

*United Nations*  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
**THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION**  
*Official Records\**

FIRST COMMITTEE  
38th meeting  
held on  
Friday, 20 November 1981  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 38TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

UN LIBRARY

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

DEC 29 1981

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 128 AND 135 (continued)

UN/SA COLLECTION

Draft resolutions were introduced by:

Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt) - A/C.1/36/L.34  
Mr. Wegener (Federal Republic of Germany) - A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.1

---

\* 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 A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), 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.1/36/PV.38  
25 November 1981

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 128 AND 135 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the Secretary of the Committee to announce the names of those delegations that have become co-sponsors of certain draft resolutions.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The following delegations have added their names to the lists of sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.1: German Democratic Republic, Panama, Barbados, Ecuador.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.5: Congo, Uruguay, Mongolia, Panama.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10: Congo.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.23: Congo.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.26: Viet Nam, Sudan, Panama.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33: Democratic Yemen, Grenada, Sao Tome and Principe.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.42: Romania.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.44: Sierra Leone.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.46: Cyprus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.40: Viet Nam, Mongolia.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.4: Uruguay, Barbados.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7: Uruguay.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1: Cuba, Panama.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.27: Cuba, Mongolia, Panama.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.9: Philippines, Panama, Ecuador.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.12: Sao Tome and Principe.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13: Sao Tome and Principe.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.15: Sao Tome and Principe, Chad.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.16: Sao Tome and Principe, Chad.

(Mr. Rathore, Secretary of the Committee)

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.25: Mongolia.  
Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.38: Sudan.  
Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.21: Panama, Ecuador.  
Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.22: Panama.  
Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.19: Panama.  
Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43: Sudan.  
Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35: Ethiopia.  
Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.36: Ethiopia.  
Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32: Cuba.  
Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.45/Rev.1: Kenya.  
Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.1: France.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): On behalf of the sponsors, Brazil, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and my own country, I have the honour to introduce a proposed amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35, on chemical weapons. The proposed amendment is contained in document A/C.1/36/L.48. It sets forth an addition to operative paragraph 3, in which the General Assembly urges the Committee on Disarmament to continue, as from the beginning of its session to be held in 1982, negotiations on a chemical weapons convention as a matter of high priority, taking into account all existing proposals and future initiatives. By the amendment, it is emphasized that the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons should be re-established with an appropriately revised mandate enabling the Committee to achieve agreement on a chemical weapons convention at the earliest date.

I should like to recall that the Group of 21 neutral and non-aligned countries in the Committee on Disarmament has for the past two years exerted all efforts to obtain a mandate for the Ad Hoc Working Group that would enable it to carry out genuine negotiations. That those efforts have so far not

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

succeeded is a matter of great disappointment for those countries. It can be said that, even without such a mandate, the Ad Hoc Working Group has been able to produce useful results. As chairman of the Working Group this year, I am, of course, most grateful for the very kind remarks a number of delegations have made concerning the Working Group's achievements this year and my own efforts in that context. The main factor contributing to our results was the co-operation given by the participating delegations. It was only because of this that the handicap in the form of the unsatisfactory mandate could be overcome.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

If we have succeeded in demonstrating that the Committee on Disarmament is a viable instrument for elaborating a chemical weapons convention, our disappointment naturally has become so much larger when we realize that there apparently is still a lack of willingness to permit the Committee to draft such a convention.

By proposing this amendment we appeal to all members of the Committee on Disarmament without exception to demonstrate their preparedness to engage in such negotiations in order to contribute to achieving agreement on the urgently required convention on chemical weapons at the earliest date. I do not underestimate the difficulties, but I would sincerely hope that all members will take the necessary steps to make it possible to reach consensus. The representatives of Canada and Japan in their statements yesterday emphasized the importance of consensus in this matter. With the amendment a consensus on the draft resolution would be even more significant, since it would mean that all nations also recognize the Committee on Disarmament as a genuine negotiating body for issues as important as a chemical weapons convention.

Mr. MENZIES (Canada): I, too, wish to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35, about which the representative of Sweden has just spoken. I appreciate the motivations behind the proposed amendment just submitted by the representative of Sweden in document A/C.1/36/L.40. Indeed, Canada shares the Swedish desire to see the terms of reference of the Ad Hoc Working Group broadened in an appropriate way. However, we are interested in producing an effective resolution on a matter as critical as negotiations on chemical weapons. It is our view, which is shared, I hope, by a great number of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35, that effectiveness can be assured only through the process of consensus. Indeed, Ambassador Lidgard, the former Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons of the Committee on Disarmament, is aware of the importance of consensus, for which he worked so very skilfully and successfully during the last session of the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Menzies, Canada)

At the same time, we are all aware that a draft resolution of this nature which is not adopted by consensus will have limited usefulness at best when the time comes to recommence the work of this particular Ad Hoc Working Group of the Committee on Disarmament.

While many members will be attracted to the substance of the amendment proposed by Sweden, there is one point in particular that should be borne in mind. The amendment implies that the Assembly is able to direct the Committee on Disarmament in the internal organization of its affairs. For some delegations, including my own, that question is by no means simple, and the effect of the amendment would be to open that question unproductively. I should mention that if this draft resolution is not adopted with the full support of this Committee, and thus of the Assembly, it would render the task of the incoming Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons of the Committee on Disarmament very difficult indeed. Ambassador Lidgard, as outgoing Chairman, was fortunate in having as support the General Assembly resolution on chemical weapons adopted last year by consensus.

Therefore, I request that a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35 be postponed to enable consultations on this matter to proceed and in a final effort to preserve consensus in the interest of adopting a resolution which will contribute to, and not detract from, the effectiveness of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform the representative of Canada that the Committee will take note of his request later when we shall discuss the order in which we are going to vote on the draft resolutions.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): My purpose in speaking is to introduce the revised draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.45/Rev.1, whose sponsors are Argentina, Bahamas, Cyprus, Ecuador, India, Kenya, Niger, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The revised draft resolution recalls General Assembly resolutions 34/83 A of 11 December 1979 and 35/156 J of 12 December 1980. It expresses alarm at the present grave state of international affairs, which is characterized by marked deterioration in the relationship between the major military Powers which seriously jeopardizes the process of détente and results in the flaring up of new and in the continuation of old conflicts, and it expresses concern about that situation.

The sponsors of the revised draft resolution are convinced that progress on the reduction of arms and armaments requires that the arms race must first be stopped. That is a matter of concern because there seems to be so much effort on disarmament measures without realizing that it is impossible to proceed to disarmament while at the same time arming with more effective and dangerous weapons. We are convinced that the arms race cannot be stopped as long as its root cause - the doctrine of deterrence and of strategic balance - continues to be regarded as the sole means for the security of nations. We are aware that the best hope for arresting the pernicious spiral of the arms race is by providing alternative means of security instead of relying entirely on the balance of armaments or on the doctrine of deterrence. We are further aware that the rational alternative means for such security is to move to a halt in the arms race by developing in a parallel way the measures and modalities for collective security as mandatorily required by the Charter.

The revised draft resolution recalls the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, which states that:

"Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces, by international agreement and mutual example ...".

(resolution S-10/2, part. I, para. 13)

The draft states that it is of essential importance to create a climate of confidence in the United Nations which will pave the way to co-operation among Member States, and particularly the major Powers, in fulfilling the common and basic obligations under the Charter.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Further, the draft resolution notes with satisfaction the references to statements made by representatives of a number of Member States in the First Committee, including the two major Powers, which indicate positive attitudes towards effective use of the United Nations - this is very important - in improving the international situation and preventing war.

The draft resolution then reaffirms the Assembly's previous resolution 35/156 J, of 12 December 1980, and reiterates its request in that resolution to the permanent members of the Security Council to facilitate the work of the Council towards carrying out this essential responsibility under the Charter. It calls upon all States to take prompt action for the implementation of resolution 35/156 J which would render effective the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the Charter and thereby be conducive to meaningful disarmament negotiations.

In its operative paragraph 2, the draft resolution deems it necessary, as a first step in this direction, that the Security Council should take the required measures towards the implementation of Article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations, which would reinforce the foundations of peace, security and order through the United Nations, and avert the growing threat of nuclear conflagration.

Now, my humble submission, on behalf of the sponsors, is that this draft resolution, which asks for the implementation of the previous resolution, is very important because of its substance, and I would say that it was an encouragement to hear yesterday, in the Committee, the representative of the United States, Ambassador Fields, refer to the need for utilizing the United Nations to solve problems and emphasize that what is required is action rather than words. We have reached a time when we can no longer confine ourselves to the rhetoric of statements which result in nothing.



(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Therefore, I would say that I fully agree with and support the statement of the representative of the United States. I wish to point out that the draft resolution I have introduced aims at co-operation among the members of the Security Council, particularly the permanent members, for the purpose of implementing the system of international security, as required by the Charter. This would lead to a climate of confidence in the United Nations and pave the way to positive co-operation towards halting the arms race and promoting the disarmament endeavour. That would be a constructive move to make the United Nations meaningful and effective, as is required in these critical times.

Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic): On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.36, on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, my delegation would like to inform the members of the Committee that, after consultations with a number of delegations which are not sponsors, the following changes have been made in the text of that draft: first, there is a change in the last preambular paragraph. Secondly, an additional operative paragraph, numbered 3, has been added. This paragraph refers to the multilateral negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament, especially to the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons and the consideration of its mandate. Thirdly, there is a change in the last operative paragraph, which is entirely one of style.

These changes have been made merely in response to proposals put forward by other delegations, and the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.36 express the hope that by those changes wider support of the draft resolution will be ensured. The revised text will be submitted as document A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1.

Furthermore, I should like to inform the Committee also of a slight change we intend to make in the text of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.14, on nuclear weapons in all aspects. Here we have included in operative paragraphs 1 and 4 a reference to paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly. This too is in response to suggestions received by the sponsors from other delegations.

We hope that the revised draft will soon be available to representatives.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): This statement of the French delegation pertains to the question of institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament, which is the subject of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.9. In resolution 34/87 E, of 11 December 1970, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, with the assistance of qualified governmental experts, to carry out a comprehensive study assessing current institutional requirements and future estimated needs in the United Nations management of disarmament affairs. This is an important contribution to preparations for the next special session of the General Assembly and for its debates.

The first special session, in 1978, unquestionably contributed to important and necessary reforms. The second session will have to continue and complete that undertaking, wherever that appears to be necessary, with a view to ensuring optimum conditions for the development of the role of the United Nations in the disarmament field.

The French delegation welcomes the conclusions reached in the report by the Group presided over by Mr. Ortiz de Rozas (A/36/392). Among the points that we have noted, I would cite in particular, first, the need for improved co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies of the United Nations family. In the report of the Group of Experts one notes, for example, that in the field of peace studies and research, funds for studies carried out by organizations not primarily concerned with disarmament are larger than those managed directly by the United Nations itself - that is, the Centre for Disarmament. There is a risk, then, of duplication of effort and of waste.

On the level of co-ordination, at the present stage everything is limited to a sort of informal club and the respective secretariats of those organizations.

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

The second point that I should like to mention concerns studies by experts carried out at the request of the General Assembly. The number of such studies has more than tripled in three years. Nineteen studies carried out with the assistance of governmental experts will have been undertaken or completed during the 1979-1981 period. We are in favour of such studies, for on many subjects they are irreplaceable for government reflexion, deliberation and negotiation.

We therefore appreciate the considerable efforts made by the Secretariat and by experts to be of assistance in such work. The report stresses that improvements could be made, in particular but not exclusively, as regards the following institutions: the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research and the contribution that it should make to United Nations work by ensuring co-operation with specialized scientific institutions; and the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, which has not yet been able fully to carry out the role that its members themselves would like to play in its proper field, namely, that of studies.

The third point I should like to mention concerns the implications for the United Nations of a development of its role in the verification of disarmament agreements. The development of technology and the dissemination of weapons will in the coming years make the association of the international community in the verification of disarmament agreements more necessary. Inasmuch as they are negotiated and concluded among signatories on an equal footing, all the parties must be assured of equal opportunities to monitor the implementation of such agreements.

Here the United Nations has a role to play. The report mentions a number of proposals that have been made, such as the creation of a verification organization or a satellite monitoring agency, and although there was no agreement between all the experts on this point, it stresses the institutional consequences of these prospects, and this deserves thorough study.

Finally, I should like to mention the question of the status of the Centre for Disarmament. The report of the experts provides specific data regarding the increased tasks of the Centre over the past few years and how the Centre has coped with its duties. It is clear, however, that the present status of the Centre in the Organization can be improved. The range of options considered

(Mr. de La Gorce France)

by the experts is very broad, since it goes from keeping the status quo to the establishment of a separate organization. But a number of intermediary options are envisaged and they should be studied thoroughly in the more immediate perspective of the second special session. Those are questions which, as we are aware, still call forth diverging views. We think that the fact that they have been posed clearly is of itself constructive and it is also useful that the General Assembly's attention has been drawn by the experts to problems of co-ordination and of studies.

Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): There is an international consensus that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is one of the important measures for disarmament in the context of general and complete disarmament. This has been confirmed by a large number of international conventions, notably the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which states in Article VII:

"Nothing in this Treaty affects the right of any group of States to conclude regional treaties in order to assure the total absence of nuclear weapons in their respective territories". (resolution 2373 (XXII), Annex).

This fact has also been confirmed in the Final Document adopted by the tenth special session of the General Assembly, which devoted three paragraphs to nuclear-weapon-free zones. It affirmed that the establishment of such zones constituted an important measure towards total disarmament.

You may recall that Egypt, together with another State in the area, undertook an initiative to establish such a zone at the twenty-ninth session, and a number of resolutions were adopted, also at the last session of the General Assembly, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

All those resolutions have enjoyed overwhelming support. However, an important change took place during the thirty-fifth session when the General Assembly adopted resolution 35/147, for the first time by consensus, in which all countries concerned, in addition to the nuclear-weapon States, participated.

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

The Egyptian Government considers that this consensus constitutes a turning-point which must be utilized to the utmost in order to give an impetus towards the establishment of such a zone. On such a basis and in order to maintain the momentum derived from General Assembly resolution 35/147, my country has deemed it useful to submit this year to the General Assembly another initiative, which is reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.34, which I am introducing in this Committee and which seeks to translate this theoretical concept into a practical one. Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.34 proposed by my country is based on the following factors. First, it reaffirms the principles enunciated by the General Assembly in its previous relevant resolutions. Secondly, it

"urges ... States to avert any action which could jeopardize the fulfilment of the present resolution, to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to place all their nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards".

Thirdly, it

"requests the Secretary-General to appoint a special representative who would contact all concerned parties in the region with a view to ascertaining their attitudes on procedures necessary for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East including the scope and modalities thereof", and

"further requests the Secretary-General to submit an interim report ... to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament ... report to the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly and to the Security Council"

which has a mandate to deal with matters related to disarmament, in accordance with Article 26 of the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with paragraph 63 (d) of the Final Document adopted by the second special session devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

Egypt believes that the mission to be undertaken by the Secretary-General's special representative is confined to his contacting all the parties concerned in order to ascertain their views on the matter.

With regard to the parties concerned that will be contacted by the special representative of the Secretary-General in accordance with the provisions of this draft resolution, we believe that the "parties concerned" should include all those who have received letters from the Secretary-General in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3263 (XXIX); adopted at the twenty-ninth session, on 9 December 1974, in addition to any other parties that wish to express their views and to co-operate with the special representative of the Secretary-General in the context of the resolutions of the General Assembly.

Egypt believes that the appointment of a special representative of the Secretary-General is an adequate step in order to maintain the momentum necessary for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and to transmute this theoretical concept into a practical one without in any way infringing upon the basic positions of the parties concerned.

In submitting our draft resolution to the Committee for consideration and the necessary support, our delegation has every hope that all the parties concerned will co-operate with the representative of the Secretary-General in order that his mission may be successful.

Finally, the question raised is related to a fundamental issue - namely, that all parties should rise to their levels of responsibility. The situation in the Middle East is very delicate and sensitive. Nuclear disarmament in the Middle East is one of the fundamental steps that should receive adequate attention and be dealt with in all wisdom, free of any unnecessary moves or desires that would create unnecessary obstacles to implementation of this vital objective. We therefore urge all parties to consider this draft resolution with all the prudence and rationality required by the public interest.

In proposing this draft resolution as well as similar ones, Egypt seeks to promote the interests of the Arab States and the Middle East region as a whole.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): Only a few days ago, on 6 November, I introduced document A/36/474, containing the comprehensive study on confidence-building measures. Today it is my honour to introduce the draft resolution in document A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.1, entitled "Confidence building measures", on behalf of the delegations of Austria, the Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Mauritania, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Zaire and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The text of the draft resolution is mainly a procedural one. The operative part, inter alia, takes note of the study, expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General and the experts, requests the Secretary-General to publish the study, and decides to submit the study to the second special session devoted to disarmament.

The positive results achieved and the wide consensus reached among the experts have, however, encouraged the sponsors of the draft to reflect in their draft some of the results of the experts' work as well as a number of generally accepted principles in this field. Thus operative paragraphs 5 and 6 regard the concept of confidence-building measures as a useful approach in reducing and eventually eliminating potential causes for mistrust and misunderstanding so that the promotion of such measures where appropriate conditions exist will significantly contribute to facilitating the process of disarmament.

In operative paragraphs 3 and 4 it is realized and recognized that confidence reflects a set of interrelated factors of a military as well as of a non-military character so that a plurality of approaches is needed to overcome fear and apprehension. Therefore in operative paragraph 8, the draft resolution invites all States to consider the possible introduction of confidence-building measures in their region in keeping with conditions and requirements prevailing in the respective region.

The preambular paragraphs stress, inter alia, the role of confidence-building measures in improving conditions conducive to further measures of disarmament and take note of the encouraging results of some such measures

(Mr. Wegener, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

already agreed upon and implemented in some regions.

Desiring to secure a broad consensus on this draft resolution such as has been enjoyed by its two predecessors, the sponsors of the draft resolution are still holding consultations with some States that take a particular interest in this matter. It is therefore to be expected that the draft may undergo some additional minor adjustments before it is presented to this Committee for ultimate approval. I am, however, pleased to report at this stage that the consultations have been going well and have shown good promise for a final consensus.

