



UN/ASG 111 1111

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-SECOND MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil)

CONTENTS

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

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 65 AND 142 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue its third phase of work devoted to consideration of and action upon draft resolutions on disarmament agenda items.

I now call upon those delegations that wish to explain their vote after the vote on draft resolutions in cluster 2, which the Committee acted upon this morning.

Mr. EMERY (United States of America): I wish to explain the vote of the United States on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.56 concerning the report of the Conference on Disarmament.

A year ago my delegation noted the gradual shift over several Assembly sessions in the language of this resolution, which, like the report of the Conference on Disarmament itself, should logically be drafted with a view to adoption by consensus. Instead, the authors of the draft resolution have sought in recent years increasingly to discount the views of some members of the Conference on Disarmament. It has pleased them instead to reflect the most extreme view of what the Conference on Disarmament can and should attempt to accomplish, and then castigate by inference any and all who hold other views. How this will increase the prospects for sound and solid progress in the Conference on Disarmament, one apparently is not expected to ask or understand.

Despite appeals by my delegation that the draft resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament be framed in a spirit of co-operation and with a view to achieving genuine disarmament steps, this year's text, regrettably, gives no cause for optimism that proponents of confrontation have weakened their grip over it. Accordingly, the United States voted against draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.56.

At the same time, my delegation hopes that next year more moderate attitudes will prevail when drafting a similar resolution.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation would like to explain the reasons for its abstention in the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.35, A/C.1/39/L.39 and A/C.1/39/L.56.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.35, I wish to emphasize that the French delegation attaches great importance to efforts made under the World Disarmament Campaign. We would have liked, as we did last year, to have expressed support for such a draft resolution. This year we were unable to do so because of the inclusion of a new provision, namely, paragraph 4, in which the General Assembly expresses regret that most of the States which have the largest military expenditures have not so far made any financial contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign.

On this subject the French delegation would like to say that beyond any doubt the effort made in France in terms of information about disarmament and about upholding the cause of disarmament is very substantial. Moreover, we believe that the contribution made by France to the budget of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research constitutes a very sizable contribution to this Campaign, inasmuch as it contributes in what is doubtless the most effective way to disseminating information about disarmament and ensuring that disarmament issues are considered. We would of course have preferred, instead of an expression of regret, an expression of hope. We would have been receptive to such an expression of hope and thus we would no doubt have been prompted to give favourable consideration to the question before us, but we do not believe it is fitting to single out certain States in this way, at least implicitly, in terms of what is viewed as a lack of contribution, whereas in our minds it is not at all a question of contributions not having been forthcoming.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.39, here again the French delegation abstained. In this respect we should like to emphasize the reasons why we cannot agree with operative paragraph 7. In that paragraph, the relevant specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency are invited to intensify activities to disseminate information on the consequences of the arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race.

We do not believe it is in the interests of the United Nations or of the international community to address such an appeal to the specialized agencies to devote a part of their activities to areas to which they are not required to contribute, thus diverting them from their proper field of activities. We do not

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

believe it is in the interests of international co-operation in the operational areas of the specialized agencies to urge them to devote a part of their activities to questions with regard to which they have no special competence.

Finally, I wish to indicate to the Committee the reasons why we also abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.56 relating to the report of the Conference on Disarmament. We attach great importance to relations between the General Assembly and the Conference on Disarmament and we feel it is up to the General Assembly to give certain guidelines to the Conference and express certain concerns of the international community on some the issues before that Conference. But we do not find it fitting for the General Assembly expressly to call upon the Conference on Disarmament to take steps to organize its work in connection with the mandate that may be given to its subsidiary bodies. We believe that this kind of intervention in the tasks of the Conference is not appropriate and it is not up to the General Assembly, so to speak, to dictate to the Conference on Disarmament the terms of reference under which it must deal with some of the issues on its agenda. That is why the French delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.56.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): My delegation wishes to explain why it was not able to support draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.17 and A/C.1/39/L.35 on the World Disarmament Campaign, although my Government supports the Campaign itself.

