.66/Rev.1 and L.26, which rightly give increased attention to conventional disarmament. We should like to make the following clarifications with regard to our position.

Concerning draft resolution L.29, we believe that the responsibility in the process of conventional arms reduction devolves on each State as such. The wording of operative paragraph 3, in our view, would have been more appropriate if it had avoided formal mention of the two major military alliances. Direct responsibility for negotiations, in our view, should first and foremost devolve on the States themselves.

On the other hand, with regard to L.66/Rev.1, we believe that the emphasis placed in operative paragraph 2 on priority for nuclear disarmament does not reflect the balance achieved in the drafting of the Final Document that is quoted.

Finally, we associate ourselves with the consensus reached with regard to L.26, but this does not mean our acceptance of the full wording of the text and in particular of the wording of the fourth preambular paragraph, as amended. In these circumstances my delegation, which had co-sponsored the initial text, is obliged to withdraw it from the text as amended.

Mr. SISOUVONG (Lao People's Democratic Republic): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.29 because of the Lao Government's well-known commitment to regional and international peace and security. We know that without peace and security no country could successfully carry out its economic and social development projects. A portion of the astronomical sums that the world is spending today on armed forces and conventional weapons could easily alleviate the sufferings of a great number of women, children and elderly persons in developing countries.

(Mr. Sisouvang, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

The thrust of this draft resolution is actually aimed at attaining this noble goal. It is our earnest hope that all countries will adhere fully and in good faith to the letter and spirit of this draft resolution. No State with the largest or a major military arsenal should resort to the use of force in violation of the United Nations Charter and of international law, against other countries whose independent policy of economic and social development it dislikes.

Mr. GERMANN (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.29 and L.66/Rev.1. We voted in favour of those draft resolutions on the understanding that neither exclusive emphasis on nuclear disarmament nor denial of the nuclear problem, and exclusive preoccupation with conventional disarmament, would be appropriate and that both have to be looked at in their interrelationship and how they impinge jointly on the security situation both globally and in individual regions. Nuclear and conventional disarmament measures are both needed and must be equally applied as the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has correctly recognized in paragraphs 20, 22 and 81. Accordingly, the emphasis on nuclear disarmament introduced in the fourth preambular paragraph of the Chinese draft resolution and in operative paragraph 2 of L.66/Rev.1 has to be interpreted in the broader context of war prevention and disarmament, recognizing that:

"Together with negotiations on nuclear disarmament measures, negotiations should be carried out on the balanced reduction of armed forces and of conventional armaments, based on the principle of undiminished security of the parties with a view to promoting or enhancing stability at a lower military level, taking into account the need of all States to protect their security."

(S-10/2, para. 24)

(Mr. Germann, Federal Republic
Germany)

It is with this understanding that my delegation fully supports draft resolutions L.29 and L.66/Rev.1.

Mr. van SCHAIK (Netherlands): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.26 on the guidelines for confidence-building measures. I must say that I share the feelings of my German colleague and I regret that in fact it has not been possible to agree on stronger language as to the operative paragraph related to the draft guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures. We do hope, however, that all delegations will seriously take into account these draft guidelines and that the policies to be pursued by Governments will be based on the draft guidelines as they have been outlined.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to explain its vote, I shall now call on the representative of the United States, to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.43/Rev.1, now before the Committee.

Mr. CORDEN (United States of America): My delegation deeply appreciates the strong support that has been demonstrated for draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.43, entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements". I am pleased to welcome the addition of the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan as sponsors of this draft resolution.

My delegation takes special note of the revised text of this draft resolution, which has now been circulated in its provisional form, A/C.1/41/L.43/Rev.1. I am very pleased to welcome the sponsorship of Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and Poland of this revised version.

I should like to draw the Committee's attention to a new preambular paragraph which appears as the eighth preambular paragraph and which reads as follows:

(Mr. Corden, United States)

"Recognizing in this context that, inter alia, full confidence in compliance with existing agreements can enhance the negotiations of arms limitation and disarmament agreements."

Unfortunately, this paragraph has inadvertently been placed in the wrong position. In the final printing of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.43/Rev.1, this paragraph will appear as the sixth preambular paragraph.

I also wish to point out that in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 the opening words have been transposed. Operative paragraph 1 now begins with the words "Urges all States parties", and operative paragraph 2 begins with the words "Calls upon all Member States". This change serves to illustrate the importance that we all attach to the complementary urgencies of complying with arms control agreements and resolving matters that call compliance into question. It is reassuring to know that these indispensable elements are so widely accepted and wholeheartedly advocated.

A consensus draft resolution would provide an important step towards the strengthening of world peace and security, and my delegation hopes that such a consensus can be achieved for draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.43/Rev.1.

Mr. PAVLOVSKY (Czechoslovakia): Our delegation appreciates the agreement reached on the joint draft resolution on the question of "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements", contained in document A/C.1/41/L.43/Rev.1. This draft is the result of difficult but fruitful discussions that we had this week. We are fully aware of the complexity of the issues involved. We are convinced that strict compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements is a matter of the highest priority, and the strengthening of confidence with such a compliance can significantly improve prospects for meaningful and far-reaching negotiations on disarmament. We furthermore believe that once the United Nations

(Mr. Pavlovsky, Czechoslovakia)

It is constructively to consider the question of compliance it has to be done in a balanced, rational and truly multilateral manner. Only in this way can the consideration of this issue serve the objectives of disarmament and the reaching of new agreements, which are necessary in the nuclear and space age.

It was with these goals in mind that our delegation submitted draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.2, which was later sponsored by several other delegations. In view of the agreement we have achieved together with the leading sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.42, we have decided that draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.2 should not be put to the vote.

(Mr. Pavlovsky, Czechoslovakia)

Consequently, the delegations of the German Democratic Republic, Poland and Czechoslovakia join the sponsors of the present draft resolution L.43/Rev.1. We are aware that the joint draft resolution now before us is not perfect. It nevertheless represents a rational, balanced and positive approach to the very important issue of compliance. We sincerely thank the delegation of the United States of America, which displayed a very serious desire and exerted a genuine effort to reach a consensus on the text we now before us.

I should also like to extend our gratitude to the delegations of Mexico, India, Yugoslavia and other countries for their encouragement and their contribution to the agreement. It is our firm belief that the revised draft resolution should be adopted without a vote, and we call upon all delegations to give it their support.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning, I should like to inform members of the Committee that I have been approached by a number of delegations that have pointed out that setting aside some time tomorrow afternoon would facilitate the process of consultations on the remaining draft resolutions. I am willing to consider this suggestion favourably because I take into account the importance of further informal consultations in speeding up the process of taking action on those remaining draft resolutions.

Therefore, we shall hold only one meeting tomorrow. I intend to consider tomorrow morning the following draft resolutions under cluster 12: A/C.1/41/L.46/Rev.1, L.51, L.53/Rev.1, L.69/Rev.1 and the draft resolution contained in document A/41/2, on the Indian Ocean; under cluster 9, A/C.1/41/L.3 and L.52, the decision proposed by the Chairman, contained in document A/C.1/41/L.78 and L.43/Rev.1.

(The Chairman)

I appeal to representatives to be as prompt as possible tomorrow morning, since we shall start the meeting punctually. We have a number of important draft resolutions before us, and we should meet our target at the end of our meeting tomorrow morning on all the draft resolutions I have just mentioned.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.