Mr. KOSTENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR would like to make some points on the draft resolution on the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon (A/C.1/36/L.33). Like many other States of the United Nations, the Ukrainian SSR has firmly condemned the decision of the Government of the United States to start wide-scale production of the neutron weapon. We regard this as a challenge to the cause of peace and restriction of the arms race since essentially this is one further step towards the implementation in practice of the doctrine of so-called limited nuclear war. This is a view that is shared not only by the socialist countries but by many other States, as has been particularly in evidence in the discussion in our Committee.



(Mr. Kostenko, Ukrainian SSR)

In this connexion, we should like to recall that the Soviet Union has frequently proposed that agreement be reached on mutual renunciation of the production of neutron weapons, to spare the world the appearance of this new weapon of mass destruction of people.

In March 1978 the socialist countries, as is known, put forward for consideration in the Committee on Disarmament a draft convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons. In the preamble to that document it was proposed that we express the profound interest of States and peoples in preventing the use of the achievements of modern science and technology for the development and production of new types of weapons of mass destruction and also express the desire to contribute to the halting of the arms race, particularly in the field of means of mass destruction.

A key element in that draft convention was article I, which provided that it would be an obligation on each State party to the convention not to produce, stockpile, deploy anywhere or use nuclear neutron weapons. The draft convention also referred to measures for monitoring its implementation.

Unfortunately, because of the resistance of certain States, that document has so far not been duly considered by the Committee on Disarmament. Repeating the now familiar arguments about the "humanitarian" and "defensive" nature of these weapons, leading countries of the North Atlantic bloc have placed a serious obstacle in the way of implementation of this proposal by the socialist countries.

After the Government of the United States took the decision to develop production of this barbaric means of mass destruction of people, the socialist countries, in August this year, proposed the urgent establishment of an ad hoc working group within the Committee on Disarmament to draft an international convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons. However, here again, the Western Powers blocked the idea of establishing such a working group.

(Mr. Kostenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR is convinced that the United Nations should express itself strongly in favour of prohibiting the nuclear neutron weapon. As may be seen from the appeal contained in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33, of which the Ukrainian SSR is a co-sponsor, negotiations in an appropriate organizational framework should be started without delay with a view to concluding such a convention. On how quickly we make progress in such negotiations will depend whether the appearance of this weapon in Europe and other continents can be prevented. It is our hope that draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33 will win wide support in this Committee and will be adopted by this session.

Mr. R. M. KHAN (Pakistan): My delegation would like to make a brief comment on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, contained in document A/36/29.

We are gratified that it has been possible for the Ad Hoc Committee once again to present a report and recommendations which enjoy a consensus among Members. At the same time, we are aware of the tortuous and protracted consultations which preceded the emergence of that consensus. In this regard, my delegation would like to express its profound admiration for the great patience, wisdom and outstanding diplomatic skills of the Chairman of the Committee, Ambassador Fonseka, whose untiring efforts made this important result possible.

I do not wish to dwell on the difficulties which came in the way of achieving the consensus. The focus of my brief remarks will be on future work in the Ad Hoc Committee.

On several occasions in the past, at meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee as well as at previous sessions of the First Committee, my delegation has emphasized the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean which was proposed on successive occasions in General Assembly resolutions, particularly resolutions 34/80 B and 35/150. We believe that the convening of the proposed Conference can become an important step towards the realization of the objective of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We are also convinced of the merit of the argument that the Conference should be convened at an early date. Furthermore, we believe that the suggested date of the first half of 1983 would give the Ad Hoc Committee sufficient time to complete the necessary harmonization of views and the necessary preparations for the convening of the Conference.

In the opinion of my delegation, the future work of the Ad Hoc Committee has two aspects: first, preparations in respect of the substantive issues to be taken up at the proposed Conference; and, secondly, decisions on organizational and procedural questions relating to the proposed Conference.

While the organizational and procedural questions relating to the Conference are of considerable consequence, the primary task of the Ad Hoc Committee would undeniably be to address itself to the substantive issues relevant to the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

(Mr. R. M. Khan, Pakistan)

In this regard, we believe that the Ad Hoc Committee should start substantive discussion on the principles of agreement which should be adopted at the 1983 Conference on the Indian Ocean. These principles should be in the nature of an elaboration of the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, and along the lines of those which were considered and formalized at the 1979 Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean Region.

The central fact of the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace concerns the strengthening of the security of the States of the Indian Ocean region. As my delegation had the opportunity to state on several earlier occasions, the threat to the security of the Indian Ocean States has two possible sources: one is extraregional, and the other is regional.

Extraregional dangers to the peace and security of the States of the Indian Ocean region arise from the foreign military presence in the area, including foreign occupation forces, foreign naval presence, naval and other military bases and also any such deployments in the vicinity of the region, which could threaten the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of the region's States.

The second aspect of the threat arises from ambitions on the part of regional States themselves and their policies of domination and assertion in the regional context. This aspect of the threat cannot be underrated in its serious implications, for it creates conditions for the great Powers to perpetuate their military presence in the area.

Pakistan's commitment to the goal of the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace has been reinforced by the constantly deteriorating security and political climate in our region and the growing recourse to the use of force.

The foreign military intervention in neighbouring Afghanistan has aggravated our concern for the stability of peace and security of our area. Therefore we earnestly hope that the conditions in the Indian Ocean region will improve, contributing towards progress in the realization of the goal of establishing the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and to the success of the Conference on the Indian Ocean proposed for 1983, which, in our view, constitutes a necessary and important step towards the achievement of that goal.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): While expressing their agreement with the content of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.38 which deals with the reduction of military budgets, a draft resolution which it was my honour and pleasure to have introduced on behalf of the 13 sponsors last Wednesday, some delegations have expressed the desire for the first preambular paragraph of this draft to use the same wording as that which is to be found in resolution 35/142 A on the same subject, a resolution which, as members of the Committee will undoubtedly recall, was adopted last year by consensus.

In order to accommodate this wish, the delegations which have sponsored the draft agree that the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.38 should be couched in the same terms as those used in the resolution adopted on the same topic at the last session.

Consequently, we should like the first paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.38 to read as follows:

Deeply concerned about the ever-spiralling arms race and growing military expenditures, which constitute a heavy burden for the economies of all nations and have extremely harmful effects on world peace and security, .

As members can see, this is a minor change and simply amounts to deleting the word unprecedented before the word growing .

On behalf of the delegations which sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.38, we should like to renew our thanks to all those delegations which were involved in the preparation and completion of this draft and at the same time we express the hope that this year, once again, it will be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the First Committee on agenda item 58 (b), namely, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, is with us and with the consent of the Committee I should like to call on him to make a brief statement which I believe will be helpful to the work of the Committee.

Mr. SCOTLAND (Guyana), Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the First Committee: I have asked for this opportunity to speak to the Committee to bring to the attention of members some information concerning the existence of a document which forms part of the work of this Committee.

I am in a position to inform the members of the First Committee that the group of States members of the Non-Aligned Movement recently adopted by consensus at its plenary meeting a document which I believe is now being distributed. This document, identified as A/C.1/36/WG/CRP.1/Rev.1, will, at the first opportunity, be formally introduced into the First Committee on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement as a whole as a draft declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States.

It will be recalled that at the last session the document was placed before the First Committee as an aid to our discussions. The document at that time was placed before the Committee on behalf of a number of States members of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Given the fact that this year, however, the plenary meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement has adopted the document in a revised form and intends during the current session of the General Assembly to present the draft declaration for adoption by the First Committee, it seemed to me that, as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group concerned with this matter, it would be helpful for the speedy consideration of and decision on the draft declaration by the First Committee if its members were apprised at the earliest opportunity of the existence of the document.

(Mr. Scotland, Chairman,  
Ad Hoc Working Group)

It seems to me too that I should take advantage of the opportunity extended to me to address the Committee and draw to the attention of representatives certain aspects of the text by way of information and to make a suggestion.

Document A/C.1/36/WG/CRP.1/Rev.1 contains a number of changes and I wish to draw attention to some of those paragraphs which have undergone change.

The fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution on page 1 of the text, the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs to be found on page 2 of the document, the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs to be found on page 3 of the document, as well as the eighth preambular paragraph to be found on page 3 of the document and, on page 4 of the document, part I, paragraph (iii), part II, paragraph (i), and on page 5 of the document paragraphs (iv), and (ix) and on page 6 of the document paragraphs (xi), (xiii) and (xiv), have all seen some change.

There are others, but I thought it would be of assistance to mention the above changes.

Given the fact that delegations have been in possession of the document in its unrevised form since the last session, it seemed to me to be a helpful course to indicate to members of the Committee the areas of change so that they might not be led to regard the document as a new one.

I wish in my capacity as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group to suggest too to all delegations not members of the Non-Aligned Movement that it would be helpful for the progress of our future work if those delegations would regard Wednesday 25 November as a good date for the submission of amendments to the draft declaration where they consider that such amendments are warranted and, further, that they submit such amendments in writing.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico)(interpretation from Spanish): I had intended to say a few words in explanation of some amendments that my delegation has submitted to the Secretariat with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43.