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.17 talks, as did resolution 38/73 F last year, of Member States avoiding dissemination of false and tendentious information. This form of words is repugnant to the United Kingdom, where we have a long-standing tradition of and belief in freedom of speech. Even when that freedom leads to the expression of ideas of which some of us may not approve, we cannot accept that anyone has the right to judge what is accurate and what is false and tendentious. We reject the censorship and suppression of free exchange of ideas for which this draft resolution appears to call.

We were also unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.35, because we take exception to the statement that some States have not contributed to the World Disarmament Campaign. The Campaign is funded from existing regular United Nations resources, to which the United Kingdom has contributed £140 million in this financial year. Part of this money is used to fund the United Nations services to support the World Disarmament Campaign.

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

The British Government also devotes substantial sums of money to its own disarmament information activities, which are consistent with the aims of the Campaign. Like most other Western countries, the United Kingdom does not make an additional voluntary contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign, although the British Government would not wish to discourage any British non-governmental organization from making such a contribution, should it wish to do so.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): This morning, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.56 because we agree with its general thrust, even though we have some reservations about certain phrases used in the text.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.35, concerning the World Disarmament Campaign.

The Federal Republic of Germany has consistently supported the underlying ideas of the World Disarmament Campaign. It has considered 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, factually objective information covering the whole spectrum of knowledge on disarmament be made available to the general public on a national and a worldwide scale.

As regards the domestic scene, in the open society which characterizes the Federal Republic of Germany, a broad and informed debate is going on, allowing all views to be expressed - a debate which makes a major contribution to the peaceful policies of my country.

My delegation has noted that a number of activities of the United Nations Secretariat have made an exemplary contribution to the Campaign. It commends the Secretariat on its efforts to improve its working programme further, in conformity with the aforementioned principles of objectivity of information and universality of application of the Campaign.

My delegation abstained, reluctantly, on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.35, concerning the World Disarmament Campaign. The draft, unfortunately, deviates from one of the principles that have been at the root of the World Disarmament Campaign. It fails to affirm the essentially voluntary character of contributions to the special fund for the World Disarmament Campaign. This is at variance with the wording of the relevant consensus text adopted by the second special session on disarmament, in 1982. My delegation, in conformity with the tenet of voluntarism,

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

continues to explore the possibility of contributing to the Campaign at an early point, in addition to promoting and supporting its purposes by other means, as it has done in the past.

I should also like to remind representatives that, contrary to what operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.35 seems to imply, the World Disarmament Campaign is to be conducted, in accordance with its original aims and principles, only if it encompasses all regions of the world without discrimination and if unimpeded access is afforded everywhere to the whole spectrum of information available on disarmament matters.

Mr. DEPASSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Belgium wishes to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.31, A/C.1/39/L.17 and A/C.1/39/L.56.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.17, on which the Belgian delegation abstained, I wish merely to echo what was said by the representative of the United Kingdom. Belgium's democratic tradition makes it impossible for it to condemn ideas.

As for draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.31, the Belgian delegation went along with the consensus despite the contradiction, which we find very difficult to accept, between, on the one hand, the statement in the last paragraph of the preamble that circumstances are not conducive to making progress towards the resolution of questions connected with the achievement of the comprehensive programme of disarmament, and, on the other hand, operative paragraph 2, which urges that all efforts be made so that the Conference on Disarmament may resume its work on this matter early in its 1985 session. We do not think the circumstances will change so quickly that any useful purpose could be served by a speedy resumption of the activities of the Conference on Disarmament.

Finally, my delegation wishes to explain its abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.56. This draft resolution creates the illusion that all that is needed for the achievement of results is for the General Assembly, by a majority, to give instructions to the Conference on Disarmament - instructions which, moreover, are drafted in rather peremptory terms, somewhat like marching orders in the army. This is in contradiction with the rule of consensus that governs the activities of the Conference on Disarmament. Furthermore, the draft resolution puts too much

(Mr. Depasse, Belgium)

stress on the procedural side of the matter. It gives the impression that by the setting up of some working groups or by the widening of their terms of reference, very complex and subtle problems can be solved. By way of example, I refer to operative paragraph 5, which urges the elaboration, without delay, of a draft treaty on a nuclear-weapon-test ban, whereas the Conference on Disarmament, within the framework of the present terms of reference, has already encountered some very serious difficulties on this subject.

