



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 40th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEMS 46, 50, 55, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63 AND 141 (continued)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/38/PV.40
22 December 1983
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46, 50, 55, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63 AND 141 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: This morning we shall begin to take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 11, that is to say, draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.22, L.44 and L.49. After that, we shall proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 12. However, I have been informed that consultations are still going on concerning draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.61/Rev.1, so we will defer that until later. We hope to be able to complete today our action on all the draft resolutions which have been submitted under disarmament items.

After cluster 12, we shall proceed to take action with regard to clusters 13, 14 and 9. After that we shall take up those resolutions from the previous clusters which we have not acted upon, that is, A/C.1/38/L.31/Rev.1, L.67/Rev.2 and L.68/Rev.2. We also have to act on A/C.1/38/L.8/Rev.1.

The Secretary of the Committee wishes to make a statement.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The following are to be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.36/Rev.1: Bangladesh, Hungary, Pakistan Sudan and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall proceed to take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 11. Are there any delegations which wish to speak to the draft resolutions listed under that cluster, that is, A/C.1/38/L.22, L.44 and L.49? If not, I shall now call on the representative of Brazil, who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

Mr. SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): I would like briefly to explain our vote on L.44 and L.49. Over the years, Brazil has advocated the principle that concrete measures for the reduction of military budgets should be taken, first and foremost, by the nuclear-weapon Powers whose vast military expenditures, which seem to be entering a new phase of the arms race, account for almost 90 per cent of the overall resources diverted to armaments. Such resources would undeniably be put to far better use if they were reallocated for economic and social development, and in particular, for the benefit of developing countries.

Bearing these considerations in mind, the Brazilian delegation will adhere to the consensus on draft resolution L.44, as it has done with similar texts before. However, it is not in a position to support draft resolution L.49, for it does not,

(Mr. Souza e Silva, Brazil)

in our view, stress the special responsibility which the nuclear-weapon States bear in this field.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly will now take decisions on the three draft resolutions in cluster 11.

The first of these is draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.22, which was introduced by the representative of Austria at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Colombia, Ecuador, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Sudan and Sweden. The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.22.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chad, Chile, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia

Against: None

Abstaining: Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.22 was adopted by 77 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.*

* Subsequently the delegations of Bangladesh, Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Malawi, Malaysia, Rwanda and Togo advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Guyana had intended to abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.44. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee, on 15 November. It is sponsored by the following countries: Austria, Bangladesh, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, Ireland, Malta, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sudan, Sweden and Uruguay.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.44, entitled "Reduction of Military Budgets" have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.44.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49, the financial implications of which are set out in document A/C.1/38/L.74. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 17 November. It is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Italy, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Romania, Sudan, Sweden and Uruguay.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia

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

Abstaining: Angola, Argentina, Brazil, China, Honduras, India, Mozambique, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49 was adopted by 78 votes to 12, with 8 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

MR. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): As in previous years on similar draft resolutions, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49, relating to the reduction of military budgets, since it considers that the subject dealt with in this draft resolution and the goals it seeks to achieve deserve our attention.

In connection with paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, which recommends all member States to report annually, by using the reporting instrument, by 30 April to the Secretary-General their military expenditures of the latest fiscal year for which data are available. I would like to point out that my delegation continues to believe that this draft resolution can be useful and effective only if all members of the international community participate in it, primarily the leading Powers and other militarily significant States.

Mr. BATSANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.22, concerning measures to provide objective information on military capabilities. The Soviet Union has frequently stated that during the disarmament process the exchange of information on arms and armed forces not only is not excluded but would be desirable and would be possible in a general climate of international confidence. This has been our experience, in particular, in preparing and concluding other agreements on disarmament measures. The only condition is that such exchange of information be directly linked to concrete disarmament measures, not some sort of separate, preliminary step as, in fact, is provided for in draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.22.

The reason for the absence of any progress in the limitation of weapons is not the lack of sufficient military information but rather the fact that in recent

* Subsequently the delegations of Bangladesh, Cameroon, Colombia, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Malawi, Malaysia and Togo advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Congo had intended to abstain.

(Mr. Batsanov, USSR)

years leading Western countries, above all the United States, have embarked on a course of unprecedented arms build-up with the objective of disturbing the existing military equilibrium and achieving superiority for themselves.

The absence of the political will on the part of the United States and other countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to end the arms race and their lack of any desire to achieve a mutually acceptable agreement on the basis of equality and equal security cannot be compensated for by a flow of information on weapons or military forces, by any kind of study on the comparability of military information or by any other such things.

For these reasons, the Soviet Union does not consider that the adoption of special measures to increase exchanges of military information would serve any useful purpose, and it sees no reason why a United Nations body - in this case, the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies - should be involved in this process.

Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands): The Netherlands chose not to stand in the way of the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.44 and voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49. We did so, however, with more reluctance than ever before on such draft resolutions. If draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.44 had been put to the vote, my delegation would have abstained.