I should like to say at this juncture that my delegation is in complete agreement with the purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.43, which is entitled "Prevention of nuclear war." However, we do have some additional suggestions with regard to the preambular part of the draft resolution, and we have a proposal to modify the procedures set forth in operative paragraph 1, which involves what we regard as a matter of principle. Tomorrow, after the amendments have been distributed, I shall request the Committee's permission to make that explanation.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair will certainly give the representative of Mexico an opportunity to introduce his amendment in due course.

The Committee has heard the last speaker on the list and will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions. The Committee will vote upon the following draft resolutions in this order: we shall begin with draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.1 and continue with A/C.1/36/L.4, L.6, L.9, L.11, L.26, L.37, L.38, L.39, L.40, L.42 and L.22.

As to the order in which we shall be taking up the remainder of the draft resolutions, the Chair will announce that order at the conclusion of this meeting.

Before I put the first draft resolution to the vote, I should like to state that it is my intention to exhaust the list of speakers in explanation of vote before the vote, if there be any, and then the Committee will proceed to a vote, and, of course, after the vote the Committee will hear those speakers who have asked to speak in explanation of vote after the vote. I would ask members of the Committee not to interrupt the voting procedure unless a delegation wishes to raise a point of order.

Although members of the Committee are familiar with the procedure, I should like to remind them that when the voting has begun, the electronic



(The Chairman)

machine will be unlocked and each delegation should registers its vote by pressing the appropriate button on its desk.

We shall now proceed to the consideration of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.1. This draft resolution is related to agenda item 51 (e), Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, and is entitled 'United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament.' The draft resolution has 23 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the twenty-seventh meeting of the First Committee on 6 November. The following 23 countries appear as sponsors: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Nigeria, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Greece, the Philippines, Congo, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Viet Nam, the German Democratic Republic, Barbados, Ecuador and Panama. The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed their wish that the Committee adopt draft resolution without a vote.

I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to state their position before a decision is taken.

Mr. OCAK (Turkey): Although we are not among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.1, we are taking this procedural opportunity to speak.

Prior to the action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.1, which, we are positive, will receive unanimous approval from this Committee, I should like briefly to present the views of the Turkish delegation on the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament.

Each year, 20 young persons receive valuable and unique training through this programme. In the sphere of disarmament, which encompasses many diverse issues with direct bearing on international politics as well as on national foreign policy issues and regional concerns of individual countries, many of

(Mr. Ocak, Turkey)

which are still undergoing a process of evolution, we feel that no other forum in the world would be as suitable as the United Nations for providing such valuable training. The figure "20" may appear to be a modest one, but when these holders of fellowships are perceived as an investment towards a better handling of disarmament issues in the future, the significance of the fellowship programme becomes evident.

(Mr. Ocak, Turkey)

It certainly is an undeniable fact that the opportunity provided to these young people from the world community of nations to participate in the present international machinery of disarmament will contribute to the formation of many responsible leaders in their respective administrations in the not very distant future.

Invitations have been extended by the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary and Sweden to this year's fellows for a further improvement of their training. Those invitations, we are sure, will contribute effectively to the substance of the programme.

We also feel that what deserves to be pointed out as the key element that has brought about a most successful implementation of the programme in the last three years is the able guidance shown by the Assistant Secretary-General, Mr. Jan Martenson, and the very enthusiastic and energetic efforts demonstrated by the Programme Co-ordinator, Mr. Ogunbanwo.

In view of the general feeling of uncertainty and anxiety that looms over most disarmament issues in today's political environment, we felt that it would help in gearing up a positive tone for the commencement of our voting process to express this tribute to the very commendable programme of fellowships, which represents a concrete course of action in comparison to the endless paperwork spent in the way of disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other member wishes to explain his position on this draft resolution and if I hear no objections, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution without vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.4, on agenda item 51 (a), entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: report of the Disarmament Commission". This draft resolution has two sponsors, Egypt and Uruguay, and was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 28th meeting of the First Committee on 10 November.

(The Chairman)

The sponsors of this draft resolution (A/C.1/36/L.4) have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution without vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.4 was adopted.

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

Mr. SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): In joining the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.4, the Brazilian delegation is glad to note that the United Nations Disarmament Commission will be allowed to continue the important work it has been performing on all items of its agenda. Among other relevant subjects, the United Nations Disarmament Commission was requested by resolution 35/156 A to work out the general approach, the structure and the scope of the proposed study on conventional weapons, to be undertaken after those elements had been fully discussed and agreed upon by the Disarmament Commission. The conclusion of such deliberations would then be conveyed to the Secretary-General and would constitute the guidelines for the study. My delegation is confident that the United Nations Disarmament Commission will be able to complete its discussion of those guidelines so as to comply fully with the responsibilities assigned to it in connexion with the decision, in principle, of the General Assembly to carry out a study on all aspects of conventional weapons. Brazil attaches great importance to such a study, and believes that the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission on that question, as well as on the other items of its agenda, should be enhanced rather than downgraded.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): After having joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.4, my delegation would like to take this opportunity to commend the Commission's Rapporteur, Mr. Mahmoud, of Egypt, for his valuable and dedicated work and to commend the Egyptian delegation for having channelled this important draft through our Committee.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

We feel that the text of this draft resolution can meet the concerns of all delegations. I should like to state briefly, however, my delegation's interpretation of the resolution just adopted. We note, in particular, that operative paragraph 3 contains a request addressed to the Disarmament Commission which the Commission will surely take into account when it decides upon its agenda at its next meeting. At that point the Commission itself will look in a more detailed manner at the items which it will discuss during its 1982 session, also taking into account requests which may emanate from this Assembly in other resolutions. In our opinion, the Commission's report to the second special session of the General Assembly will require high priority among those items.

It is in the interest of the Commission's standing that it organize its work in a well-structured and rational manner within the available time. In this connexion, I note the not always fortunate tendency of bodies within the United Nations system to exploit fully the time frame theoretically allotted to them. In the coming year, when, because of the holding of the second special session, the calendar of the disarmament community will be particularly well filled, there hardly seems to be any time for a session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission exceeding two weeks.

A shorter session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in the coming year, will, of course, in no way be prejudicial for the length of further sessions of the Commission in future years, which will have to be organized taking into account, inter alia, the results of the second special session.

The CHAIRMAN: There are no further speakers on item 51 (a). Before beginning the procedure for deciding on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.6, I shall call on the representative of Argentina.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I have asked to speak in order briefly to introduce a small amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.6, which is now before the Committee. My amendment applies to operative paragraph 1, which now reads:

"Calls upon the Committee on Disarmament to continue negotiations with a view to an early conclusion of the elaboration of a treaty prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, in order that it may be submitted to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held in 1982";

That means that the Committee on Disarmament is being given a specific period within which to complete its draft treaty, i.e. by the beginning of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

The draft resolution itself, however, recognizes in its eighth preambular paragraph" that divergent views continue to exist in connexion with various aspects relating to a convention prohibiting radiological weapons". It is thus definitely possible that the Committee on Disarmament will not have enough time to complete negotiations and iron out remaining differences by the beginning of the special session.

Consequently, in the opinion of my delegation, it would be more realistic not to make a request of the Committee that it might not be able to fulfil - although we hope it will. My delegation therefore proposes the amendment of operative paragraph 1 by the insertion of the words "if possible" in the fourth line after the words "in order that it may be submitted". The phrase would then read as follows:

"in order that it may be submitted, if possible, to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held in 1982".

I trust that I have made myself clear and that the sense of my proposed amendment is understood. And precisely because we believe that this would contribute to a better and more realistic wording of the resolution I would ask the representative of Hungary, the sponsor of the draft, to be good enough to consider accepting my proposed amendment. If he does so, I am convinced that it would facilitate adoption by consensus.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): The Indian delegation fully supports the amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.6, on radiological weapons, proposed by the representative of Argentina. In our view, it would be highly unrealistic to proceed on the assumption that a draft treaty on radiological weapons can be submitted in time for the second special session on disarmament.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): My delegation supports the amendment proposed by the representative of Argentina and seconded by the representative of India.

Mr. YANG (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation considers the amendment just proposed by the representative of Argentina to be very realistic. Therefore, we also support it.

Mr. KOMIVES (Hungary): My delegation listened with great attention and interest to the statement made by the representative of Argentina proposing the insertion of the words "if possible" in the first operative paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.6 and seconded by the delegations of India, Yugoslavia and China. I understand fully the considerations of my colleagues, who, by proposing this change, would like to avoid giving the impression that this item would get special priority in the Committee on Disarmament next year. In my opinion, there is no need to underline it in this way. Everybody knows that the question of radiological weapons has had a limited priority in the work of the Committee on Disarmament in comparison with such problems as a comprehensive test ban, nuclear disarmament, and chemical weapons.

The addition of the words "if possible" seems a bit superfluous to my delegation. According to my poor English, the idea is already contained implicitly in operative paragraph 1, whose wording - "may" be submitted - has a completely conditional character. That is why, originally, I intended to ask for a separate vote on the proposed amendment, but, realizing the wider support for it, I shall not do so.

