

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
*Official Records**



NOV 23 1984

FIRST COMMITTEE
41st meeting
held on
Monday, 19 November 1984
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-FIRST MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEM (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 DC-2-750, 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.1/39/PV.41
19 November 1984
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 65 AND 142 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: Today the First Committee will begin taking action upon draft resolutions on disarmament agenda items based on the programme of work I suggested in the informal paper distributed on Thursday, 15 November, in which I attempted to organize the 71 draft resolutions and one draft decision according to certain criteria to which I referred earlier.

In that connection, it might bear repeating that the suggested programme of work is meant only to facilitate the work of the Committee; accordingly, it will be used with the necessary degree of flexibility.

This morning, the Committee will commence taking action on the draft resolutions grouped together in the informal paper as cluster 1, namely: A/C.1/39/L.11, L.13, L.16, L.23, L.27, L.29, L.36, L.38, L.48, L.52, L.54, L.57, L.68 and L.70. At the request of some delegations - either because they are not yet prepared or because they are in consultation with other delegations about the possibility of merging draft resolutions - two draft resolutions in this first cluster will not be acted upon at this stage: A/C.1/39/L.16 and L.36.

I suggest that delegations wishing to make statements on the draft resolutions in cluster 1 be given the opportunity to do so first. Subsequently, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on any or all draft resolutions in the cluster, before a decision is taken, would do so. Then, after the Committee has taken a decision on the draft resolutions in cluster 1, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes after the voting would be given an opportunity to do so. When the Committee has completed the process I have just outlined with respect to cluster 1, it would move on to the second cluster, then successively to the others, following a similar procedure.

May I take it that this procedure is acceptable to the Committee and that we may proceed accordingly?

It was so decided.

Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): After reading the many draft resolutions - and particularly trying to study in depth those contained in cluster 1 - I am forced to make some brief comments which would apply in principle to my delegation's sentiments regarding all the draft resolutions issuing from the agenda items allocated to the First Committee. Nevertheless, I would wish to reserve the right to speak at another time, if necessary, on specific draft resolutions.

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

My first general comment deals with the verbosity of the language used to formulate the resolutions. Many see this as standard United Nations terminology and cannot accept any changes. Further, I would venture to say that few delegations research or, indeed, have the time or the stamina to compare all of the cited references to past action. Those who are fortunate enough to do so or who have kept the facts stored in their consciousness find exactly the same phrasing contained in the current texts of several of these repetitious preambular paragraphs.

As I plodded through many of them, I observed that were it not for the numbering system, the sponsors, and in some instances the titles, these resolutions would be indistinguishable. Given this recognition, I have been wondering why it is impossible for Member States to accept a sole reference to the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament as sufficient since all States have agreed that that document incorporates the main guidelines for effective disarmament.

My second general comment concerns the proliferation of resolutions. While it is fair to assume that most of them are the result of frustration and the stubborn absence of political will to ensure implementation, others are born out of sheer cussedness, in other words, selfishness translated as national interests. Of course, it may be said, who can argue against the call for self-preservation, individual justice and territorial integrity? No one, I dare say. What bothers my delegation is that these laudable principles are not incorporated in the policy of interdependence - the you-for-me and me-for-you theory, if you wish. The other concern is that in the question of disarmament measures, the quantity of recommendations neither enhances nor diminishes the quality.

My third general comment centres around the concept of attitude. As I listen to the general debate and introductions to resolutions and try to combine them with the texts, I feel that despite our genuine concern with the status of the arms race, we perceive it as a game called "chicken", in which one opponent dares the other to self-destruct. We believe that we can talk away the horror of total annihilation.

My last general concern is with outcome and goals. What do we expect to achieve? In every resolution there are catch phrases with which no one can disagree. Year after year they reappear but lead nowhere. They are "sweet nothings". On closer examination, it appears that we are not seeking to find

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

solutions to problems, but rather we search for problems in solutions. We seem oblivious to those immediate measures that could be taken and revel in the beautiful sound of "general and complete disarmament". My delegation is not asking that we not shoot for the stars - pardon the expression - but that we should not disregard the realizable goals along the way. We should be able to savour some degree of success from the efforts we have expended over the years on this very important issue.

I am aware that progress cannot be made overnight, and perhaps my delegation expects too much too soon, but I am not convinced that the main thrust of our work would be diminished if we considered the general concerns I have just stated.

These thoughts are not new. I, as well as other colleagues, have expressed them in different ways at different stages of our deliberations. I know that the political and ideological differences among major Powers would not disappear. I do not think that there should be any conscious effort to bring that about. On the contrary, these differences should be used to promote communication and co-operation, rather than confrontation and division.

History bears out the fact that negotiations do not proceed from a position of peace. Disagreement is ever present and our goal is to achieve peace. It would seem then that differences should serve as vehicles for the promotion of communication and co-operation. I must seriously question whether human nature deprives us all of rational behaviour and whether selflessness is alien to our species.

I am beginning to hear myself, which means that I have taken too much time. Let me conclude with a word of caution about my delegation's concerns. I do not advocate or support a falling away from the responsibility of all States to bring pressure or to use tactics that may hasten the demise of the arms race in all its aspects. Perhaps one of these methods is "resolution build-up", as someone so aptly said. My reaction is that fewer resolutions and more genuine and serious consultations and negotiations would bring greater results. Some of the resolutions state that the major military Powers have a greater responsibility in the process. I believe that what is more important is that small, developing and non-militarily significant States increase their interest and participation, thereby causing the Powers to rethink their programmes and actions.

(Mr. Hepburn, Bahamas)

My delegation is hesitant about supporting all of the similar and multiple texts on the questions of nuclear arms and weapons, chemical weapons, test bans, military budgets and disarmament issues arising out of the decisions taken at the first special session devoted to disarmament. The lack of support, none the less, is not to be considered a partial approach, but rather a genuine appeal to sponsors to re-evaluate their reasons for duplication.