The Netherlands still shares the view of those who hold that the gradual reduction of military budgets on a mutually agreed basis is an objective that merits serious consideration as one possible measure, among others, towards general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. For such a measure to be meaningful, however, it should be adequately verifiable. Agreed measures on the reduction of military expenditures should not be open to easy circumvention by one State through a simple book-keeping operation that would pass unnoticed within the overall budget of that State.

It is for that reason that the Netherlands has always made a constructive contribution to the efforts of Sweden and others to promote the creation of a system that would make the comparison of military budgets easier and thereby lay the foundation for any attempt to verify agreed measures to reduce military expenditures in the future. The establishment of such a system would at the same time constitute an important confidence-building measure, in that it would provide transparency and avoid mutual misconceptions between States about their security-related intentions.

We profoundly regret, however, that one particular group of States - among

(Mr. Ramaker, Netherlands)

which is Romania itself, a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.44 - does not take this exercise seriously and continues to refuse to carry out the recommendation made in resolution 35/142 B that they report their military expenditures.

Consequently, already last year the Netherlands did not wish to be among the sponsors of a call for a further study in this field such as that contained in draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49 this year. We regret to note that the negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49 cast by the group of countries concerned shows once more that those countries are not seriously considering ways and means that could open up the way to reductions in military budgets, but only pay lip-service to that valuable idea.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I wish to explain the reasons why my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49 and joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.44. Draft resolution L.44 requests the Disarmament Commission to continue its consideration of the reduction of military budgets, with a view to identifying and elaborating the principles which should govern the further action of States in that field. Whilst my delegation has participated in these efforts, we are firmly of the view that principles alone cannot build confidence. For this reason, we have consistently advocated the completion of the reporting instrument by a larger number of State from different geographical regions of the world and with different budgetary and accounting systems.

The United Kingdom has frequently stressed the importance of this point and welcomes operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49, which emphasizes it. We believe that a systematic reporting of military budgets can do much to strengthen international confidence by contributing to greater transparency in military matters and that, indeed, without a generally accepted procedure for the comparison of military expenditures it would be most difficult to arrive at balanced and verifiable agreements to restrain and reduce such expenditures.

Thus, it is with disappointment that my delegation has again noted that so far no party to the Warsaw Pact has supported this attempt to increase trust and confidence by completing the reporting instrument. My delegation last year expressed its reservations with regard to the study proposed in paragraph 5 of resolution 37/95 B and referred to in paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49. My delegation believes that further work on the question of

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

comparing and verifying military expenditure is necessary, but the fact that only 10 States, all with similar budgetary and accounting systems, have expressed their willingness to participate in the exercise proposed in paragraph 5 of resolution 37/95 B leads us to consider that unless there is a wider and more balanced participation it will be difficult to justify carrying out the proposed study on the scale indicated by the statement of 4 November by the Chairman of the Group of Experts on the Reduction of Military Budgets.

If it is none the less decided to go ahead with the study, my delegation believes that the additional resources and financial support needed to carry it out should be found within the level of resources already proposed for the biennium 1984-1985.

Mr. SHARMA (India): India abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.22 because we consider that progress in disarmament is a matter of the exercise of political will by the major Powers and that a lack of progress cannot be attributable to the lack of information on military expenditure or to the absence of an adequate format for collecting such information.

Secondly, India abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49 and, while we did not stand in the way of the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.44, we would have abstained on it had a vote been taken. We took this position because, in our view, since it is the five or six militarily significant States which account for more than 80 per cent of the world's military expenditure, it is they which must take the lead in cutting military expenditure. We cannot endorse the premise that rising military expenditure is a phenomenon for which all States are somehow responsible. So long as there is a lack of political will on the part of the major Powers to stop and reverse the arms race, particularly in the field of nuclear weapons, exercises such as the one endorsed in draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49 would merely serve to deflect attention from the principal political issue in disarmament.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): The United States delegation was pleased to support draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49 calling for openness in reporting military expenditures and for wider adherence to the reporting of military expenditures using the standardized United Nations format.

We also joined in the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.44 on the reduction of military budgets. However, my Government has certain reservations regarding this draft resolution.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

Before expressing them, I should like briefly to discuss draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49. The United States fully supports the basic point of that draft resolution, namely, that greater openness in reporting on military budgets is an essential part of efforts to create conditions which might allow for negotiations on the reduction of military expenditures. One of the major achievements in this field has been the elaboration and adoption of an international system for standardized reporting of military expenditures, as well as current efforts to work out problems of comparability on national budgets. The United States has contributed actively over the past decade in this area, and since the institution of a standardized reporting system has provided, along with 22 other States, data on military spending. It is clear that if any agreement on the reduction of military expenditures is to become more than a theoretical possibility it is absolutely essential to have available data on national military budgets of States and a method for establishing the comparability of such data.

In this connection we are pleased to note that draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49 underscores the need for wide participation in the reporting system by States from different regions and representing different budgeting systems. We are gratified at the progress made so far in this important area, but it is evident that much more has yet to be done.