Mr. MAJOUD (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Iraq joined in the consensus concerning the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.54. However, we wish to make the following observations.

The situation in the Middle East is completely different from that in Latin America. Hence, the Tlatelolco Treaty is not relevant to the region of the Middle East. Indeed, there are already stockpiles of nuclear weapons in the Middle East.

(Mr. Majoud, Iraq)

These stockpiles constitute a major barrier to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. In order that that region may be genuinely free of nuclear weapons, the nuclear arms possessed by Israel must first be eliminated through Israel's accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and by its subjecting its nuclear installations - all its nuclear installations - to the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). It was on that basis that my delegation understood draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.54, concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker inscribed on my list to speak in explanation of vote on cluster 2 but I think the representative of the Soviet Union wishes to speak.

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have asked to speak not to explain my delegation's vote on a specific draft resolution but for the following reason.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30, which is in cluster 2, was deferred - the vote on it was deferred. In order to determine the position we shall take on that draft resolution we would like some clarification on some points connected with the financial implications of the draft resolution, which we are still not sure about.

In the section on the financial situation of the Institute in document A/C.5/39/33, it is pointed out that the Institute has a budget deficit which will amount to \$US 175,000 by the end of this year. The note points out, furthermore, in the section "Conclusion" that in addition to overcoming this deficit by means of a one-time grant from the regular budget of the United Nations, which is totally undesirable, of course, there would be the alternative of treating the sum as an advance to be recovered from future income of the Institute.

We would like some clarification on the possibility of recovering this advance from future voluntary contributions.

I have a further comment in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30. In the Secretary-General's report concerning the activities of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies (A/39/549), which contains the draft statute of the Institute, it is pointed out that several of the members of the Board made it clear that they could concur with the recommendation for having the Institute financed out of the regular budget of the United Nations only

"if the necessary funds could be found from within the available resources of the Organization". (A/39/549, para. 33)

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

The note before the Fifth Committee on this item (A/C.5/39/33) draws the conclusion that funds cannot be found within the existing resources of the United Nations to finance the Institute.

As we understand it, in this case the article of the draft statute of the Institute concerning its financing cannot be considered a consensus recommendation of the Advisory Board. In our opinion, therefore, we need to refer back to the mandate for drafting the statute of the Institute, which was contained in the consensus resolution of the General Assembly and which provided that the Institute's activities

"shall be funded by voluntary contributions from States and public and private organizations"? (General Assembly resolution 37/99 K, IV, para. 3 (d))

We would be very pleased to have some further clarifications on these specific points so that we may determine our position on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall ask the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement on the subject.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to assure the representative of the Soviet Union that his remarks have been noted by the Secretariat and that the necessary clarification, as appropriate, will certainly be provided in due course.

I should, however, mention that a communication has been addressed by the Chairman of the First Committee to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee with regard to this matter, the statute of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research. I do not think it is necessary to go into the entire letter, which is dated 15 November 1984, but, inter alia, after going into the background of the situation, it states as follows:

"The Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research has revised the draft statute which has been submitted to the current session of the General Assembly for consideration and approval ..."

and refers to the particular document, A/39/549, annex II.

The communication from the Chairman of the First Committee to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee continues:

(Mr. Kheradi)

"In accordance with the usual practice, I should appreciate it if you could kindly bring the revised draft statute of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research to the attention of the Fifth Committee for necessary action before the First Committee takes any decision on it."

My understanding is that the matter has been the subject of consideration in the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and will be coming before the Fifth Committee, it is hoped, some time this week.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolutions in cluster 2, the Committee has now disposed of cluster 2.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that at this juncture we should take stock of our proceedings, bearing in mind the organization of our work as already approved by the First Committee at its 40th meeting last Thursday, 15 November, when I proposed the following procedure concerning clusters:

"... I am distributing to the Committee clusters of the 72 draft resolutions that have been submitted so far. Those clusters, as I explained before, were drawn up according to certain criteria which seemed to me to be the most logical and which also followed the pattern of last year. There will be no indication of the days on which those draft resolutions will be acted upon because it is my intention to take one cluster after another as soon as they have been decided upon." (A/C.1/39/PV.40, p. 101)

This is no longer a statement by the Chairman but a decision approved by the Committee, which, as the Committee is aware, can only be modified after receiving a two thirds majority vote.