Besides the fact that their streamlining into a negotiated comprehensive whole would save time, costs and manpower fatigue, it could not help but promote better understanding of differences and consequently more comprehensive and positive results.

The CHAIRMAN: The Secretary of the Committee wishes to make a statement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The following countries are to be added as sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

- Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.29: Niger;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.34/Rev.1: German Democratic Republic;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.36: Liberia and Mali;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.41: Niger;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.56: Bolivia;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.57: Bolivia;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.58: Bolivia;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.59: Niger;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.64: German Democratic Republic;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.68: Japan;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.70: Liberia and Romania;
- Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71: Thailand; and
- Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.72: Niger.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any delegations which wish to speak on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 1? If not, we will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.11. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Finland at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, India, Norway, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

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

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.11, I should like to make a few comments. On 10 December 1976 - very soon it will be 10 years - the delegation of Mexico voted against the draft text which was to become General Assembly resolution 31/72, which referred to all States "for their consideration, signature and ratification" the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, annexed to the resolution.

That is the resolution which is recalled in the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.11, which will now be put to the vote in the First Committee.

Given the background to it, we will have to abstain in the vote without it implying any changes from our previous position. If this were not a predominantly procedural aspect, as we hold to be our view, but rather a substantive aspect, we would once again have to vote against it, as we did on the the occasion I have just recalled.

Since most representatives taking part in the work of the Committee in this year of 1984 are different from those who took part in the work in 1976, I think it timely to mention a basic document in this area which might be very enlightening concerning the main reasons which, in our view, explain why, despite the passing of time - and very soon it will be 10 years, as I said a moment ago, since the Convention was opened for signature - it has only received ratifications amounting to fewer than one third of the total membership of the United Nations. The document I have referred to is A/C.1/31/8, and it is dated 16 November 1976. That document reproduces the full text of the working paper which the delegation of Mexico presented to the First Committee and which, with many historical and legal arguments, defined the reasons why its Government considered that the drafting of article I of the draft Convention was "totally unacceptable".

Those reasons may be summed up by saying that the language in that article is tantamount to legitimizing such monstrous actions as the deliberate manipulation of natural processes to produce earthquakes, seawaves, hurricanes and storms of various kinds, or to change the ozone layer or the ionosphere or ocean currents, so long as they do not have "widespread, long-lasting or severe effects".

That is all the more difficult to understand and alarming if we bear in mind that among the means of environmental warfare, which would thus be permitted, because they would not be considered "widespread", we would have, as stated by the

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

two sponsors of the draft convention, those which may encompass an area smaller than several hundred square kilometres. Among those equally tolerated, because they would not be in the category of "long-lasting" under the Convention we would have those lasting less than several months or approximately one season.

We believe that the Review Conference which was just held was entirely right in observing, as stated in article IX of the annex to the Final Declaration, which, at the request of the delegation of Mexico, was distributed as a document of this Committee, and which has been issued as document A/C.1/39/5, dated 13 November 1984, "the Conference notes with concern that the Convention has not yet achieved universal acceptance".

That no doubt is what we would in English call an understatement, because in a convention which will very soon have been opened for signature for 10 years, the fact that it has 45 members certainly does not speak very highly for its acceptance. On the other hand, we believe, and we are certain, that it would be very easy to achieve that universal acceptance.

In draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.11, we find, in our view, some indications that the Review Conference began to see clearly what would have to be done to attain universal acceptance. Thus, in the fourth preambular paragraph, we read:

"... the Review Conference found the Convention and its objectives to be of continuing importance and that it was in the common interests of mankind to maintain its effectiveness ..."

In what? And this we must bear very much in mind:

"... in prohibiting the use of environmental modification techniques as a means of war".

And in operative paragraph 2:

"Calls upon all States to refrain from military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques".

As will be seen, in neither one of these two cases is there added the limitation that those techniques should not have - and I quote from article I of the Convention - "widespread, long-lasting or severe effects as the means of destruction, damage or injury to any other State Party". Therefore, those two paragraphs I have quoted, the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.11 show us what path we should follow to achieve what the Review Conference would rightly like to attain, and that is universal acceptance.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): As we embark on the voting process, I should like, in the interest of efficiency, briefly to set out the general considerations which will guide the delegation of Malta in its attitude towards the draft resolutions presented for decision in this Committee.

For many years now, national Governments have made serious efforts to control the harmful effects of inflation. Regrettably, no comparable effort seems evident as yet in the attitude of delegations presenting draft resolutions.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

I have spoken at some length on this aspect in previous statements before the Committee, most recently on 22 November 1983, almost a year ago. I regret that matters have not improved since then. It is ironic that, as we strive unsuccessfully against the proliferation of nuclear weapons, we thrive successfully in proliferating resolutions which continue to increase both in length and in number.

I will not go into statistical details as I did on the previous occasion, because the trend is self-evident. But I will give one more practical example on this occasion. First, an encouraging observation: those resolutions designed to attract consensus are commendably short, but unfortunately they constitute only a minority. We will be pleased, however, to support those resolutions.

By contrast, the majority of resolutions on average have three times as many repetitious preambular paragraphs as operative ones and each resolution tends to include at least 12 preambular paragraphs, totalling in all some 3,000 words.

I am willing to bet that most of us, even as representatives, have no idea whatsoever of the resolutions that are being recalled, theoretically for serious attention, in those preambular paragraphs. I need hardly add that if we as representatives do not know what we are recalling and repeating, even less can we expect the man in the street to understand why, for instance, we need so much circumlocution to come to the point - assuming, of course, that there is a point. Yet we are supposed to be working for the benefit both of our Governments and of the man in the street to alert them to the dangers of the arms race, the most serious issue now facing mankind.