We believe draft that resolutions such as A/C.1/38/L.49 can give an important impetus to progress in this important area of endeavour.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.44, we note with interest the fact that it acknowledges many activities carried out in this field. My delegation understands this reference to include precisely those activities we mentioned earlier, namely, participation in the reporting system and in the efforts aimed at resolving problems associated with the evaluation of data reported.

Mr. KRUTZCH (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic voted against draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49. My country firmly believes that, with the necessary political will of States, results in the field of the reduction of military budgets can be achieved within a relatively short period of time if the conduct of relevant negotiations is being envisaged.

Regrettably, draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49 replaces negotiations on reductions by the reporting, comparing and verifying of military expenditures. As was stated in the working paper submitted by the German Democratic Republic and other States to the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1983 session,

(Mr. Krutzsch, German Democratic Republic)

those demands for openness and transparency of military expenditures only distract attention from effective disarmament measures in this field. Agreements on a freeze or on reductions of military budgets, respectively, can be reached when negotiations are not further prevented by insistence on previous agreement on reporting, comparing and verifying. In the framework of the elaboration of an agreement on the reduction of military budgets, the German Democratic Republic, like other States, will be no less interested to ensure that all parties to an agreement on a freeze or on the reduction of military expenditures have assurances of its observance.

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49 is nevertheless not of a kind to contribute towards making progress in the field of reducing military budgets, and therefore we could not support it.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.44 in spite of some reservations on certain points. It did so also in order to take account of the fact that Romania, which is a sponsor of this draft resolution, is also a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49 and that, consequently, the views expressed in that draft resolution are also those of the Romanian delegation. We note in particular in this connection that it is therefore subscribing to the positions expressed in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.49 concerning the widest possible participation in the international system of standardized reporting of military expenditures.

We hope that Romania will itself participate in this system.

With regard to the arguments tending to reduced what we consider to be the key importance of comparability, we must insist on its fundamental character. The presentation of military budgets by the various States differs widely and this makes it impossible to draw any valid conclusions. As an example, I would point out the comparison that could be made by means of the parallel established, between the military budget of the Soviet Union and that of France. In their present presentation, such comparison leads to a total absence of valid conclusions.

I endorse the observations just made on this subject, in particular by the delegations of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The CHAIRMAN: That completes the Committee's work on the draft resolutions in cluster 11.

We shall now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 12 - draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.33/Rev.1, to L.40 and L.46.

(The Chairman)

As I said earlier, draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.61/Rev.1 will be deferred for consideration this afternoon, as consultations are still going on in order to seek agreement between the various interested parties.

I shall call on the delegation of the Netherlands, which wishes to explain its position.

Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands): In spite of the fact that, as far as we know, draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.40, on the World Disarmament Campaign, could be adopted by consensus, I wish to make clear the position of the Netherlands.

My country objects to the prominence given in this draft resolution to the idea of pledging conferences, both past and future. As my delegation tried to make clear during this year's pledging conference, my Government believes that too much emphasis on pledging conferences like this one might erroneously suggest that the success of the World Disarmament Campaign depended merely on raising the necessary funds. The Netherlands does not think that is so. It holds the opinion that what, in fact, is more needed is the pledge to an unconditional commitment in no way to impede the unqualified free flow of information. We are afraid that too much emphasis on the idea of pledging conferences might hide the fact that in many countries, even those with enough money for a successful campaign, information is not allowed to flow freely. Only if and when the barriers to such an unqualified free flow of information are removed will the World Disarmament Campaign be successful, as my Government sincerely hopes it will be.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall first take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.33/Rev.1.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 17 November, and the co-sponsors are: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, India, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark,

Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Democratic Kampuchea, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.33/Rev.1 was adopted by 107 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.40, which was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 32nd meeting of the Committee, on 15 November. It is sponsored by the following countries: Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Mexico, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

The sponsors have expressed the wish that the draft resolution should be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.40.

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.40 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.46. This resolution was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 32nd meeting of the Committee, on 15 November, and is sponsored by Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Romania and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi,

Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, 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 Cameroon, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Brazil

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.46 was adopted by 88 votes to 1, with 30 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I wish to explain why my delegation was unable to support resolution A/C.1/38/L.46, which the Committee has just adopted.

The United Kingdom welcomes the successful beginning of the implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign, which should complement the extensive information programmes of this kind already taking place in the United Kingdom and other European countries. We support the guidelines for the Campaign agreed at the second special session of the General Assembly on Disarmament, and we joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.40.

We regret that it has been thought necessary to introduce another draft resolution on this topic, of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.46, especially as we cannot support it. Operative paragraph 2, which talks of Member States avoiding "dissemination of false and tendentious information", is an open invitation to censorship. Who is to be the judge of what is "false and tendentious" and what is

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

accurate"? In the United Kingdom we have a long-standing tradition of, and belief in, freedom of speech, even when that freedom leads to expression or propagation of ideas that some of us may not approve of. When the subject is as important as that of disarmament we believe that every facet of it should be fully explored and should be the subject of public debate. We would never be party to the suppression of the free exchange of ideas, which this draft resolution clearly implies.

Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): The Soviet delegation joined other delegations in voting for draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.40, and we should like to explain how we understand paragraph 4 and its implementation.