As I said before, we should proceed with a certain amount of flexibility. What I have in mind is that if delegations, because of consultations on draft resolutions, or in some cases because they are trying to merge certain draft resolutions, or withdraw or amend others as a result of negotiations, we should not press them for a vote because it would be in the interest of the Committee as a whole to conclude such negotiations successfully. However, if delegations ask for postponement of action on draft resolutions because they do not have instructions, or for any other individual reason, this problem does not concern the Committee as a whole but only that particular delegation, or even a few delegations.

It is important to bear that in mind, because I do not have any doubts about the good faith of those delegations that have approached me concerning their problems with draft resolutions, but one delegation or a few delegations could block the work of the Committee because of individual problems which do not concern the Committee as a whole.

I shall now proceed to cluster 3, which contains 11 draft resolutions. I have, however, received requests from different delegations not to take action upon 10 of the 11 draft resolutions contained therein. If delegations come to me and tell me that they are negotiating draft resolutions, I think we should postpone decisions on them, but if they tell me that they are waiting for instructions, I do not think the Committee should be blocked in its work for that reason. So I have organized our work to allow enough time for all delegations not only to receive

(The Chairman)

their instructions but to prepare their respective positions concerning these 72 draft resolutions.

I shall not, therefore, press today that we adhere to the decision taken by the Committee, because it is within the jurisdiction of the Chairman to adjourn the meeting. I shall therefore adjourn the meeting today, on the understanding that as from tomorrow morning we shall start with cluster 3 and comply with the decision of the Committee that we shall vote on one cluster after the other, unless some delegations want to change that decision, or a postponement is requested because of ongoing negotiations.

On that understanding I should like to have reactions from delegations.

Mr. EMERY (United States of America): My only question is that if we have one draft resolution ready for consideration this afternoon, we might, with the Chair's permission, move ahead with that one, which will, at least to some extent, lessen the workload for tomorrow and the remainder of the week.

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no other views, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act in accordance with the suggestion we have just heard from the representative of the United States. We shall then proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.65, after which I understand that the Committee and interested delegations will be prepared to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.16, which is included in the first cluster.

If there is no objection, my intention would be to take up this afternoon both draft resolutions included in cluster 4, which are the same ones we have been dealing with for the last few years.

We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.65. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 39th meeting of the Committee, held on 15 November 1984, and is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Tunisia and Yugoslavia.

I have received a request that this 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.65 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.16. I call upon the representative of Denmark to introduce an amendment to the draft resolution.

Mr. GROOF (Denmark): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.16, submitted by Denmark, we have had consultations with all delegations, and I should like to introduce an amendment to the draft resolution. The amendment concerns operative paragraph 3, which should now read as follows:

"Draws the attention of all Member States to the study and its conclusions".

With that small amendment, it is my understanding and hope that the Committee will be able to adopt draft resolution L.16 as orally amended, without a vote.

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

Mr. QIAN Jiadong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): In recent years people have become increasingly aware of the significance of conventional disarmament for the safeguarding of international peace and security. People note with concern that four fifths of the total military expenditure of the world is spent on conventional armaments. Continuous conflicts fought with conventional arms since the end of the Second World War have created large numbers of casualties and constitute a constant and very real threat to the people of the world.

What is more disturbing is that conflicts fought with conventional arms contain the danger of triggering a nuclear war. Therefore, while asking for nuclear disarmament on a priority basis, many countries are of the view that due attention should be paid to conventional disarmament.

The Chinese delegation welcomes the study submitted by the United Nations Secretary-General on conventional disarmament. That study contains an analysis of the present situation, the nature and the causes and effects of conventional armaments. It points out that East-West confrontation is the root cause of wars fought with conventional arms. It stresses that progress in disarmament depends to a large extent on the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union and their major allies. It also points out that the two super-Powers are the largest weapons producers and suppliers.