Words are the only currency of the United Nations. Surely we can no longer afford to devalue our currency further by abusing or misusing this one precious commodity that we possess.

It is really not too difficult to think of an alternative and fresher approach. If, for instance, we were to limit reference in preambular paragraphs only to recalling the final documents of the special sessions on disarmament, we would at one stroke: first, avoid the avalanche of words that go into preambular paragraphs; secondly, save ourselves the expenditure of time and effort to write and to read those preambular paragraphs and the cost of reproducing them; thirdly, constantly remind ourselves of that important document, approved by consensus - which, incidentally, we seem to be forgetting - fourthly, give the man in the street something worth while to ponder over, providing a good account both of the

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

objectives we seek and the difficulties we have to surmount; fifthly, shorten by about 66 per cent the length of the resolutions, thereby greatly enhancing their appearance and giving them more clout; sixthly, demonstrate at least an awareness of the need for effective cost efficiency and discipline; and seventhly - perhaps most important - we would be trying to build on solid common ground instead of advocating a partisan approach. There are probably many more benefits that can be cited, but these will suffice for this occasion.

We in Malta, a small country dedicated to peace, resolutely wish to preserve some sort of sanity in the work on disarmament. We deplore the confrontational attitudes that persist in this Committee when what we seek is a common objective.

We also regret that the focus of concentration has shifted from disarmament to "confidence-building measures" even in the midst of the most persistent international mistrust. While we appreciate the value of "confidence-building measures", we also recognize that they have a tendency to legitimize the massive display of military might by opposing forces of military alliances. What is worse, they offer no consolation whatever to small or medium size countries outside these military alliances, and they do not cover sufficiently naval or aerial contingents of these armed forces which pose the greatest threat to most countries.

For the reasons stated today and in the past, we have co-sponsored only a selected few resolutions. Similarly, we intend to give preference to resolutions which are not merely propagandistic in content and which are not intended to hoodwink public opinion by extolling good intentions at length while being very short on practical applications.

It is simply not enough for us to resign ourselves to accepting as inevitable that lack of progress in disarmament negotiations should automatically be translated into more numerous and more long-winded resolutions. That is simply covering up and creating false illusions. If we have not made progress, we should not hide that fact from an aroused public opinion by obfuscation in words. On the contrary, we should candidly admit it and strive to do better in future.

My delegation therefore will as in the past continue to support those resolutions that have a broad base of co-sponsorship, indicating at least an attempt to find common ground, even though we would prefer them to be expressed more succinctly. And I trust that we are still in time to avoid having too many conflicting resolutions on the same subject. If we cannot avoid repetition and duplication this year, let us at least try to resolve not to repeat the same

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

mistakes next year as we take stock of 40 years of experience in disarmament negotiations.

I may have to ask to speak on one more subsequent occasion to indicate our position on some specific resolutions unless in the meantime, as I hope, they are sensibly revised or withdrawn in the process of consultations.

Mr. SHARMA (India): My statement concerns draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.13.

We have stated the views of our Government on the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones many times in the past. We do not agree that the mere establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is a realistically viable way to cope with the menace of an unchecked escalation of the nuclear-arms race.

Although draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.13 is concerned with a purely procedural matter, because of our reservation about this approach in principle we cannot go along with it. India will therefore abstain in the voting on the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution

A/C.1/39/L.11. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, 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, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Mexico, Venezuela

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.11 was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

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

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.13.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Finland at the 30th meeting, on 7 November, and is sponsored by Finland and Romania.

The programme budget implications on this draft resolution are contained in document A/39/L.73.

Are there any delegations wishing to explain their vote before the vote? If not, we shall proceed to the voting procedure. 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, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: India, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.13 was adopted by 135 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I wish to make an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.13. My general remarks apply equally to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.38, which we shall be considering later.

My delegation notes with appreciation the considerable amount of work already carried out by the Group of Experts on the study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects. Notwithstanding their efforts, however, and the fact that there have been five consecutive drafts, it is disappointing that the experts were able to reach agreement on less than half of their report at the last meeting. We attach importance to the Group's producing a consensus text. As with all studies covering a highly contentious issue, the methodology adopted by the Group as a whole should allow for opinions to be given adequate and balanced expression in their report. My delegation regards this study as a significant one, but we view with increasing concern the tendency of United Nations studies on disarmament subjects to overrun their allotted time and budgets. We consider it important that these studies should be carried out with the maximum economy and with due regard to the resources of the Secretariat. We do not regard the extension of the time allotted for the study on this subject, nuclear-weapon-free zones, as a precedent for the work of other United Nations expert groups. Moreover, the additional resources and financial support which arise from the extension of the Group's mandate, as contained in document A/C.1/39/L.73, should be found from within the level of resources already proposed for the biennium 1985-1986.

It was on this basis that my delegation was able to support the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to ask for some clarification. My delegation had understood that explanations of vote before, as well as after, the vote would be made either before or at the end of each cluster of draft resolutions and for that reason, having intended to explain its vote on the first draft resolution the Committee voted upon, A/C.1/39/L.11, it refrained from doing so, thinking it would do so at the end of the first cluster of draft resolutions. However, if the Committee is going to adopt the practice of having explanations of vote before or after the voting on each draft resolution, then of course my delegation will follow that practice.