In accordance with his report in document A/38/349, and in particular paragraph 13, the Secretary-General will consult donor countries about concrete measures for a Campaign in their countries financed by their contributions.

Miss BOYD (Australia): I should like to explain Australia's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.46, "World Disarmament Campaign: actions and activities", and A/C.1/38/L.33/Rev.1, "Disarmament Week", both of which the Committee has just adopted.

In voting for draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.46 we have taken it at its face value. Australia applauds the dissemination of accurate information and believes that no State should disseminate false or tendentious information about disarmament issues or indeed about any matter.

In saying that, of course, Australia in no way endorses State censorship or centralized control of information available to citizens. On the contrary, we favour and shall fight for freedom of information, including information about official decisions and statements, whether they are tendentious or otherwise.

We have supported the World Disarmament Campaign and at the recent Pledging Conference contributed \$30,000 to it. We have co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/38/L.61, on peace and disarmament movements. We believe that appropriate activities carried out at the national and regional levels are important aspects of the campaign, which cannot be limited to events organized within the framework of the United Nations alone.

I turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.33/Rev.1, on Disarmament Week. Australia has always been an active supporter of Disarmament Week and has furnished annually to the Secretary-General details of activities which have taken place in my country to mark that Week. We would have hoped that the sponsors of this draft resolution could once again draft a text capable of being adopted by consensus. We

(Miss Boyd, Australia)

regret, therefore, the inclusion of operative paragraph 4 in this draft resolution. That paragraph calls on the International Atomic Energy Agency, in particular, to undertake activities which are outside the scope of its statute. It is for that reason that Australia is, regrettably, unable to give the draft resolution its full support.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation has shared in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.40 because the Federal Republic of Germany has consistently supported the underlying idea of the World Disarmament Campaign. It considers it essential that not only Governments but also the peoples of the world recognize and understand the problems of disarmament and security, and that balanced, fully objective information on disarmament be given the widest possible dissemination among the general public, world-wide and nationally. The World Disarmament Campaign, in the framework of the United Nations, is a particularly suitable instrument for achieving that worthy goal. It therefore deserves the support of the General Assembly.

My delegation has, however, reservations concerning operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. That paragraph provides for another pledging conference, to be held next year. In the first place, my delegation has doubts as to whether such a conference is the best means available to elicit maximum contributions for the Campaign. Secondly, and more importantly, the objectives of the World Disarmament Campaign depend, in our view, much less on funds - many of them in currencies of very restricted international usefulness - than on the promotion of a free, unencumbered flow of information, especially by countries that still exclude their citizens from sharing freely in the broad information process on political issues.

Mr. SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.46, as it did at the thirty-sixth session on the text that became resolution 36/92 J, on the proposed action for collecting signatures. We remain convinced that activities such as collecting signatures do not conform to the function and purpose of the United Nations.

Mr. MORRISON (Canada): The Canadian delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.33/Rev.1, entitled "Disarmament Week".

Canada voted in favour of that draft resolution, as we strongly support Disarmament Week. Many Canadians participate actively in its observance across our country. At the same time, however, Canada wishes to state its expectation that those agencies involved in implementing paragraph 4 will take particular care to

(Mr. Morrison, Canada)

remain within their mandates. To do otherwise is, as we have seen all too often recently, to risk undermining the division of labour on which the United Nations system is predicated - a move which can only be detrimental to us all.

Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic supported the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/38/L.40. As regards the statements contained in operative paragraph 4, it is our understanding that the Secretary-General's power to take decisions within the framework of the Campaign is based on the United Nations Charter; the Final Document of the General Assembly's first special session devoted to disarmament, particularly the priority tasks set out in that Document; and the United Nations resolutions adopted in order to carry out those tasks, especially with a view to preventing nuclear war and achieving nuclear disarmament.

Mr. de LA GROCE (France) (interpretation from French): The delegation of France abstained in the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.33/Rev.1 and A/C.1/38/L.46. We should like very briefly to explain the reasons for those abstentions.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.33/Rev.1, we have serious reservations on paragraph 4, which invites the specialized agencies to disseminate information on the consequences of the arms race. Some of these agencies may have certain lateral competence on some aspects of disarmament issues, but we believe that inviting them to expand their activities in this sphere would be contrary to the reasonable balance of responsibilities and competence established within the United Nations system. It is up to the Secretariat, and particularly that of the Centre for Disarmament, to carry out the activities which are properly theirs in regard to information on disarmament problems.

As for draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.46, we have serious reservations regarding the reference at the end of the preamble to the collection of signatures. Moreover, we do not believe that operative paragraph 2 will promote a truly satisfactory dissemination of information. The references to accurate or false and tendentious information pave the way either to censorship or to endless controversy regarding the origin or the quality of the information.

Mr. PALAEZ (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to make a few brief comments on its affirmative votes on draft resolutions that have just been put to the vote.