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

These views are in line with the real state of affairs regarding conventional armaments in the world. Of course, the report or study is not without defects. It fails to mention explicitly the fact that the two super-Powers, which possess the largest and most sophisticated conventional arsenals, are stepping up their conventional arms race. It also fails to emphasize the special responsibilities these two countries should bear in the field of conventional disarmament.

The recommendations in the study on the principles, ways and measures for conventional disarmament are not sufficiently specific. However, as a whole the report, in our view, should serve to enhance awareness of the importance and urgency of conventional disarmament. It is of positive significance for the promotion of future progress in conventional disarmament.

The Chinese delegation agrees that the study should be distributed as a United Nations document. We hope that the international community will give it serious consideration and take actions accordingly so that definite steps will be taken towards conventional disarmament.

We also wish to take this opportunity to express our thanks to the Group of Experts on conventional arms, which included one Chinese expert.

In accordance with the position I have just stated, my delegation is in favour of adopting draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.16 without a vote.

Mr. ELBE (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation is pleased to be able to give its approval to the Secretary-General's study on conventional disarmament and to the corresponding draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.16.

However, I should like to elaborate on some specific aspects which, in the view of my delegation, are not adequately reflected in the study. The basis for my explanation is the letter of transmittal, which clearly indicates that although individual members might have preferred that views be expressed in a different manner, the report as a whole was adopted by consensus. The Federal Government, which sent an expert to the Group, appreciates the results and the conclusions of the study, and it hopes that the recommendations will influence the present and coming arms-control negotiations on conventional weapons and armaments, which should, in our view, be resolutely pursued within the framework of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

(Mr. Elbe, Federal Republic
of Germany)

My delegation has, however, some reservations concerning the definition of the causes of the so-called conventional arms race, as contained in chapter II of the study, and concerning the question of the world-wide arms transfer.

Let me turn first to the definition of the so-called conventional arms race. My delegation would have preferred a more detailed analysis of the causes of the world-wide accumulation of conventional weapons. The explanation that the world-wide arms race began after 1945 and has since assumed a global character and the deduction from that that an arms race of such dimension has developed an irreversible dynamism of its own tend to ignore the significance of political factors as a cause for a world-wide accumulation of conventional weapons. The right approach would have been to state that there have been many political developments which, taken together, have led to the huge stockpiles of weapons now existing all over the world.

(Mr. Elbe, Federal Republic
of Germany)

It is true that the East-West conflict has played a very important role in this context. But it is more than doubtful to argue that the confrontation has been the main reason for the global accumulation of conventional weapons, when one considers the great number of areas of tension and military conflict in the third world which result from a variety of specific regional factors. For these reasons, it would also have been more appropriate to use the term "arms accumulation" or "arms build-up" instead of "arms race".

In the view of my delegation, chapter II, of the Secretary-General's report (A/39/348), which deals with the prevention of the causes of the global arms race, concludes that there are no feasible means of preventing the further accumulation of conventional weapons and of reversing the present trend. But such a perspective is neither true nor politically tenable. The Federal Government of Germany, together with its Western allies, has presented a large number of wide-ranging initiatives in the field of arms control and disarmament and has thereby indicated the possibilities of shaping the future with fewer weapons, yet with a greater measure of security for all.

Secondly, it is true, as stated in the Study, that endeavours to achieve disarmament in the conventional sphere would be incomplete if they did not include the world-wide, steadily increasing transfer of arms. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) estimates put such world-wide transfer as high as 13.2 billion dollars for 1982 at 1975 prices. But the conclusions necessary for our present work have not been drawn from these findings. The comments in the study on supplier and/or recipient agreements on the reduction of international arms transfer do not reflect the importance of this problem. Thus, for instance, the study does not mention earlier proposals or suggested solutions in some areas which were promising or had actually proved successful. Nor does it cover the serious attempts in the form of studies to indicate possibilities for tangible progress.