Consequently, in the spirit of compromise, for the sake of consensus, and in order to expedite the work of the Committee, the Hungarian delegation is willing to accept the proposal made by the representative of Argentina and supported by the delegations of India, Yugoslavia and China.



Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to thank the representative of Hungary for the goodwill that he has demonstrated in accepting my amendment.

Mr. DABO (Guinea) (interpretation from French): I see that the Chairman has been very patient and has taken care that delegations can consult one another if necessary. In the light of the experience on this draft resolution, I think it would be advisable in the case of future draft resolutions if delegations consulted beforehand so that they would not have to put forward amendments when a decision is about to be taken. We could then conclude our work more expeditiously.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the members of the Committee will take note of the comment of the representative of Guinea.

After the discussion that has just taken place, it is apparent that the Committee wishes to accept the draft without vote. If no other delegation wishes to express its position before the revised resolution is adopted without a vote and if I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.6 as revised without vote.

The revised draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their position on the decision we have just taken.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): While India has joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.6 as revised, we should like to put on record that serious divergencies of views still continue to exist in the Committee on Disarmament concerning the scope of a future treaty on radiological weapons, as well as on the definition of such weapons. My delegation would therefore like to make it clear that the adoption of this resolution should in no way be used for upsetting the present priorities among the various items at present under consideration and negotiation in the Committee on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.9, relating to agenda item 55 (b), under the heading "General and complete disarmament: institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament". This draft resolution has 24 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the twenty-ninth meeting of the First Committee on 12 November. The sponsors are as follows: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Cuba, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without vote. If no delegation wishes to explain its position before we take a decision, may I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt this draft resolution without vote?

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.9 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position in connexion with the decision we have just taken.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): India has supported the undertaking of a study of the institutional arrangements relating to disarmament. We welcome the results of the study, although it has not come up with agreed conclusions and recommendations. However, as a result of this study we now have a better understanding of the issues involved in dealing with the question of institutional arrangements for disarmament.

(Mr. Venkateswaran, India)

My delegation's views concerning the subject are well known. We are of the opinion that the United Nations Centre for Disarmament is adequately equipped and fully competent to carry out both the promotional role with respect to disarmament and preparatory work in support of disarmament activities. We do not believe that there is any need to set up a United Nations disarmament organization separately at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1. It relates to agenda item 51 (i), entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: world disarmament campaign". This draft resolution has nine sponsors and was introduced by the delegation of Mexico at the thirtieth meeting of the First Committee on 13 November. It has the following sponsors: Cuba, Mexico, Nigeria, Panama, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without vote. Does any delegation wish to explain its position before a decision is taken?

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): Let me say that throughout our deliberations in this Committee my delegation has stressed the need for practical, serious measures to promote disarmament and world peace. My Government's unswerving commitment to a concrete set of disarmament goals was underscored on 18 November when President Reagan presented a realistic four-point plan to achieve reductions - not just limitations but actual reductions - in nuclear and conventional arms, and thus to advance peace security and freedom in the world.

Unfortunately, the proposals contained in the draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1 are anything but concrete, realistic and practical. They exemplify instead a kind of well-meaning but fundamentally flawed approach to disarmament that has made real progress in this crucial area more, rather than less, difficult.

Let me be quite specific: the draft resolution envisions the possibility of the General Assembly's launching a campaign to mobilize world public opinion on behalf of disarmament, a "world disarmament campaign".

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

In so doing, however, it blurs the vital distinction between open and closed societies. In open societies, appeals to public opinion are readily made; no censors impede the flow of public information and no ideological commissars stand guard over the media, alert to the mere hint of heresy. But in closed societies, just the reverse is true: public access to information is strictly controlled by the Government; the public is told only what the Government wishes it to be told, and only when, and in what context, the Government may wish.

Thus the consequences of a United Nations campaign to mobilize world opinion on behalf of disarmament are not hard to predict. Despite the intentions of the campaign's sponsors - and we do not for a moment question their sincerity - the campaign would inevitably come to focus only on public opinion in the free societies of the world.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

Its effects on public opinion in closed societies would be zero. Yet in free societies numerous private bodies already exist with aims identical to those presented in this draft resolution. How, then, would the draft resolution before us materially advance the goal of disarmament? In free societies, its aims are already being met; in closed societies, they stand no prospect of being met.

Moreover, it seems to my delegation that "mobilizing world public opinion" is an activity singularly unsuited to this Organization. The United Nations is an assemblage of Governments. Its appeals are properly directed towards Governments and not to so amorphous an entity as "world public opinion". For this Organization to undertake to mobilize world public opinion, be it for disarmament or for the environment or for health, or for any other worthwhile goal, would constitute a serious departure from its legitimate role, that of a forum of nations.

My Government and my delegation are also disturbed by the draft resolution's mention of a possible "pledging conference" to launch the campaign of "mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament". As the record of the United Nations assessments clearly shows, free societies in general, and the United States in particular, invariably shoulder the financial brunt of most United Nations undertakings. For the United States to assume or to be expected to assume financial burdens on behalf of noble United Nations activities is one thing; for the United States to do so on behalf of its impractical public-opinion initiative is something entirely different and quite unacceptable.

Precisely because my delegation is so deeply and so realistically committed to genuine arms control and arms reduction and so wary of encouraging this world Organization to launch public opinion campaigns on any topic, however noble, we must abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Japan): In general, my delegation supports the idea of mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament. From this viewpoint, last year my delegation voted in favour of resolution 35/152 I entitled "World Disarmament Campaign". However, on the draft resolution now before this Committee, A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1, under the same title, my delegation has difficulty in supporting the idea contained in operative paragraph 4 of holding a pledging conference at the initial stage of the second special session on disarmament since my delegation believes that adequate consideration of the organization of the campaign setting up a programme, if that is necessary, should precede such a fund-raising conference.

In view of those considerations my delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I confess that when I heard the first words of the representative of the United States I thought there had been a mistake as to which draft resolution was under discussion. Then I saw that I was wrong, that he did indeed have in mind this modest draft resolution - modest in appearance, as I said in my statement in the general debate, though it might in its results be one of the most constructive of draft resolutions inasmuch as it refers to a world disarmament campaign.

I should like to make just two comments. The first concerns what he said about the mobilization of world public opinion not being within the competence of the United Nations. I think that the right time to put forward that argument would have been in 1978, during the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, because in the Final Document there is paragraph 99, which was adopted not as we are adopting documents now, without vote, but by consensus. It says:

"In order to mobilize world public opinion on behalf of disarmament, the specific measures set forth below, designed to increase the dissemination of information about the armaments race and the efforts to halt and reverse it, should be adopted." (General Assembly resolution S-10/2, part III, para. 99)

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The following paragraphs, from paragraph 100 up to at the very least paragraph 107, contain a series of measures that are essentially the same as or similar to those contained in the study that the experts have submitted to us in document A/36/458. And all of this was adopted by consensus in 1978. The United States was part of that consensus.

My second point has to do with closed and open societies. Here I think it may have been forgotten that what the experts are saying - and we support it - is that the world disarmament campaign would be guided and co-ordinated, as the report of the Group of Experts says, by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who in addition is to report annually to the General Assembly. I refer to document A/36/458, Annex, para. 59 (f) (i).

The United Nations has some information centres in the countries to which the representative of the United States has referred as "closed societies". In the performance of the duties assigned to him, I believe that the Secretary-General would try to open those societies, if they are all that closed, through those information centres. In addition, once the campaign is approved, just as embassies often have military, air and naval attachés, so attachés, so to speak, could be appointed and sent out by the United Nations Centre for Disarmament. That is how my delegation sees it.

I had not expected the point that has been raised, but readers of The New York Times will be aware that in the section "Letters to the Editor" this subject has been touched upon rather frequently. I recall, for example, a recent letter to the editor which contained a reference to doctors in the United States. They have organized a campaign to bring out the dangers of nuclear war, and these letters to the editor refer to a very similar campaign being waged by doctors in the Soviet Union. There is, then, no great difficulty in making known the dangers of the arms race.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to act on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tomé and Príncipe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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 Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia



Against: None

Abstaining: Israel, Japan, United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.\*

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

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): I am speaking on behalf of the 10 Member States of the European Community.

In accepting the passage of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1, just adopted, entitled "World disarmament campaign", the Member States of the European community would like to make a few observations after the vote.

We have examined carefully the study carried out by the small group of experts, to which the draft resolution refers. We have noted that that study confines itself to making suggestions, sometimes alternative suggestions, rather than offering conclusions. Therefore we are somewhat puzzled by the language in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1, which asks the General Assembly to commend the conclusions of the study.

Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution implies that what is really intended is that the General Assembly take note of the recommendations in the study, for in that paragraph Member States are given an opportunity to express themselves on the implementation of all the recommendations contained in the study. Operative paragraph 4, however, gives the impression of prejudging the direction that the views of Member States might take: for example, with respect to the desirability of a pledging conference.

The delegations on whose behalf I speak reserve the right of their Governments to express themselves freely on the implementation of the recommendations contained in the study, as provided for in operative paragraph 3, including the option of a pledging conference.

As far as the financial implications are concerned, the Ten note the recommendation in the report that in the carrying out of a possible campaign the

---

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

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

existing resources of the United Nations in the disarmament field should be utilized to the fullest extent possible in order to reduce administrative expenses to the minimum.