When we speak about freedom of expression and freedom of public opinion, we

(Mr. Palaez, Cuba)

must remember that, regrettably, not all citizens have the means to secure information and to express themselves freely. There are some countries represented here which defend freedom of expression and even vote in favour of certain relevant resolutions but which have tens of thousands of citizens, particularly among their ethnic minorities, who cannot even read or write. What kind of freedom of information do these people have if they do not have the means to obtain information or express their views? That is the kind of freedom of information we should defend here. We should see that people are given the full opportunity to express their views and obtain information. We have heard references here to flows of information. My delegation defends a flows of information, but a flow of information that does not involve a press monopoly, that does not involve an information monopoly. What sort of flow of information is it when we have recently seen situations in which the press was not even permitted to be present to report on it? What kind of flow of information is that? Is that not an information monopoly.

Lastly, I believe that the draft resolutions we have been considering on this subject should put more emphasis on the link necessary between information and disarmament, with a view to making it clear that all Governments in negotiations on disarmament must take account of the views of their citizens and act accordingly.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): I would like to refer to just a few resolutions that we did not have an opportunity to vote on. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.22, concerning measures to provide objective information on military capabilities, if we had been here we would have asked for Costa Rica to be added to the list of sponsors of that text, of which we think highly. We particularly like the last preambular paragraph on the building of confidence which is so necessary for the success of any disarmament negotiations. We support the text as a whole.

Costa Rica is also a co-sponsor of A/C.1/38/L.44 and L.49 on the reduction of military budgets, and we would accordingly have voted for them. We would have also joined the consensus on A/C.1/38/L.44 and we would have voted for A/C.1/38/L.49.

The CHAIRMAN: The completes the discussion and action on cluster 12, expect for draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.61/Rev.1, which we will take up this afternoon.

The Committee will now proceed to take up draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.45/Rev.1 and L.57/Rev.2, together with the financial implications contained in document L.77.

(The Chairman)

I call on the representative of Bulgaria who has asked to speak to the resolutions.

Mr. ALEXANDROV (Bulgaria): I would like to inform the representatives that the Bulgarian delegation, in agreement with other sponsors, has amended the draft resolution concerning limitation of naval activities as reflected in the revised text contained in document A/C.1/38/L.45/Rev.1, now entitled "Curbing the naval arms race". These revisions, introduced following consultations with friendly Member States, are aimed at emphasizing further the necessity of ending the naval arms race. Several new formulations have been incorporated into the draft text which strengthen the basic thrust of the resolution by emphasizing the danger of nuclear war stemming from the build-up and the sophistication of naval arms arsenals.

Taking into account the considerations expressed by a number of delegations, certain provisions dealing with regional aspects of the problem of peace and security of seas and oceans have been omitted from the draft. As a whole, the revisions in question are predicated on the need to make the draft resolution reflect the growing importance of the problem of limiting and reducing naval armaments and extending confidence-building measures to seas and oceans within the overall context of the need to undertake urgent measures to halt the arms race.

Together with the other sponsors of the draft resolution, the Bulgarian delegation is hopeful that these modifications will be welcomed by the other members of our Committee as well.

I also wish to take this opportunity to thank the Secretariat for its efforts to expedite the circulation of the revised draft, in spite of the shortage of time.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I wish to make a statement in explanation of vote in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.57. But the general remarks I shall make apply equally to resolutions A/C.1/38/L.30, on which we have already voted, and L.59, on which we shall vote later.

My Government believes that disarmament studies made on behalf of the international community can serve a useful purpose provided that they are thoroughly discussed between the interested parties beforehand and that they tackle a carefully defined field with a precise and workable mandate. For any study to be worthwhile, there has to be general agreement that further work is desirable, that

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

the necessary information is likely to be available, and that an expert group would be capable of carrying out a study in a balanced manner. It goes without saying that such studies should be carried out with maximum economy and with due regard to the demands made on the resources of the Secretariat.

We have been concerned by the failure of the study group on conventional weapons to complete its report on time and by the request for substantial amounts of further expenditure contained in document A/C.1/38/L.69, especially as the group has already had two extra meetings. We are deeply concerned that in spite of this unforeseen burden on the resources of the United Nations, a number of further requests for studies have been made in this session. These requests for studies have been drawn up by their sponsors with little or no consultation with other interested delegations. In two cases, Member States are invited to give their comments when a decision has been taken to set up the study. In another, not even that. But their views are sought only on the content of the study, not on whether the subjects proposed are in themselves suitable and capable of study by a United Nations expert group.

This seems to us to be a very unfortunate state of affairs. We would ask how we can note, in resolution L.52, our satisfaction at the revival by the Secretary-General of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, while at the same time ignoring one of its prime functions - that is, to give consideration to the merits of proposals for United Nations studies. It would appear to my Government more logical and more effective if sponsors of studies were to seek the views of Member States and of the Advisory Board before the General Assembly is asked to vote on their proposals. We would hope that we could reach some agreement to follow such a procedure before further studies are requested.