We all know that the task of placing restrictions on arms transfer is an extremely complicated business. Real progress can only be achieved if a reliable data basis is established. This was the reason why the Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany proposed that the General Assembly should establish a register for arms exports and imports. It should be possible to agree on criteria

(Mr. Elbe, Federal Republic
of Germany)

for such a register. For instance, the register could initially be limited to certain categories of weapons. This would, of course, be only a beginning and a first step to the development of an actual data base. The Federal Government repeatedly underlined the necessity for establishing such a register, which would provide the international community with facts and figures about the extent and flow of the weapons trade. In addition, such a register would create a valuable basis in order to achieve a more accurate and reliable assessment of international arms transfers and, thus, strengthen confidence among States. It is evident that the problem of arms transfer is playing an increasingly important role in the field of disarmament as well as in the field of development, now that several developing countries are spending funds at an alarming rate on the importation of armament. The United Nations study, The Relationship between Disarmament and Development, has made a thorough analysis of this problem, which gains particular significance in the face of the mounting financial and economic difficulties of many countries. Where nations have balance-of-payment problems, the transfer of arms, often a very costly business, cannot be left out of consideration. In general, one must say that the incomplete data basis, indeed in the case of some countries or group of States the complete lack of a data basis, reduces the study's value considerably. This applies in particular to the multi-faceted problems of the weapons trade where effective limitations will not be feasible as long as no central register is established. Without openness and comparability, world-wide and regional restrictions which would help considerably to reduce the burden of arms in individual countries will not be possible.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.16, as orally amended.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana,

Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, 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, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Bahrain, Iraq, Kuwait, Qatar, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.16, as orally amended was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to explain his vote.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation did not object to the adoption of draft resolution L.65 by consensus.

In this connection, we should like once again to reiterate that the Soviet Union has always been and remains a staunch advocate of the holding of constructive and fruitful talks in order to elaborate practical ways and means of preventing nuclear war and curbing the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race. We have frequently stated our readiness to conduct talks concerning various spheres of disarmament, the prevention of the arms race in outer space and a number of other problems which face mankind today. At the same time, we have always made concrete proposals of our own and have put forward definite ideas on the subject of specific talks.

With regard to the last preambular paragraph which states that there is a need for the resumption of negotiations, both bilaterally between the Soviet Union and the United States and others, our position on this matter has been frequently expressed at different levels, including here in the First Committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN: As I announced before and since I have had no request for postponement, I now propose that we take action on both draft resolutions included in cluster 4, draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.19 and A/C.1/39/L.28. We will now take action on these two draft resolutions by calling on those delegations which wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): It has been the consistent position of Brazil, on the question of the reduction of military budgets, that it is incumbent upon the nuclear-weapon Powers to be the first to take concrete steps towards the reduction of their own military budgets. It is a matter of public record that the military expenditures of the nuclear-weapon Powers continue to increase at an accelerated pace and that such expenditures account for almost 90 per cent of the total military expenditures of the world.

Brazil believes that the enormous amounts spent for armaments by the nuclear-weapon Powers would be put to better use if they were reallocated for purposes of economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries.

Guided by these considerations, my delegation will adhere to the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19. We shall, however, abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.28, since, in our view, it does not lay appropriate stress on the special responsibilities that are incumbent on the nuclear-weapon Powers in this regard.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the representative of Romania for a statement, not for an explanation of vote, as Romania is a sponsor of both draft resolutions under consideration.

Mr. TINCA (Romania): Mr. Chairman, you are right. We are co-sponsoring this draft resolution and we cannot explain our vote. Nevertheless, I would like to take the floor to indicate that in the French version of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19, in operative paragraph 5, there is a slight translation error. The original version of the draft resolution was in English and we carried out the consultations on the original version, namely, English. But in the translation of this draft resolution into French, there was a slight mistake in operative paragraph 5 and I now wish to correct this. I would like to draw the attention of representatives to the fourth and fifth lines of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19. In French, the text should read as follows:

"... en vue de finaliser l'identification et l'elaboration des principes ..."

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

The English version is correct and reflects the consensus recommendation adopted by the Commission on Disarmament.

With this correction which I have made, the French text will also reflect the recommendation of the Commission on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat will take note of the observation of the representative of Romania.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union has always favoured the reduction of military expenditure in view of the fact that growing military expenditure is directly connected with the spiralling arms race. The Soviet Union, together with its friends and allies, under the Warsaw Treaty, in March of 1984 put forward a very complex and comprehensive proposal on negotiations in order to achieve a practical degree of agreement between the countries members of the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), not to increase their military expenditure and subsequently to reduce them, in both percentage and absolute terms.