Mr. NOLAN (Australia): Australia voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1, on the world disarmament campaign. We wish, however, to record our reservations over the call in operative paragraph 4 for the convening of a pledging conference. In addition, it is our understanding that the study on the world disarmament campaign did not come to a specific conclusion. We do not, therefore, understand the meaning of operative paragraph 1.

Mr. PROKOFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation actively supports the proposal made by Mexico and the other sponsors of the draft resolution for the carrying out of a world disarmament campaign.

We attach great importance to world public opinion. We regard those in the anti-war movement who have spoken in favour of peace and disarmament as important allies in the efforts to prevent the nuclear threat, to curb the arms race and to proceed to disarmament. In this connexion, we are gratified to see the growing wave of demonstrations among various segments of the populations in various parts of the world, including Europe, against the increasing threat from nuclear and other types of weapons.

We share the general policies mentioned in the study presented by the Secretary-General in document A/36/458, since they emphasize the significance of mobilizing world opinion in support of disarmament so that it can play a constructive part for the achievement of genuine and effective steps towards disarmament. We support initiatives that help to achieve that end. In particular, we are very pleased to see draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.32, which has been submitted by Bulgaria and Mongolia and which puts forward the idea of carrying out a world-wide campaign to collect signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, to curb the arms race and for disarmament.

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

The Soviet Union, too, has put forward a very important initiative. At the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, L. I. Brezhnev proposed that a committee be set up of authoritative scholars from different countries which would show peoples the truth regarding the terrible consequences of nuclear war and which would help step up efforts to prevent such a war. We believe that the United Nations could play a useful part in disseminating the results of the work done by such a committee.

In view of what I have said, the Soviet delegation supported and voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1, operative paragraph 1 of which we regard as acknowledging the basic idea of the study mobilizing world public opinion in support of disarmament.

Of course, States will need to give detailed and thorough consideration to the study and to any other proposals on a world disarmament campaign. For example, some further serious work and consideration will be required by the recommendations of the study dealing with the role of the United Nations and its Secretary-General in conducting this campaign with its financing and with the preparation and selection of informational and educational materials on relevant issues.

Mr. MENZIES (Canada): The Canadian delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1 and I wish to put on record our interpretation of that favourable vote.

We have studied the report of the Secretary-General on a world disarmament campaign in document A/36/458 of 17 September 1981. We consider that the report provides a useful survey of ways in which the Centre for Disarmament and other United Nations agencies might support, through expanded research and information programmes, the implementation of the Programme of Action of the Final Document of the first special session, the recommendations in the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade and decisions yet to be taken of the second special session to be held in June and July 1982.

(Mr. Menzies, Canada)

We support the proposal in operative paragraph 3 that Member States be invited to transmit to the Secretary-General their suggestions and comments on the implementation of the various proposals in the report. We do not interpret the report as containing clear-cut conclusions and recommendations. We think that it would be premature to schedule a pledging conference before there has been an exchange of views at the second special session on the basis of written and oral contributions and some definition has been agreed regarding the elements of a world disarmament campaign.

The report of the Secretary-General on a world disarmament campaign suggests a range of methods for financing a world disarmament campaign: the regular budget of the United Nations, contributions from private sources and a possible pledging conference involving Governments. My delegation believes that as a matter of proper financial management most Governments would wish to see possible world disarmament campaign programmes carefully defined and costed before considering any increase in the regular budgets of the Centre for Disarmament and other co-operating agencies, or deciding their policies and positions on the proposal for a pledging conference to support a world disarmament campaign.

For these reasons, we look forward to the exchange of views on the subject matter and conduct of a world disarmament campaign on the basis of the Secretary-General's report before deciding our positions on financing.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): The head of the United Kingdom delegation, speaking on behalf of the ten members of the European Community which, as we all know, includes my own country, has already stated why we agree to the important draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.11/Rev.1 sponsored by Mexico and other countries on the study concerning a world disarmament campaign.

In giving my full support to his explanation of vote, I should like to make some brief additional remarks on behalf of my delegation.

A world disarmament campaign can only achieve the aim of drawing the attention of the peoples in all parts of the world to the very complex issues involved if a free flow of information, via press, radio and television, is assured worldwide. The Western States, with their free, democratic systems, meet this fundamental requirement. As regards those countries, neither measures of an organizational nature, nor financial contributions aimed at mobilizing opinion, are really indispensable, because the free flow of information, which some of their Governments do not always find easy to live with but which is the foundation of the democratic system itself and which we are proud of, automatically guarantees the dissemination of arguments and counter arguments.

This, apart from the general shortage of funds, which affects us all, is another reason why we have been very hesitant about the provision of additional funds.

A world disarmament campaign, if it is to be successful, needs to be based on balanced, objective and relevant information. This can be provided only by the individual participants in the campaign themselves. My country would therefore like to call on all countries involved to provide such information in a manner conducive to ensuring the free flow of information. This would require a high degree of openness and transparency in the relevant fields on the part of all participating countries. Should it be asked to do so, my Government will consider ways and means of assisting countries which do not yet benefit from a free flow of information with whatever experience in the field of communications we can contribute.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation supported the resolution which we had before us and we agree in principle with the idea of this campaign. But we should like to make it clear, first, that, as we see it, this campaign should essentially be something to be done by Member States. It is in the light of national conditions and particularly the security needs of particular countries that the cause of disarmament should be presented and pleaded.

There can be no doubt, furthermore, that the effort to be undertaken should be designed as providing objectives and serious information which would of course be completely incompatible with any intention to spread propaganda or polemics.

Finally, this campaign can only be of value if there is full exercise of freedom of opinion and communication in free discussion on the objectives and conditions of disarmament.

In conclusion - for what I have just said merely supplements what was stated on behalf of the States belonging to the European Community - I should like to associate myself with the statement by the Community read out by the representative of the United Kingdom. Of course, we reserve the position of our Government regarding any contribution it might make to the planned campaign at the United Nations level.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.26/Rev.1. This draft resolution is related to agenda item 51 (h), Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, and is entitled "Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session." The draft resolution has 26 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the thirty-second meeting of the First Committee on 17 November.

The following delegations appear as sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Viet Nam, Sudan and Panama.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic): May I indicate that my delegation expressed the wish to be included among the sponsors of this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the representative of the co-sponsors, the delegation of Yugoslavia, if he has any comment.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.26/Rev.1 are grateful to the representative of the German Democratic Republic for the co-operation he has shown in preparing the common draft, and we would be pleased to include the German Democratic Republic among the sponsors of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The German Democratic Republic is therefore included in the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.26/Rev.1.

Mr. KABIA (Sierra Leone): My delegation would also like to be included among the sponsors of this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Since the request of the representative of Sierra Leone is acceptable to the delegation of Yugoslavia, as representative of the co-sponsors, Sierra Leone is also included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.26/Rev.1.

I hear no objection to the adoption of this draft resolution without a vote, and I therefore take it that the Committee so decides.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon the representative of the United States of America, who wishes to make a statement following the adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): My delegation has joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.26/Rev.1 on the review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session. The United States strongly supports the general thrust of the draft resolution, in that it calls for progress in arms control.

President Reagan's proposals of 18 November attest to that fact. We are concerned, however, that the draft resolution fails to acknowledge that genuine progress in arms control negotiations must take into account the essential requirements of verification, balance and mutual restraint. As we proceed in our work towards establishment of effective arms control agreements, the challenge of meeting those requirements must not be obscured by hortatory or unrealistic appeals such as the references in the draft resolution to general and complete disarmament.

My delegation, however, is committed to work towards an effective, balanced and verifiable agreements.



The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.37. This draft resolution is related to agenda item 55 (e), General and complete disarmament, and is entitled "Study on all the aspects of regional disarmament." The draft resolution has 30 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Belgium at the thirty-first meeting of the First Committee on 16 November 1981. The sponsors of the draft resolution are as follows: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Guatemala, Greece, Indonesia, Italy, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, Viet Nam, Ireland, Norway and Singapore.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee so decides.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.37 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon the representative of India, who wishes to make a statement following the adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. NAMBIAR (India): Had the draft resolution which has just been adopted been put to the vote, India would have abstained. It has been our consistent position that partial measures of disarmament have a rationale only if they are conceived of as integral components of a process of achieving general and complete disarmament on a global basis. To disarm some regions of the world while others continue to accumulate armaments can hardly contribute to the establishment of an enduring system of international peace and security. Rather than dissipate its energies on measures of limited and doubtful relevance, the international community should keep the global perspective always in sharp focus.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded our consideration of this item. We shall now consider draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.38, related to agenda item 40 (a), entitled "Reduction of military budgets". This draft resolution has 14 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 18 November.

The 14 sponsors are as follows: Austria, Bangladesh, Ecuador, Indonesia, Ireland, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sweden, Uruguay, Niger and Sudan.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. Before proceeding to that matter, I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their position before a decision is taken.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): I should like to speak on draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.38 and L.39 together. Both are entitled "Reduction of military budgets".

The United States has contributed actively over the years, and continues today to contribute, to the work of the United Nations aimed towards the goal of restraining and reducing military expenditures and redirecting scarce resources to economic and social development. We believe United Nations resolutions, especially initiatives aimed at greater openness in reporting on military budgets, are an essential part of efforts to promote military restraint and to control military budgets.