My Government cannot support the study on the naval arms race contained in document A/C.1/38/L.57/Rev.2, first, because there has been little or no prior discussion on the desirability or the practicability of setting up an expert group which would be capable of carrying out a study of this large and complex subject in a balanced manner. It must be doubted whether a worthwhile study can be carried out without comprehensive information being made available by all States; and yet, this problem appears not to have been given the consideration it deserves. The expert group's mandate not only fails to meet these points but goes further in postulating a naval arms race and seems disposed to produce a set of conclusions with which my Government would find it hard to agree. My delegation cannot condone

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

this attempt by a few Governments to have a United Nations expert group endorse their own views. Further, as I have already said, we are concerned that the need for such studies to be carried out with maximum economy is not being given sufficient weight and prominence, and that the increasing burden, financial and operational, on United Nations disarmament efforts will produce worse, rather than better, results.

Mr. ADAN (Somalia): My delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.45/Rev.1, since we consider it to be highly selective. In our view, international peace and security is not endangered solely by the escalation of the naval arms race but also by such other serious developments as the introduction of massive foreign forces into the territories of non-aligned States and the use of extraregional surrogate troops for the purpose of destabilizing the territorial integrity and national independence of militarily weak countries.

We feel that the authors of the draft resolution should have taken into consideration all forms of pressure against sovereign States or interference in their internal affairs, instead of merely concentrating on one aspect of the serious danger to international peace and security.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will first take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.45/Rev.1. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 17 November. It is sponsored by the following countries: Bulgaria, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Poland, the Syrian Arab Republic and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Liberia, Malaysia, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Togo, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.45/Rev.1 was adopted by 57 votes to 20, with 35 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.57/Rev.2. The financial implications of this draft resolution are dealt with in document A/C.1/38/L.77. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 17 November. It is sponsored by the following countries: Austria, Finland, Iceland, Indonesia, Mexico, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

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

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Mozambique, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.57/Rev.2 was adopted by 93 votes to 1, with 31 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. KISLYAK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In determining its attitude to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.57/Rev.2, the Soviet delegation proceeded from the conviction that the time has come to take a firm approach to limiting the naval arms race and to the question of confidence-building measures in connection with the seas, in particular the most frequently used seaways, or those areas where there is the most probability of conflicts arising.

In our view, this question is particularly urgent in light of the increased role played by naval forces, and in this connection we support the commencement of negotiations among, at first, the major naval Powers and other States concerned. But what is proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.57/Rev.2, on a study on the naval arms race, deals purely with technical aspects and is not aimed at taking practical measures to reduce naval activity and armaments.

For that reason, the Soviet delegation abstained in the vote on that draft resolution.

With regard to United Nations studies into questions of disarmament, we wish to note that these constitute a one-sided approach which can distract world public opinion from the importance of practical measures being taken, especially in the area of conventional disarmament.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.45/Rev.1 and L.57/Rev.2. We consider that both of them refer to very timely issues such as the recent build-up

* Subsequently the delegation of Liberia advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

in naval deployments, and all their consequences for the maintenance of international peace and security. We think it highly appropriate for the United Nations to concern itself with this question, and we believe that the Organization should adopt ways and means of making the international community more aware of this phenomenon, which is obviously a very disturbing one.

Both draft resolutions advocate measures on this question, and that is why the delegation of Argentina voted in favour of them.

Mr. AL-MOHAMED (Oman): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.45/Rev.1. We abstained in the vote on that draft resolution because of our belief that it is unbalanced and highly selective. We also feel that its wording is unhelpful and cannot be considered as a step forward towards achieving disarmament.

Mr. SHARMA (India): My delegation believes that a study on naval forces and naval weapons systems will not add anything to the information on those systems which is already available. Therefore, such a study is not really necessary.

Also, we do not think that singling out naval activities from amongst weapons systems in general is the right approach to making progress in the field of disarmament. We further feel that the attention of the international community should be centred on the challenging task of nuclear disarmament, and that our resources and energies should not be diverted to activities which involve duplication and do not seem to have any utility.

In view of those considerations, our delegation abstained in the votes both on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.45/Rev.1 and draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.57/Rev.2.

Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (interpretation from French): We fully share the concerns of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.45/Rev.1, and we consider that it is very timely, since we are witnessing in all the world's oceans not merely an increase in naval forces, but also many military manoeuvres carried out by air and sea forces. In the context of the concerns of these draft resolutions, these unquestionably pose a serious threat to world peace and freedom.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.45/Rev.1 for reasons very similar to those put forward by the representative of Somalia. We agree with him that the draft resolution is selective; it does not take into account the critical situations provoked by certain efforts at destabilization aimed at the Governments of developing countries. One of the preambular paragraphs

(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

refers to extending confidence-building measures to seas and oceans. This is a very difficult subject to be specific about, for what inspires confidence in some may decrease it in others, and vice versa. It all depends on which Power is deploying its military forces and where it is deploying them. That is why my delegation abstained on this draft resolution, although we agree with the idea that, because they are of vital importance to mankind, the world's oceans should be used for peaceful purposes.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee's action on the draft resolutions grouped in cluster 13 is thus completed.

We shall now take up cluster 14, comprising draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.15, L.18, L.26/Rev.1, L.27, L.54/Rev.1, L.56/Rev.1 and L.59, the financial implications of which are set out in document A/C.1/38/L.76.