We continue to believe that efforts not to increase but to reduce military expenditure should involve all States and, first and foremost, those States which possess a major military potential. At the same time, the implementation of such measures by the members of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO would be very important because of their high military expenditures.

The achievement of practical agreement to reduce military budgets would not require a great deal of time if countries Members of the United Nations demonstrated the political will and aspiration to achieve a speedy solution to this extremely important and long-overdue problem.

As far as the question of determining a reporting machinery and the comparability of military expenses, as contained in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.28, this can only be regarded as an attempt by some to try to shirk the task of actually reducing military expenditure and to distract attention from the actual growth in their own military budgets. And the same is true of the proposal on the holding of a so-called international conference in order to compare military expenses between various States. Therefore, we consider that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.28 simply deadlocks the whole problem of reducing military budgets, as similar drafts have done in the past, last year in fact. Therefore, we shall vote against that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there other delegations which wish to explain their vote?

If not, we shall proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19. This draft resolution was introduced by Romania at the 35th meeting, on 9 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Austria, Bangladesh, Colombia, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Ireland, Malta, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sudan, Sweden and Uruguay.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19 have requested that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall declare draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19 adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall take action now upon draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.28. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 38th meeting, on 14 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Romania, Sudan, Sweden and Uruguay.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelo ussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, 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: Bahamas, Brazil, Burma, China, India, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.28 was adopted by 100 votes to 14, with 7 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their vote on the two draft resolutions we have just acted upon.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.28 and joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19, and I should like to explain briefly my reasons for this.

* Subsequently the delegation of Qatar informed the Secretariat that it had intended not to participate in the vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19 requests the Disarmament Commission to continue its consideration of the item on the reduction of military budgets with a view to finalizing the identification and elaboration of the principles which should govern the further action of States in this field. My delegation has participated in those efforts but 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 States from different geographical regions of the world and with different budgetary and accounting systems. We therefore particularly welcome operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.28, which emphasizes this point. 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, conversely, that without a generally accepted procedure for the comparison of military expenditures it would be very difficult to arrive at balanced, verifiable agreements to restrain and reduce such expenditures. Thus it is with disappointment that my delegation has noted that so far no Party to the Warsaw Pact has supported this attempt to increase trust and confidence by completing the reporting instrument.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19 and voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.28. With regard to the latter, my delegation must express some misgivings as to the true usefulness of providing information according to the standards proposed in that draft resolution. We have the impression that this exercise, which has been conducted for some years now, is not being as fruitful as it should be. If information is supplied, as occurs today, by only a relatively small number of Member States, that the true effectiveness of this exercise leaves much to be desired.

Secondly, information of this kind should not be wholly divorced from serious efforts relating to the reduction of military budgets that may be taking place in the world.

With reference to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19, my delegation believes that the States that are militarily the most powerful and are responsible for the highest military expenditures should take the initiative in these matters.

Despite those reservations, my delegation voted in favour of both draft resolutions, because my Government, as it has demonstrated, takes a deep interest in the reduction of military budgets. It therefore voted accordingly, as we support the objectives of these draft resolutions, despite the doubts I have expressed.

Mr. SHARMA (India): India abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.28 and, although we did not wish to stand in the way of a consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19, we would have abstained on it had it been put to a vote.

In our view, since it is the five or six militarily significant States that account for more than 80 per cent of the world's as military expenditure, it is those States that must bear the onus of cutting military spending. We cannot endorse the premise that rising military expenditure is a phenomenon for which all States are somehow responsible. So long as there is not the 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 that proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.28 will serve merely to distract attention from the central issue in the field of disarmament, that is, nuclear disarmament.

Mr. DEPASSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The Belgian delegation did not wish to break the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19 because that draft resolution contains a number of ideas with which we agree. However, its weakness is that it does not attach due importance to the ideas of comparability and verification which seem essential in any exercise aimed at the reduction of military budgets.