With that in mind, we are pleased to support resolutions promoting a reduction of military budgets. However, while we shall join the consensus adoption of both those resolutions, my Government has reservations regarding A/C.1/36/L.38.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

Before discussing those reservations, I should like to discuss draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.39.

Over the past decade, the United States has supported a series of resolutions initiated by Sweden and a broad group of neutral and non-aligned States designed to prepare the way for standardized reporting to the Secretary-General by all Member States of national military expenditures. That initial goal is now nearer achievement. For the first time, in 1981, a number of States submitted national military expenditure data to the Secretary-General in a standard format approved by the General Assembly. The United States submitted detailed data on its expenditures, and further progress is being made. Another panel of experts is studying problems of comparing and verifying national military expenditure data and the Secretary-General will report on that work to the second special session on disarmament.

Even with the active co-operation of all Member States - something far from having been achieved today - agreement on reduction of military expenditures may seem remote. None the less, real steps to building mutual confidence can be registered, on a worldwide, regional or bilateral basis, if States will pursue a course of greater openness and restraint while taking into account their legitimate security concerns.

The General Assembly at its last session adopted resolution 35/142 B, which calls for all Member States to report their military expenditures annually to the Secretary-General. If all States would follow that procedure, in fact as well as in principle, we would go a long way towards encouraging restraint on military expenditures. In addition, progress in the area of reducing military budgets is undermined by the uniform and pervasive secrecy of the communist States with regard to the size and shape of their military expenditures.

Sadly, while my country has provided, and will continue to provide to this body publicly and in great detail, information on our military expenditures, the Soviet Union has opposed all United Nations efforts in that field. That is perhaps not surprising since the Soviet Union has much to hide.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

The fact is, as I mentioned before in the First Committee, the Soviet Union has been out-spending, out-producing and out-gunning the United States and other Western nations for the past decade and it continues to do so today. This frightening reality has been documented by all recognized centres of disarmament studies.

During that period, while we heard many lofty thoughts from the Soviet delegation in this forum on the reduction of military budgets, what have been the facts?

Since 1968, while the United States defence budget has declined by 25 per cent in real terms, the Soviet defence budget has increased by almost 50 per cent.

During the same period, the Soviet Union has spent twice as much as conventional armament and nearly three times as much on strategic arms as has the United States. The Soviet Union, with a population 20 per cent greater than ours, fields a standing army 100 per cent larger and a reserve force 1,000 per cent larger than those of the United States. Soviet investment in military research and development exceeds that of the United States by 85 to 100 per cent.

But Soviet military expenditures have a human as well as a monetary aspect. For example, at least 70 per cent of the approximately 800,000 Soviet scientists and engineers who are now engaged in full time research and development efforts are graduates in fields applicable to military research.

That disproportionate, unprecedented use of scarce resources on the Soviet military-industrial complex has other, more immediate, side effects. It is a sad fact of life that the people of that country, so rich in natural resources and so fertile in agricultural land, must rely on the production of foreign nations for the very bread on their table.

The tragedy of misused resources is compounded in much of the developing world, where expanding military budgets deprive the people of that region of even scarcer resources. The reduction of military budgets should not be a goal of the major Powers alone, but a goal for all nations.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

If all States would submit information on their military expenditures, mutual knowledge and confidence could be built up in these regions, which have often only known fear and distrust.

Unfortunately, today the developing world devotes a higher percentage of its gross national product to military expenditures than does the developed Western world. During the past decade military expenditures increased in all regions of the world except North America.

To obtain a true picture of the impact of military expenditures, one must compare spending on the military with spending on health, welfare and education. Total world military expenditures in 1978 - the last year measured by most internationally recognized disarmament study groups - amounted to twice as much as devoted to education and 5 per cent more than that devoted to health.

In general, developed Western countries, including the United States, tend to spend more on health and education combined than they do for military purposes. In contrast, except for Latin America, developing States have devoted a larger proportion of their budgets to the military than they have to health and education.

I address these unfortunate realities not to cast aspersions, but rather to emphasize that expanding military expenditures are a sad fact that affects most nations represented in this forum. The manner in which a country chooses to allocate its resources is, of course, a sovereign decision. However, greater openness, and adequate verification of military budgets, as well as all arms control agreements, is essential if we are to build a foundation of trust and confidence among nations.

I should now like to come back to my delegation's reservations about draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.38 and the key question of verification. As the General Assembly has repeatedly stressed in its resolutions - including the one in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament - verification and compliance with arms control agreements is a fundamental necessity. In the light of the long and consistent record of secrecy with regard to the military expenditures of some States, therefore, my Government considers it of exceptional importance that any resolution on the subject of reduction of military budgets explicitly and prominently recognize the importance of verification measures. Resolution 34/83 F, the father, so to speak, of draft

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

resolution A/C.1/36/L.38, in its operative paragraph 1, stated that impetus should be given to reaching agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain military expenditures, "including adequate measures of verification satisfactory to all parties concerned".

In resolution 35/142 A and again in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.38, the need for verification has regrettably been relegated to a position of lesser importance by being placed in the preambular section. It is no secret which nations object to prominent references to verification: those nations invariably call for unilateral freezes, reductions or renunciations devoid of provisions for verifying compliance.

My Government will continue to support every serious proposal directed towards the goal of the reduction of military budgets. One means of doing so is annual standardized reporting of national military expenditures to the Secretary-General. Another is avoidance of the illusion that arms restraint or reduction can go forward without mutual confidence that each State's national security is being protected.

The road of progress in this area will not be short, nor will it be easy, but each one of us can contribute to the goal of the reduction of military budgets by increased openness leading to increased mutual confidence. It is with this goal in mind that we support the reduction of the resolution of military budgets.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation will support the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 40, particularly draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.39, on the understanding that the reduction of military budgets is first and foremost incumbent upon the nuclear-weapon States, whose military expenditures account for the largest part of the resources devoted to armaments. We also deem it important that savings generated by reductions in the military expenditures of those States be reallocated for economic and social development, particularly of developing countries.

(Mr. de Souza E Silva, Brazil)

It is the position of the Brazilian delegation that the nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States should take the lead in utilizing the reporting instrument, thus showing their willingness to reduce their expenditures on armaments.

The CHAIRMAN: As I have indicated, the sponsors of this draft resolution - A/C.1/36/L.38 - have expressed their wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. From the statements just made, I conclude that we can meet their wish, and if I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.38 without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.38 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of India, who wishes to explain his position.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): Though draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.38 has just been adopted by consensus, I should like to state that had a vote been taken on the draft, my delegation would have abstained.

It has been the consistent position of my delegation that concepts such as military balance or so-called parity cannot serve as the basis for measures of arms limitation or disarmament, as such. They are equally untenable as the basis on which to undertake the reduction of military budgets. We regret, therefore, that the sponsors of the draft have once again introduced the notion of so-called military balance as some kind of benchmark against which reductions in military expenditures should be undertaken.

The simple fact is that it is five or six militarily significant States that account for over 80 per cent of global military expenditures. It is they who must take the lead in cutting military budgets. Instead, the draft resolution gives the erroneous impression that rising military expenditures are a phenomenon for which all States are somehow responsible. It is this mistaken assumption that has led to the idea of codifying principles for reducing military budgets which would be applicable equally to all States. India cannot endorse such an inequitable proposition. Our position, as has been explained on numerous occasions, is that the question of reduction of military budgets can best be resolved through

(Mr. Venkateswaran, India)

parallel actions based on a policy of mutual example by the States concerned - and first and foremost by those States which account for the bulk of global military expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other delegation has indicated a desire to explain its position on the draft resolution just adopted, we have thus concluded our action on that draft.

We shall turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.39, related to agenda item 40, reduction of military budgets. This draft resolution has 19 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 18 November.



(The Chairman)

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.39 is sponsored by the following delegations: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Romania, Rwanda, Sudan and Sweden.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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 Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.39 was adopted by 102 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

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

Mr. NAMBIAR (India): My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.39 for reasons that are well known. As stated in reference to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.38, we cannot accept that the reduction of military expenditures -- a laudable objective in itself -- can be based on untenable concepts such as that of military balance. Moreover, the draft does not take into account the indisputable fact that it is the five or six militarily significant States which are responsible for over 80 per cent of the world's military expenditures. Any reduction of military budgets should therefore first and foremost be the responsibility of those States.

The recommendation to States to use the so-called international reporting system for providing data on their military expenditures is, we feel, premature. The system has to be further refined and must be acceptable to all States.

In my own country, data on military expenditures is freely available in published documents and our defence budget is openly debated and determined in Parliament.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.39 since, as it did last year, it considered that the subject dealt with in this draft resolution and the goals it wishes to achieve deserve our attention.

In connexion with operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which recommends:

"to all Member States to report, by using the reporting instrument, annually by 30 April to the Secretary-General their military expenditures of the latest fiscal year for which data are available."

I should like to point out that my delegation continues to believe that the action recommended by this draft resolution can be useful and efficient only if all members of the international community participate in it.