Mr. STRUCKA (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.18, I should like to make an oral correction to paragraph 5, in the first line of which the words "or political", should be deleted. The text would then read as follows:

(spoke in English)

"5. Appeals to States which are members of military groupings to promote..."

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations which wish to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation will - as it did last year on a similar draft resolution - regretfully abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.27, entitled "Report of the Committee on Disarmament".

My delegation is of the considered opinion that if and when the General Assembly addresses the work of the Committee on Disarmament, a negotiating body that operates by the rule of consensus, it should do so in terms at least acceptable to all delegations directly involved in the work of the Committee. By failing to do so, and thereby taking sides, it sets the wrong example for the Committee on Disarmament.

The wording of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.27 does not meet this essential requirement. The language used in it is not acceptable to all members of the Committee on Disarmament. Let me cite as an example, to which others could be added, the terminology used in referring to the issue of nuclear testing. The sponsors of this draft resolution chose to use the words "nuclear-weapon test ban",

(Mr. Ramaker, Netherlands)

thereby clearly deviating from the consensus formulation used by the Committee on Disarmament in its own report, namely, "nuclear-test ban".

My delegation shares with many others feelings of frustration on the lack of concrete results of the Committee on Disarmament. We profoundly regret, however, that the sponsors of this draft resolution have once again shown their unwillingness to take the views of others into account or at least to respect them. We fail to see in what way this could be helpful in our efforts to advance the work in the Committee.

As I said, the Netherlands will therefore abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. FINDLAY (Australia): Australia will abstain in the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.26/Rev.1 and AC/1/38/L.27, introduced by Yugoslavia, because they both call for a nuclear-weapon test ban, a concept far more limited in scope than that favoured by Australia.

While we of course favour the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, we believe that such a measure would be ineffectual unless all nuclear tests by all States were banned. Australia has introduced wording to this effect in the Committee on Disarmament for the scope of a future comprehensive test ban treaty. We were also, of course, co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.35, on a comprehensive test ban, which has already been adopted by this Committee.

Australia particularly regrets that, as a result, we must abstain in the voting on the draft resolution relating to the Committee on Disarmament. This is a body to which we have given strong support and in which we have participated actively. We urge the sponsors of this annual draft resolution to consider next year using the terminology of the Committee on Disarmament itself regarding the prohibition of nuclear testing - that is, "a nuclear test ban". This would be without prejudice to the positions of all interested parties on the scope of a future comprehensive test ban treaty.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): My delegation deeply regrets that for the first time since the Committee on Disarmament was established, in 1978, it is compelled to vote against the draft resolution dealing with the report of the Committee on Disarmament to the United Nations General Assembly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.27 contains many elements which my Government cannot support. Instead of reflecting the consensus on its report within the Committee on Disarmament, it seeks to rewrite the report in order to inject views

(Mr. Fields, United States)

of individuals or groups of States within the Committee on Disarmament and of some outside that Committee. It thus distorts the true picture of the work of the Committee on Disarmament and establishes a precedent which I find it difficult to imagine that any member of the Committee on Disarmament could accept. This draft resolution bears little, if any, resemblance to the report of the Committee on Disarmament to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

The Committee on Disarmament conducts its work by consensus, a decision mandated by paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It conducts its work on this basis because only mutual agreement and accommodation can lead to progress towards disarmament measures which would ensure undiminished security for all States. Attempts to impose on other States measures they do not judge to be in their overall security interests can only disturb or even impede such progress.

It should be noted that more time was devoted this year than previously to the preparation of the report, which led to many critical remarks in the Committee on Disarmament. A consensus was, admittedly, difficult to achieve, but it was achieved. My Government views the apparent move away from the search for a consensus, which is evidenced both in the substance of the draft resolution and in the way it has been handled, with the gravest concern. Whereas in past years the sponsors of the draft resolution dealing with the report of the Committee on Disarmament had worked with other delegations to develop a generally acceptable text, little or no effort was made this year - or, for that matter, even last year - to do so. As a result, a draft resolution which, given the subject matter it is to cover, should be a non-controversial one, has instead become contentious and potentially counter-productive as regards serious work in the Committee on Disarmament.

My delegation earnestly hopes that this situation will not continue and that the sponsors will in future find a more constructive approach to what should be one of the more important draft resolutions placed annually before this Committee.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I wish to make a statement in explanation of vote on two draft resolutions - A/C.1/38/L.26, which deals with the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session and A/C.1/38/L.27, which deals with the report of the Committee on Disarmament. It has long been a matter of regret to my delegation that we have been unable to support draft resolutions on these topics. Last year

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

we abstained on both draft resolutions because they contained language and proposals which were unacceptable to my delegation. We regretted particularly that the co-sponsors had made no attempt to negotiate on the language in the draft resolutions in order to make them more generally acceptable. This has proved to be the case again this year.

The co-sponsors have used them to express not a consensus view but their own highly partisan opinions. The language has become more extreme and even more objectionable than in the past. For these reasons, my delegation will, with much regret, vote against both draft resolutions this year.