Specifically, however, I not only wish to ask for clarification in a general way but also to know whether I should wait until the end of cluster one to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.11.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to thank the representative of Argentina for reminding me, and the Committee, of my introductory statement, in which I said that delegations would be free to make statements in explanation of vote before or after the voting on each individual draft resolution. It would be my preference - and I think it would expedite matters in the Committee - if all delegations were to explain their votes after we had finished with a whole cluster of draft resolutions. In that case, delegations would refer specifically to the draft resolutions on which they wished to explain their votes. If that is the general wish of the Committee, I shall invite members of the Committee to explain their votes after the Committee has acted upon all the draft resolutions in the first cluster.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I think we should abide by the procedure which you, Sir, proposed at the outset - that is that delegations might make statements in explanation of vote either before the cluster is taken up or before the actual vote on a specific draft resolution. The point is that in this cluster of draft resolutions there are some which refer to very different items and it would be difficult to be certain what a delegation was speaking about.

My proposal would be that the Committee should follow the procedure which it has normally followed in the past, that is, that those delegations wishing to make general statements on an entire cluster, as in fact has occurred in relation to the statements of at least two delegations which spoke at the beginning, of course

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

might do so, but that those delegations which would like to speak before or after the vote on any specific draft resolution should have full liberty to do that, as has been the case in the past.

The CHAIRMAN: As I said, delegations may prefer to speak before or after the vote on any individual draft resolution, although I think it would expedite matters if all delegations would speak at the end of a cluster, without precluding the right, if they wish, to speak after an individual draft resolution, and, as we are not going to open a procedural discussion on that, I shall ask the representative of Argentina whether he wishes to speak now or after the first cluster of draft resolutions has been concluded.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.11, on which the Committee has already voted, my delegation will speak at the end of cluster 1.

The CHAIRMAN: At the request of some delegations, the Committee will not take up draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.16, in the first cluster, but will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.23, which was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 37th meeting of the First Committee, on 14 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Burundi, Peru, Poland, Spain and Sri Lanka.

It has been requested by the sponsors that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote.

The programme budget implications of this draft resolution are in document A/C.1/39/L.74. Is there any objection to the adoption of this draft resolution without a vote? If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.23 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.27, which was introduced by the representative of Norway at the 35th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Austria, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan,

(The Chairman)

Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to make a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.27, concerning the holding, in 1986, of the Second Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction. By that draft resolution, the General Assembly would note that at the request of a majority of States Parties to the Convention, a second Review Conference will be held in 1986 and that, following appropriate consultations, a Preparatory Committee is to be established prior to the holding of the Review Conference.

In addition, the Secretary-General would be requested to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as might be required for the Review Conference and its preparation.

(Mr. Kheradi)

It should be noted that the Review Conference is a conference of States parties to the Convention. The first Review Conference, held in 1980, like other review conferences concerning multilateral disarmament treaties, for example, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Sub-soil Thereof, included in its rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the Review Conference, including the session of the Preparatory Committee.

The wording of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.27 is identical to the wording of resolution 33/59 B, which preceded the convening of the first Review Conference. Consequently the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under the draft resolution to provide the necessary assistance and services for the preparation and holding of the Review Conference has no programme budget implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that, as in the case of the first Review Conference, the associated costs will be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the Review Conference.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a request that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.27 be adopted without a vote. If there is no objection, it will be so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.27 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.29.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 39th meeting, on 15 November 1984, and is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Australia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Ecuador, Greece, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, the Philippines, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia.

I have received a request that this draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If there is no objection, it will be so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.29 was adopted.

Mr. ZHARKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.29, which that has just been adopted, the Soviet delegation is pleased to note the fact that the programme of

(Mr. Zharkov, USSR)

studies under the United Nations Fellowship Programme is becoming more detailed. In order to present additional information and practical knowledge about disarmament it is very important to have scholars from various parts of the world invited by United Nations institutions. The Soviet Union, as is well known, last year made a contribution to the implementation of that objective.

We also share the view that, in order to carry out this programme, we should make further use of the possibilities existing in the Secretariat in order to promote professional training of specialists on disarmament matters. That being so, we regard operative paragraph 3 (c) of the draft resolution as being interpreted in that way. We believe that "proposals for further utilization of existing capacity within the Department for Disarmament Affairs for training in the field of disarmament" should first and foremost have the aim of more effective use of existing capacity and not an increase in the number of people participating in the programme or of the members of the United Nations Secretariat servicing the programme. As that was the understanding of the purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.29, we had no objection to its being adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.29. As I stated previously, the Committee will take no action at present on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.36.

We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.38. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 37th meeting, on 14 November 1984. The programme budget implications of the draft resolution are set forth in document A/C.1/39/L.76.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives,

Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Germany, Federal Republic of, Luxembourg, Netherlands

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.38 was adopted by 133 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.*

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

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.48.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Belgium at the 39th meeting, on 15 November 1984, and is sponsored by the following countries: Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zaire.

I have received a request that this 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.1/39/L.48 was adopted.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has no objection to adopting draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.48 without a vote. In view of our fundamental position on this question we have constantly been and continue to be in favour of preparing regional disarmament measures to be carried out on the initiative and with the participation of all States involved.

To promote regional disarmament, the Soviet Union not only supports measures to study regional approaches to disarmament carried out by the Secretariat but also makes its own weighty contribution to this work. Thus, in the report of the Secretary-General on regional disarmament contained in document A/39/485, reference is made to an initiative of 11 to 15 June this year when, within the framework of the World Disarmament Campaign, a regional conference was held in Leningrad, with participants from more than 50 European, United States and Canadian non-governmental organizations, together with participants from a number of other international organizations and scientific institutions involved with studying problems of peace and disarmament.

At that conference the most urgent topics were discussed in connection with the removal of the threat of nuclear war, the cessation of the arms race, measures for confidence-building and disarmament, in the context of the European region, as well as other matters.