Mr. PROKOFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The position of the Soviet Union on the question of the reduction of military budgets of States has been set forth on a number of occasions. The Soviet Union is a constant advocate of reducing military expenses which it considers to be an indissoluble part of its policy in favour of reducing the arms race and disarmament.

The Soviet Union does not increase its military budget; on the contrary, over the past few years it has on many occasions reduced its budget unilaterally.

Speaking today in the First Committee, the delegation of the United States tried to blacken and distort the position of the Soviet Union in the area of the reduction of military budgets. That statement was aimed at diverting the attention of the members of the Committee from the important military preparations being engaged in by the United States of America.

It is very well known that the military budget of the United States of America has beaten all records. The representative of the United States should be the last to dwell on this question. It is in the United States that the military budget is being increased enormously, that new systems of nuclear weapons are being elaborated and implemented, that a rapid deployment force is being created and that the network of military bases on the territory of other countries is being expanded. It is precisely the leading circles of the United States and of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) who have openly set as their goals the breaking up of the strategic balance that has been established in the world and the destruction of the strategic stability which flowed from that.

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

We of the Soviet Union were the ones who in 1973 took the initiative in presenting to the General Assembly the draft resolution that became resolution 3093 A (XXVIII), aimed at reducing the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and the allocation of part of the funds thus released for the provision of assistance to developing countries. That resolution laid a sound foundation for the settlement of problems posed by the growth of military budgets.

The Soviet Union is prepared to reach agreement on the size of the amounts that would be assigned to assistance to the developing countries by each State that reduced its military budget. In the case of the United Nations, machinery could be created to distribute the resources thus released to the States benefiting from that assistance.

In the past few years the Soviet Union has proposed various alternatives and has expressed the will to seek flexible solutions that are acceptable to all. We are prepared forthwith to consider reductions either in percentages or in absolute terms as a first stage, either for the three coming years or for any other period to be considered. We could have begun by freezing military budgets. The achievement of a practical agreement on the reduction of military budgets does not require very much time if member States of the Organization demonstrate the necessary political will and a real desire to solve this problem, which is so crucial in our time.

Nevertheless the cause of the real reduction of military budgets has not progressed. A number of States, including certain permanent members of the Security Council, refuse to go along with a practical agreement and endeavour to set up a system to control military budgets by using a system of "normalized relations" in order to camouflage their real military budgets, which would make it possible for them to conceal the fact that they are not prepared to proceed to a reduction of military budgets.

The theoretical and abstract research conducted in recent years by the United Nations into military budgets and the comparing of military budgets is quite removed from reality and does not serve the cause of the reduction of military budgets. In the present circumstances, to deal with elaborate bookkeeping machinery on the reduction of military budgets would be a step

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

concrete decisions that have been taken and would lead to an impasse in the reduction of military budgets.

It is precisely in that direction that the draft resolution just adopted, A/C.1/36/L.39, guides us. The Soviet delegation, which is interested in the reduction of military budgets, could obviously not support the draft resolution and abstained in the vote.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): I just want to emphasize that we supported these two items because we do believe it is the responsibility of all the countries of the world to look at the expenditures on military arms, especially, as I said in my statement, in comparison with expenditures on health and education. I do not believe it is at all the obligation of particular States. I believe it is the obligation of all the States of the United Nations.

Secondly, I would say that in order to move forward in the whole field of the reduction of military expenditures, and indeed in the reduction of armaments in the world, there must be a certain openness and certain means of verification.

The CHAIRMAN: We have completed our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.39.

I would suggest that the remaining draft resolutions before the Committee be taken up as follows. After we have completed the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.40, L.42 and L.22, we could take action on the following draft resolutions: L.7, L.8, L.10, L.12, L.13, L.14, L.24, L.29, L.33, L.46 and L.47.

(The Chairman)

I feel that, with the best will in the world, we shall not be able to deal with them all at one meeting.

The next series of draft resolutions we would put to the vote would be: A/C.1/36/L.15, L.16, L.20, L.25, L.28, L.31, L.32, L.35, L.36 and L.44.

The remaining draft resolutions would be part of the third series, that is: A/C.1/36/L.2, L.3, L.5, L.17, L.18, L.19, L.21, L.23, L.27, L.30, L.34, L.41, L.43, L.45 and the draft resolution contained in document A/36/29, on the Indian Ocean.

With the assistance of the Secretariat, I have consulted the sponsors about their preferences as to when any particular draft resolution should be taken up. This order has been established, according to the preferences of the sponsors that have been consulted. It is quite difficult to predict how long a certain draft resolution will take. Consequently, it is very hard to predict when any of these series of draft resolutions will come on to the agenda, but I shall try to inform delegations at the end of each meeting concerning the draft resolutions that will be taken up at the next meeting. The order that I have just indicated will be the order in which we shall take them up, not prejudging whether it will be at a morning or at an afternoon meeting.

Mr. PROKOFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, in instances when you list the draft resolutions on which we are going to vote at the next few meetings, would you please indicate not only the numbers of the draft resolutions but also whether they are revised versions in cases where there are such revised drafts?

The CHAIRMAN: With reference to the question by the representative of the Soviet Union, I should like to inform him that we shall do so.

Mr. MARTIN (New Zealand): Mr. Chairman, the last thing I want to do is hold up the course of the voting on these draft resolutions. However, I understood you to say that the list beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7 and ending with L.47 had been put down for voting tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: It was not my idea to suggest that we complete tomorrow the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.40, L.42 and L.22 and on all the drafts from L.7 to L.47. I do not think we can get through them all during the morning meeting.

Mr. MARTIN (New Zealand): My point was not so much that that might be too much for tomorrow morning but that there are certain draft resolutions on this list on which we do not yet have voting instructions. It is already Saturday morning in New Zealand, and I think I really do not have much chance of obtaining them. For that reason it is desirable from our point of view, where we have to cross the date-line, to have a clear 24-hour notice and more if we are into the week-end. So perhaps we could reconsider tomorrow morning taking some of the draft resolutions - as few as possible, of course.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand the difficulties that some delegations may have about this. So I would very much appreciate it if any delegation would communicate to me any difficulties, and we shall try to accommodate it.

Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): Mr. Chairman, am I then to understand that tomorrow we shall definitely take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.40, L.42 and L.22 and that as regards the others the situation is uncertain? I would share some of the apprehensions expressed by the representative of New Zealand. Would it not perhaps be better - I am expressing the opinion of my own delegation - to take up tomorrow some of the drafts that you indicated last Wednesday would be taken up today - for instance, draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.27, L.35 or L.36? My delegation and, I presume, other delegations as well, because we were supposed to take action on those draft resolutions, today, have instructions

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

on them. I realize that some of those draft resolutions have amendments and so on, and in that case perhaps it would be advisable to postpone action until Monday or Tuesday. It might be difficult for some delegations, mine included, to take action on all those draft resolutions listed by you, starting with draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7 and ending with L.47, tomorrow. I would only ask you to take that into consideration and, if possible, to indicate what agreed drafts we are going to take up tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: As I understood it, the representative of Poland made two points. I should like to answer the second point first. As far as draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.27 is concerned, we cannot take action upon that, since it has financial implications and we have to obtain the opinion of the Fifth Committee.



(The Chairman)

As far as draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.35 and A/C.1/36/L.36 are concerned, we have been guided by the specific desires of the sponsors of those draft resolutions to the effect that the votes should be taken at a later stage. That is why I have put those draft resolutions into the second series and why we cannot take either draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.27 or A/C.1/36/L.35 or A/C.1/36/L.36 tomorrow morning.

As far as tomorrow morning's work is concerned, perhaps we should not be taking up so much time in discussing it. We are going to vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.40, A/C.1/36/L.42 and A/C.1/36/L.22 and any other draft resolution that everyone would agree to vote on from the list that begins with draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.7 and ends with A/C.1/36/L.47. There is certainly no intention on the part of the Chairman to force a decision upon anyone and if there is any reservation on a vote then we shall not take that vote. But we have to take a vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.40, A/C.1/36/L.42 and A/C.1/36/L.22.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): As the representative of Poland has said that he understood we would certainly vote on those three draft resolutions tomorrow, I should like to say that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.42, on the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, are now trying to secure the agreement to it of all delegations, or at least of as many as possible.

I doubt very much that between now and tomorrow we will be able to achieve the success that we are seeking in our talks.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

I therefore request that the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.42 be postponed.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Japan): My delegation also finds itself in a situation similar to that of the delegation of New Zealand, in that my country lies on the other side of the date-line.

We are not sure whether we are going to receive additional instructions by tomorrow morning, so we cannot exactly say on which draft resolutions we shall not be in a position to vote.

But I should like to inform the Committee that we may not be able to vote on all the draft resolutions on which the Chairman suggested we vote on tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN: The members of the Committee have just heard the statement from the representative of Mexico asking that action upon draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.42 be postponed, I assume, until Monday morning. That would leave us to all intents and purposes with draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.22 and A/C.1/36/L.40. The representatives of New Zealand and Japan have voiced their concern over possible action on the other draft resolutions that I have mentioned.

That brings us to the only logical conclusion, which is that we are not going to have a meeting tomorrow morning. I have to say that I have sensed this all along and I have enjoyed the exchange of views on this particular subject very much.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.