We would hope that in future years consultations could be held early in the session, particularly with regard to the draft resolution on the report of the Committee on Disarmament, so that a more generally acceptable formulation could be found.

Mr. DEPASSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Belgium wishes to associate itself with the observations made by the delegations of the Netherlands, the United States and the United Kingdom regarding the regret felt at the breakdown of the consensus which existed in the Committee on Disarmament when the report was drafted. Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.27 conveys the impression that the General Assembly need only give imperative, majority instructions to a committee on disarmament - a little like giving it marching orders - in order to produce results, but that flies in the face of the consensus rule which has governed operations in the Committee on Disarmament. Draft resolution L.27 puts undue emphasis on procedural questions. It suggests that with the creation of a working group and the expansion of the mandate a number of much more subtle and difficult problems could easily be settled.

I might just mention paragraph 4, which suggests that a convention be drafted on a nuclear-test ban, whereas the co-sponsors of this proposal have in fact made no contribution to the Committee on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we take up the draft resolutions to which I have referred, I should say that I understand from one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/54/Rev.1, the French delegation, that consultations are still going on. I therefore suggest to the Committee that we take action on that draft resolution this afternoon in order to allow a few more hours. Is that acceptable to the Committee?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.15. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 11 November, and is sponsored by Bahamas, Bangladesh, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Indonesia, Mali, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.15 was adopted by 112 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.18, as orally corrected. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Czechoslovakia at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 11 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic

(The Chairman)

Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam and Yemen.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, 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 Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Austria, Brazil, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Lebanon, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.18, as orally corrected, was adopted by 84 votes to 15, with 18 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.26/Rev.1, which was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the Committee's 33rd meeting, on 17 November. The sponsors of the draft resolution are: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burma, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, the United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Honduras, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted by 107 votes to 11, with 7 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.27. The draft resolution, which was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the Committee's 32nd meeting, on 15 November, is sponsored by Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burma, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet

Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.27 was adopted by 104 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution

A/C.1/38/L.56/Rev.1. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Cyprus and is sponsored by the following countries: Bahamas, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Malta, Panama, Sri Lanka, Sudan, and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique,

Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.56/Rev.1 was adopted by 109 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.59, the financial implications of which are set out in document A/C.1/38/L.76. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 33rd meeting of the Committee, on 17 November, and is sponsored by: Austria, Bahamas, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Finland, Mexico, Nigeria, Romania, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.59 was adopted by 110 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): The United States delegation wishes to set forth some reasons underlying its negative votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.57/Rev.2 and A/C.1/38/L.59.

I wish to state at the outset that in principle my Government does not object to studies being conducted by the United Nations on subjects in the disarmament field. In fact, we believe that some of such studies undertaken in the past have been useful. In determining its attitude towards proposals for studies, however, my Government applies several basic criteria: First, the subject matter of the proposed study should be sufficiently well defined to provide a focus for careful examination of relevant issues. Secondly, the data base available for a study should be such as to make possible an objective and balanced review of the problem. Thirdly, any proposal for a study should be practicable from the standpoint of the range of expertise required to conduct it. Last, but not least, the proposed study should not overburden the current United Nations budget and thus require allocation of additional funds.

Unfortunately, neither of the two studies proposed in the draft resolutions to which I have referred met those criteria, and in both cases the terms of reference are extremely broad and vague and the underlying concepts lack precision or definition; frankly speaking, some of them even lack justification.

As regards the proposed study of the so-called naval arms race, it is extremely difficult to see how a small number of experts - six, according to the Secretary-General's statement in document A/C.1/38/L.77 - could possibly deal in any meaningful way with the vast array of issues to be covered under the proposal, issues ranging from naval arms systems to the legal régime on the high seas to the exploitation of marine resources.

The terms of reference for the other proposed study are even more broad and imprecise. Indeed, they seem to cover any and all matters containing to foreign

(Mr. Fields, United States)

and international security policies of States. Moreover, draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.59, which calls for the study, welcomes the report of a group of private individuals which, to our knowledge, none of the Governments represented here has endorsed.

In this connection, there is another important point which I wish to make regarding draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.59. That draft resolution is a follow-up on last year's General Assembly resolution 37/99 B, which dealt with the report of the International Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. My delegation joined the consensus adoption of that resolution out of respect for the distinguished members of that privately organized Commission and because of our belief in the value of a free flow of ideas. In so doing, however, we made clear serious reservations on the inclusion in the General Assembly's agenda of reports of private groups, however eminent their membership. During this year's session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, we thought an understanding had been reached that this matter could not be pursued further in the United Nations context. We were therefore puzzled and surprised by the introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.59.

Finally, the question of expenditure is also an important factor my delegation has taken into account. As indicated in the relevant statement of financial implications, both of the proposed studies would require allocation of a significant amount of additional funds. Clearly, if the feasibility of studies is questionable, as we believe it is in these cases, their financial implications weigh all the more heavily.

Unfortunately, our consultations with the main sponsor of the two draft resolutions did not bring about changes in the text indicating that the proposed studies should be carried out within existing resources of the United Nations. This was a very important factor determining our vote.

The meeting rose at 1. p.m.