We are prepared to continue such practices in the future, particularly by means of convening similar regional conferences in the Soviet Union on the

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

territory of one of its Central Asian Republics, and also to take other measures as our contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign.

While we support the draft resolution as a whole, which takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on regional disarmament, we must at the same time point out that studies on the question of a so-called disarmament fund should not be included among regional disarmament measures, as appears in paragraph 5 (a) of that report.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.52.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 39th meeting, held on 15 November 1984, and is sponsored by the following countries: Austria, Belgium, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia and Ecuador.

I have received a request for the draft resolution to be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.52 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.54, which was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 40th meeting, held on 15 November 1984.

The sponsor has requested that it be adopted by consensus. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.54 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.57.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 38th meeting, held on 14 November 1984, and is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

I have received a request from the sponsors that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

(The Chairman)

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.57 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.68.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Czechoslovakia at the 37th meeting, held on 14 November 1984, and is sponsored by the following countries: Czechoslovakia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and Sweden.

I have received a request 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.1/39/L.68 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.70.

This draft resolution is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Bahamas, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Greece, Liberia, Nepal, Pakistan, Romania, Sudan and Uruguay.

I have received a request from the sponsors 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.1/39/L.70 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded action on cluster 1 of draft resolutions and I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. EMERY (United States of America): I have asked to speak in order to explain several of the United States votes on the cluster of draft resolutions that we have just finished considering.

The United States was unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.13 on a study on nuclear-weapons-free zones or draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.38 on a military research and development study. We regret that we were unable to support these two draft resolutions, which requested extensions to provide for the completion of studies by the two different groups of experts. I wish to make it clear that my delegation was prepared to join with others in approving the substance of both these draft resolutions and that our votes were only on the financial implications of the draft resolutions.

Resolution A/C.1/39/L.38 does contain language attempting to limit the financial implications of the study's extension and my delegation appreciates the efforts of the sponsors to this end. Nevertheless, neither text contained language to keep the cost of extending the studies within existing resources. With such language in the draft resolutions my delegation would have had no difficulty in joining the consensus on them.

We have made our views on this question clear for some time and we feel that the principle involved is a very important one, sufficiently important to justify the votes we have just cast.

My delegation looks forward to the completion of the work of both groups of experts. The United States expert in both groups will participate in their final sessions with a view to bringing the studies to a successful conclusion. My delegation hopes further that the extension of the study on nuclear-weapon-free zones called for in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.13 will be conducted within the framework laid out in document A/C.1/39/L.73, which provides for one three-week session in New York in 1985, a session that we understand will be held early in the year.

The United States has joined again in the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.23 on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference. Document A/39/28 contains the United States views on this matter and I would like briefly to recall them now:

(Mr. Emery, United States)

"The United States believes that a propitious international environment is indispensable for a successful world disarmament conference. An unsuccessful or inconclusive conference would serve no useful purpose and could prove unhelpful by creating impediments to future efforts towards concrete and verifiable arms control and disarmament measures. ... the United States believes that ... insufficient political agreement exists on the disarmament issues central to such a conference and it is therefore premature to contemplate the convening of a world disarmament conference. In view of the situation, the United States is persuaded that serious consideration should be given to whether or not future meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee are warranted." (A/39/28, p. 4)

While funded within existing resources, we wonder whether such funds might be better put to other uses.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): My delegation was pleased to support draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.38. It did so because the United Kingdom attaches importance both to the study on military research and development and to its successful completion. We are, however, disappointed that although the Group of Experts held several additional meetings in 1984, it was unable to complete its work in time to submit a final report to this year's General Assembly as originally envisaged. We believe it would be to the advantage of all Member States if a consensus report could be presented to the fortieth session of the General Assembly. The United Kingdom expert has taken a flexible position on the contents of the report and he is ready to continue to search for language to which all experts can agree. However, it is essential that all those participating in the study should observe the same degree of flexibility. It is pointless for experts to continue their work if some of the participants maintain their insistence that their or their Government's views be included in their entirety. This is not the way to achieve a consensus report.

I have already indicated in a previous statement my Government's concern about the tendency of United Nations studies to overrun their time limit and budget. My delegation also wishes to emphasize the need to avoid unnecessary additions to the United Nations regular budget. We consider that the additional resources and financial requirements for the extension of the study on military research and development should be found within existing resources.

Mr. TARI (Israel): Israel studied draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.54 concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East with the great care and attention it deserves since the subject is of utmost importance to it.

Israel has constantly supported resolutions at the United Nations aimed at preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In keeping with this line, during this session Israel joined the consensus on this issue in order to stress its wholehearted support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Israel has some reservations regarding the modalities included in the text adopted. It believes that the precepts of the Latin American model which led to the conclusion of the Treaty of Tlatelolco could serve as the most effective way to the achievement of a similar goal in the Middle East. Within this context, Israel has always maintained and frequently proposed that: the initiative for the establishment of such a zone should originate with the States in the region; the consultations necessary for reaching this aim should be carried out directly among them; the negotiations between the States in the region should address themselves to the modalities for the establishment of the zone, the obligations and rights of the contracting States, the machinery and other procedures for ensuring the effective compliance by States with the obligations undertaken by them, as well as other means for averting proliferation, as agreed by the negotiating States.

Israel's vision of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East is consistent with the studies of various groups of experts composed of distinguished members from countries representing different political backgrounds. In this context my delegation would like to refer to and quote from the most relevant documents.

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

In 1975 the group of experts from 21 nations who studied all the aspects of nuclear-weapon-free zones submitted a report which was reproduced in document A/10027/Add.1. In paragraph 90 of that report the experts listed several principles governing the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, one of them being "the initiative for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, [which] should come from States within the region concerned, and participation must be voluntary".