Fortunately, those ideas are included in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.28, on which our delegation has just cast a positive vote.

Mr. de la BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.29, despite certain reservations that we had about it. We joined in the consensus to demonstrate that we wanted to acknowledge the fact that Romania, a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.19 is also a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.28 and that, consequently, the views expressed in the latter draft are equally held by the Romanian delegation.

In this connection, we take note of the fact that, ipso facto, Romania subscribes to the position expressed in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.28, which refer to the broadest possible participation of States in the standardized system of reporting military expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to explain its vote, we have concluded consideration of and action on draft resolutions in cluster 4.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: The following is an outline of our programme of work for this week.

We shall hold meetings morning and afternoon on Tuesday and Wednesday, as representatives know, Thursday is a holiday and there will be no work in the United Nations.

With reference to Friday, we shall take a decision about that on Wednesday. If our work progresses well enough we might cancel our Friday meeting; otherwise we shall hold a meeting on Friday. That decision will be taken on Wednesday.

With regard to voting on Tuesday and Wednesday, as was decided by the Committee at its meeting last Thursday and restated by me this afternoon, we shall proceed cluster by cluster - at the end of one cluster we shall proceed to the following one. We shall postpone action on draft resolutions within a cluster only if delegations explain that they are in the process of consulting and negotiating on draft resolutions. I hope that I shall no longer be approached by any delegation saying it will not be able to participate because of individual circumstances. Only circumstances that concern the Committee as a whole will be entertained.

Therefore, in the morning we shall take up cluster 3 and proceed in accordance with the decision already taken.

(The Chairman)

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Of course we are fully ready to go along with your proposal, Mr. Chairman, but should like to know the reason so that we can explain to our Government why we are not going to work on Friday.

We had assumed that the voting on draft resolutions - and there are 72 of them - would take up the period from today until 27 November. The Government of my country and, undoubtedly, the Governments of other countries must have a certain amount of time to consider and give instructions on all 72 of those draft resolutions. Since we are already losing four days - Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday - just like that, we do not understand why draft resolutions should be adopted in such a hasty manner.

We accept your proposal that we work tomorrow and the day after, both morning and afternoon; but, naturally, if we or other delegations give reasons for a request to defer the voting those reasons should be respected.

I should like to draw attention to the fact that although a number of draft resolutions have been formally introduced they are still being worked on by the sponsors themselves. For example, we still do not have a final text for a particular draft resolution which was formally introduced a few days ago. I can refer to a number of draft resolutions that are in the same position, but I am sure other delegations are perfectly well aware of this.

We are quite prepared to work on Tuesday and Wednesday, on the understanding that the interests and concerns of delegations, as well as those of the entire Committee, will be taken into account so that we can take action on these draft resolutions in a responsible spirit and in the light of relevant instructions from our Governments.

The CHAIRMAN: As I said, the flexibility that we should adopt in our work should not imply any lack of discipline. When there are postponements that concern the Committee as a whole I think they are justified and should be accepted; but if one single delegation or a few delegations would stop the Committee's work owing to their individual circumstances, although I would not question their good faith, that might create a bad precedent and make it possible for one or a few delegations to block the work of the Committee as a whole. That is what I have in mind. However, I am sure that with a spirit of flexibility and co-operation we shall be able to finish our work, not in a hasty manner, but in a responsible way.

Mr. LUNDBO (Norway): While I appreciate the statement of the representative of the USSR, I suggest that we decide today, as has been done before, on a limit beyond which we will not work tomorrow - for example, that under no circumstance would we go beyond cluster 7. I think that was done last year, and I believe that such a decision would facilitate the work of this Committee as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Norway for his encouraging optimism, in saying that we might reach cluster 7.

I intend - indeed, it is my duty - to abide by the Committee's decision to vote one cluster after the other, so tomorrow we shall take up cluster 3, except for those resolutions that are under consultation and negotiation among delegations. We may be able to start cluster 5, but it is not my intention, bearing in mind the kind of resolutions that we have to vote upon in cluster 5, to go further than that. So we shall start with cluster 3 and if we have disposed of it during the day we shall start on cluster 5.

If I hear no comments, I take it that the Committee reaffirms its decision.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.