This principle also represents one of the leit-motivs of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, also known as the Palme Commission. In the recommendations and proposals in its report, the Commission stated as follows:

"The Commission believes that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region or subregion concerned, constitutes an important step towards non-proliferation, common security and disarmament." (A/CN.10/38, chap. 6, para. 5.3)

A similar approach was also advocated by the non-aligned countries. In a working paper submitted by them under agenda item 4 of the 1983 session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, it was stated:

"The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world on the basis of agreements and/or arrangements freely arrived at among States of the region concerned should be encouraged, with the ultimate objective of achieving a world entirely free of nuclear weapons." (A/38/42, annex V, para. 3 (k))

In conclusion, it is thus generally recognized that within the purview of the regional approach to disarmament there is considerable scope for regional initiatives and practical action through negotiations between the States of the region. These principles are also consistent with the regional measures which have been adopted so far, particularly the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.54, although designed to attain the same aim of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, omits mention of the negotiating process, without which such an arrangement is unlikely to come about. Therefore, our serious reservations of past years remain in force as to the ways and means proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.54 for arriving at the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to explain its vote on two of the draft resolutions upon which the First Committee has taken a decision at this morning's meeting. First of all, I should like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.11 on the Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques. My delegation voted in favour of that draft resolution in view of its basically procedural nature, but that does not mean that my delegation no longer has reservations with regard to that Convention in so far as its scope is concerned, as defined in article 1. My delegation and my country continue to believe that that Convention, which is aimed at very lofty objectives, will be fully operative throughout the world only after its scope has been expanded, at which time it will be better suited to its stated purposes.

It is indeed a shame that the Review Conference held this year did not put into motion machinery that could lead to the revision of article 1 of the Convention. Nevertheless, the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution notes that the Review Conference recognized the need to keep under continuing review and examination the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 1 of the Convention. However, given the procedural nature of the draft resolution, I repeat, my delegation voted in favour of it.

I should like next to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.54 concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. This draft resolution was adopted without a vote, and my delegation raised no objection to that procedure. I should like, however, to repeat my country's position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and on the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, two matters that are referred to in operative paragraphs 1 and 2. My country's position on this matter has not changed, and it is because of the purposes of this draft resolution that my delegation did not object to its adoption without a vote. The explanation of vote I am now making with regard to my delegation's difficulties with this draft resolution will also apply to other draft resolutions we may come to in the future which deal with the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world.

Mr. SOB (Cameroon): I should like to explain the position of the delegation of the Republic of Cameroon on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.13 and L.38. We have supported those draft resolutions because the subjects with which they deal are important and deserve our collective attention.

However, we wish to emphasize that our support at this time to extend the work of the two Expert Groups responsible for carrying out the studies concerned should be seen as exceptional. In general, we would hope that all efforts might be made to finalize the work of expert groups on time.

Mr. SHARMA (India): India would have abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.48 had it been put to the vote. In the field of disarmament, and particularly in the crucial question of the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, only a global approach with generally accepted principles, priorities and objectives can have a chance of succeeding. Peace and security are indivisible in the age of nuclear weapons. There cannot be a piecemeal approach to disarmament in geographical terms when the escalation of the nuclear-arms race fundamentally exacerbates the international situation and aggravates existing tensions, both regional and global.

(Mr. Sharma, India)

As regards the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, my delegation wishes to state for the record that India's support for the consensus on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.54 is without any prejudice whatsoever to its consistent position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and on the application of so-called full-scope safeguards.

Mr. KUNDA (Zambia): My delegation was pleased to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.54, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. We support the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones all over the world as a matter of principle. However, my delegation wishes to dissociate itself from paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, in so far as it invites the countries concerned to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It so happens that Zambia does not belong to the Non-Proliferation Treaty régime; hence we cannot urge or invite other countries to adhere to a régime to which we ourselves are not party.

Mr. ABDEL WAHAB (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to refer to two draft resolutions: A/C.1/39/L.13 and L.54. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.13, I would note that completion of the study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects is of paramount importance. We attach great importance to completion of the study within the time allotted to it. This study will make available significant information of great value to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, and will make an effective contribution to the realization of our hope to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

I turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.54. I wish first to thank all the States which made possible adoption of this draft resolution by consensus. The draft resolution contains a certain amount of new material, and stresses the role of the United Nations in the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

We look forward to the report of the Secretary-General on the views of all concerned parties regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Mr. DEPASSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): While the Belgian delegation did not object to the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.29, it wishes to express its concern regarding sub-paragraphs 3 (a) and 3 (b), in that the Secretariat should be made aware that the system of evaluating research papers requires the establishment of objective, non-ideological evaluation criteria.

With regard to sub-paragraph 3 (c), Belgium notes that it provides for the utilization of existing capacity for financing these additional activities; this implies that savings must be effected in other areas.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of and action upon draft resolutions in cluster 1.

We shall now proceed to consideration of and action upon draft resolutions grouped in cluster 2, to wit: A/C.1/39/L.17, L.30, L.31, L.35, L.39, L.56, L.59 and L.62. At the request of a number of delegations, we shall not for the present take action upon draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.30, L.59 and L.62.

As was the case with cluster 1, delegations may explain their positions and their votes on any or all of the draft resolutions included in the cluster before the voting, and may explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. ERDENECHULUUN (Mongolia): I wish to make a change in the text of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.39, entitled "Disarmament Week". This became necessary after last-minute consultations with a number of delegations. The fifth preambular paragraph should read as follows:

"Recognizing the important role of mass media in mobilizing world public opinion in support of disarmament".

The word "which" is replaced by the preposition "of"; and the words "should play" are deleted.

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

Mr. EMERY (United States of America): I wish to explain several of the votes of the United States we intend to cast in the consideration of this cluster.

First, I would like to explain our position on two draft resolutions relating to the World Disarmament Campaign - A/C.1/39/L.17 and A/C.1/39/L.35. The United States has always believed in the widest possible dissemination of information on all subjects, including arms control and disarmament. In this light, the United States joined a consensus in favour of the creation of a World Disarmament Campaign at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, a consensus followed up with the adoption of a relevant implementing resolution at the thirty-seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly. We agreed to do so because the language establishing the Campaign provided that it

"... should be carried out in all regions of the world in a balanced, factual and objective manner"; (A/S-12/32, annex V, para.3)

that its universality

"... should be guaranteed by the co-operation and participation of all States and by the widest possible dissemination of information...and opinions on questions of arms limitation and disarmament, and the dangers relating to all aspects of the arms race and war, in particular nuclear war"; (para. 4)

and that it should provide

"an opportunity for discussion and debate in all countries on all points of view relating to disarmament issues, objectives and conditions". (para. 9)

We have been very pleased to see that the Secretariat has made every effort to carry out the Campaign in accordance with these positions. We have hoped that in the years since 1982's special session the Assembly could combine its support for a campaign with support for resolutions expressing the right of citizens to organize, to express their views on disarmament and to organize and meet publicly for that purpose. President Reagan believes so strongly in this that he mentioned it in his address to the Assembly on 24 September.

A resolution along these lines was adopted by consensus at the thirty-seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly - 37/100 J - and I regret that it has not proved possible, due to the unfriendly efforts of some delegations, to again endorse by consensus such a resolution.

(Mr. Emery, United States)

The United States is unable to support either draft resolution. Draft resolution L.17 calls for avoiding the dissemination of false and tendentious information. As far as the United States is concerned, dissemination of information is free and unhindered and it is up to the recipients to decide what is true and what is false. The United States is, therefore, unable to support draft resolution L.17.

As for draft resolution L.35, my delegation greatly regrets that, although there is language in the text we strongly support, additions to this year's text have made it no longer a consensus resolution. The Campaign was meant to be funded by voluntary contributions. We cannot accept criticism of those who have not contributed. We are therefore forced to abstain in the vote on draft resolution L.35 this year.

Mrs. OSODE (Liberia): My delegation will support draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.17.

However, we have reservations on operative paragraph 4. We would appreciate a more refined language to be used in addressing Member States.

It would be preposterous for my delegation to question the credibility of information provided to the United Nations by any Member State. Hence, we are unprepared to support a provision which could be interpreted as sinister in motive.

Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands): My delegation would like to address in particular draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.35 in this cluster.

Before action is taken on this draft resolution, my delegation wishes to make clear the position of the Netherlands with respect to some of the ideas in it.

The draft resolution under consideration once more gives undue prominence to the idea of pledging conferences to promote the aims of the World Disarmament Campaign. It does so in even more unequivocal terms than in last year's resolution, 38/73 D.

The Netherlands is of the opinion that in doing so the draft resolution emphasizes too much the financial aspects of the World Disarmament Campaign. This suggests, quite erroneously in our view, that lack of the necessary financial resources constitutes the bottleneck in the success of the campaign. My delegation does not deny that without financial resources there will be no campaign, but its

(Mr. Ramaker, Netherlands)

views on the Campaign and its objections to what draft resolution L.35 suggests focus on considerations of a more fundamental nature.

We feel very strongly that in order to be successful a World Disarmament Campaign depends not so much on the availability of the necessary funds but rather on the fulfilment of one essential prerequisite, and that is the guarantee of an unqualified free flow of information in all Member States. This condition exists only in some parts of the world. In many countries freedom of thought and expression are insufficiently guaranteed. By putting too much emphasis on the financial aspects of the campaign, the draft resolution in question obscures this sad reality.

We sincerely hope that one day we will see the barriers to such an unqualified free flow of information and a free expression of thought removed. Only then will the conditions exist for a successful World Disarmament Campaign, to which my Government indeed continues to look forward.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.17. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 40th meeting on 15 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Romania, 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, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Canada, Chile, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.17 was adopted by 96 votes to none, with 34 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: As I stated before, we shall not take action now on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30.

We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.31. That resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 37th meeting of the Committee, on 14 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Ecuador, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall declare draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.31 adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.31 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.35. That draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 37th meeting of the Committee, on 14 November, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.35 was adopted by 124 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.39 as orally amended. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 37th meeting, on 14 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic,

(The Chairman)

Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, 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, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.39 as orally amended was adopted by 110 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.56, which was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 40th meeting, on 15 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire. A recorded vote has been requested.

I recognize the representative of the Netherlands on what I understand is a point of order, since the voting procedure has already started.

Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, I made known to the Secretariat that I would like to make an explanation of vote before the vote, and I ask your indulgence to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: I received no communication of this request to make an explanation of vote before the voting. May I ask the representative of the Netherlands to make his explanation of vote after the voting has been completed as we have already started the voting procedure.

Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands): If you insist, Mr. Chairman, I will agree to that, but I would have preferred to speak before the voting.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the Netherlands for his co-operation.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: United States of America.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.56 was adopted by 113 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting on all items included in cluster 2.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): My delegation wishes to give an explanation of vote on two resolutions.

First, I should like to make it clear that our abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.17 should not be construed in any way as meaning that Japan takes the World Disarmament Campaign lightly. The Government of Japan has always recognized the significance of the World Disarmament Campaign and will continue to do so. However, we abstained because we find the overall tone of the draft resolution more alarmist and emotional than the versions of last year or other draft resolutions on the same subject and we therefore decided not to take a committed position on it.

I should also like to explain our position regarding draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.39. We voted in favour of the draft resolution because of the importance the Government of Japan attaches to the purpose to be served by Disarmament Week. Ever since Disarmament Week was inaugurated in 1978, Japan has taken an active part in it. However, I should like to point out at this juncture our concern about the language used in various parts of the draft resolution, which contains rather alarmist overtones that do not necessarily reflect or represent our views. While favouring the draft resolution, I should like to register the above-mentioned reservation of my delegation.

Ms. BOYD (Australia): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on two of the draft resolutions that the Committee has adopted this morning, draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.56 and L.39.

Australia abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.56, which was introduced by Yugoslavia, because it calls for a nuclear-weapon-test ban - a concept far more limited in scope than that favoured by Australia. Australia does, of course, wish to see a prohibition of nuclear-weapons test, but 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 Conference on Disarmament for the scope of a future comprehensive test-ban treaty.

We are also co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.71 on the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, which unequivocally states our conviction that a treaty to achieve the prohibition of all nuclear-test explosions by all States in all environments for all time is a matter of greatest importance.

(Ms. Boyd, Australia)

Australia particularly regrets that as a result of the inclusion of a call for a nuclear-weapon-test ban we had to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution relating to the Conference on Disarmament. This Conference is a body to which we attach high importance and one in which Australia participates actively. It is a body which operates under the rule of consensus and we would accordingly have liked to see the resolution relating to the report on the work of the Conference on Disarmament framed in such a way as to enable that resolution also to be adopted by consensus.

We therefore once more urge the sponsors of this annual draft resolution to consider next year using the terminology of the Conference 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 nuclear-test-ban treaty.

My delegation once more had to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.39 for two reasons. The main reason related to the inclusion of what we considered to be inappropriate language concerning activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and other specialized bodies. We interpreted the references to the mass media in the draft resolution, which are new references this year, as meaning an endorsement of the extremely important role of the mass media in transmitting in an untrammelled and unrestricted way views on disarmament issues in order to ensure that those members of the peace movements in our countries and ordinary citizens are able to have access to the fullest range of opinions and factual material, which they need in order to shape their views and opinions, which in turn are translated into the policies of our Governments.

Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation had wished to place on record before the vote the reasons compelling it to abstain once more on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.56, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". It regrets that it was not allowed to do so despite its specific request. My delegation hopes that in the coming days due attention will be given to the wishes of delegations in this respect.

On previous occasions my delegation has stressed that the Conference on Disarmament is a multilateral negotiating body which operates by rule of consensus. This has a number of implications. Consensus implies that although differences of opinion on substance exist, mutual respect for each other's points of view should in the end prevail. It also implies that delegations should exert their best efforts to identify common ground in their various positions, rather than emphasizing their differences. Only in such a manner can a consensus body like the Conference on Disarmament hope to make progress.

The draft resolution now under consideration does not meet these demands. Its language shows a clear lack of comprehension of the consensus rule as regards decision-making in the Conference when it uses terms like "was once again prevented" or "has not been enabled". My delegation strongly feels that the General Assembly, in addressing the Conference in such terms, makes a fundamental mistake and sets a wrong example. The objections my delegation has against the formulation of this draft resolution, however, relate also to the manner in which this draft text takes sides in the ongoing discussions in the Conference on Disarmament. Without going into the details of these discussions, I wish to emphasize that a draft resolution tilts completely to one side when, for example, it addresses the question of the Conference's subsidiary bodies and their mandates. To my delegation, this is unacceptable.

My delegation objects not only to what this draft resolution says, but also to what it leaves unmentioned, or at any rate mentions only in passing. I am referring to the important work the Conference has been doing during the past year in the field of chemical weapons. The draft resolution, instead of stressing - and as I hope to have made clear, in the wrong way - the agenda items where unfortunately a situation of impasse prevails, could have spelled out in more detail this field of activity of the Conference on Disarmament. The work on chemical weapons is highly relevant, as recent events have shown, and the Conference made progress on this subject during this year's session. Let me take this opportunity to recall in this context the importance the Netherlands attaches

(Mr. Ramaker, Netherlands)

to intensified efforts in order to conclude a comprehensive chemical weapons ban as soon as possible.

It is for this reason that, during the general debate in the First Committee, my delegation proposed considering in what way more time could be devoted to chemical weapons negotiations, including the possibilities of negotiations during the fall of next year, a question rightly addressed in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.24, but unfortunately missing from draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.56.

In summarizing, my delegation feels strongly that the present draft resolution insufficiently takes into account the consensus character of the Conference on Disarmament, takes sides in the discussions in that body and overemphasizes the negative aspects of its work.

It is therefore with profound regret that my delegation had to abstain on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: It was my intention to finish this morning with explanations of vote on cluster 2, but as I still have five speakers inscribed on my list, and as explanations of vote have taken longer than I had anticipated, we shall continue with explanations of vote on cluster 2 this afternoon. Then we shall proceed immediately to consider and take action on draft resolutions in cluster 3.

Ms. BOYD (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I should like to seek some clarification of the programme you have just announced for this afternoon. It was the understanding of my delegation that we would be voting today only on clusters 1 and 2, and I must say that my delegation is not yet prepared, we have not yet our instructions, on all the draft resolutions in cluster 3. If our delegation is unique in this position, we shall of course not raise any objection to proceeding in the manner you have indicated. But if, as I suspect, there may be many other delegations in the same position, we would ask you to take this difficulty into account.

The CHAIRMAN: May I state that there is no reason for misunderstanding. In my statement last Thursday - and it is very clear in the record - I said that the clusters would be taken one after the other. There was no indication that a particular cluster would be taken on a particular day. That is how I intend to proceed, but I would be prepared, as I have said, to show some flexibility, to postpone draft resolutions on which some delegations are not yet prepared to take action.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.