United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
FORTIETH SESSION
Official Records*

FIRST COMMITTEE
42nd meeting
held on
Tuesday, 19 November 1985
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 42nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/40/PV.42
25 November 1985

ENGLISH

85-63249 5943V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 4. Before taking up that cluster in its entirety, however, I should like to inform members that, because of ongoing consultations or because revisions will be submitted to certain draft resolutions, the following draft resolutions will not be taken up in cluster 4, and the Committee will postpone action on them: draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.6, L.58, L.62 and L.70. We shall defer action on those draft resolutions for the time being.

I now call upon delegations that wish to make statements other than in explanation of vote before the voting on the draft resolutions in cluster 4.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like to make a few brief comments on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.52/Rev.1, which is a revised version of the draft resolution on United Nations disarmament studies which I had the honour to introduce to the Committee on 12 November.

The sponsors of the draft resolution undertook extensive consultations with a view to producing a widely acceptable text. Since submitting the draft resolution, we have received further instructive comments, including those from some delegations whose countries are represented on the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies. They have suggested, in particular, that the Board should be allowed more time to prepare the report called for in the draft resolution in view of the timing and relatively brief duration of the Board's meetings and of the need for a thorough appraisal of the subject-matter.

We have therefore amended the draft resolution in such a way as to take full account of that concern. Operative paragraph 4 of A/C.1/40/L.52/Rev.1 now requests

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

the Secretary-General to submit the Advisory Board's report to the forty-second session of the General Assembly, that is, in 1987, which, we hope, will allow sufficient time for the preparation of the report.

We hope that the changes in the draft resolution will meet with the approval of the Committee and that it can be adopted without a vote.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.67, which is sponsored by 46 States, including Mexico. As the Committee may recall, the last paragraph of that draft resolution reads as follows:

"Notes with satisfaction that on 21 September 1985 the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons adopted by consensus a Final Document."

My delegation considers that the final document is so broad that we venture to hope that the draft resolution might be adopted without a vote. The scope of the document will allow each and every one of us to find in it reason for the "satisfaction" to which the draft resolution refers.

As far as the Mexican delegation is concerned, our satisfaction at the consensus adoption of the Final Document is based primarily on the contents of the two documents that form part of that Final Document. At the request of the Mexican delegation, those documents were reproduced in document A/C.1/40/9. One of them is the Final Declaration of the States Parties to that Conference; the other is the Declaration of the Group of Non-Aligned and Neutral States. Both are reproduced in extenso in the document to which I have referred.

That document gives a summary account of the events at the Conference with regard to the participation of the aforementioned group of States. Those States submitted three draft resolutions to the Conference. One was a draft resolution on

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

a comprehensive nuclear test ban; the second, a draft resolution on a nuclear-test-ban moratorium; and the third, a draft resolution on a nuclear-arms freeze. The objective pursued by those three draft resolutions was achieved on the final day of the Conference thanks to the inclusion in Section B, paragraph 12, of the section on Article VI of the Treaty, of a text in which the Conference unequivocally stated, that, with that single exception, it

> "deeply regretted that a comprehensive multilateral Nuclear Test Ban Treaty banning all nuclear tests by all States in all environments for all time had not been concluded so far and, therefore, called on the nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty to resume trilateral negotiations in 1985 and called on all the nuclear-weapon States to participate in in the urgent negotiation and conclusion of such a Treaty as a matter of the highest priority in the Conference on Disarmament." (A/C.1/40/9, p. 15)

With respect to the other two draft resolutions, the sponsors expressed their wish that the record reflect that they had decided not to press for a vote at that time because it had been unanimously agreed that the texts of the draft resolutions would be reproduced, together with the Declaration, immediately following the text of the Final Declaration and because in paragraphs 7 and 9 of Section B of the Final Declaration the Conference expressly took note of the repeated appeals contained in many General Assembly resolutions, as well as "similar calls made at this Conference" for a moratorium on nuclear-weapons tests and for a "freeze on all nuclear weapons in quantitative and qualitative terms", respectively.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Those are the principal reasons for our satisfaction, the satisfaction expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.67 relating to the adoption of the Final Document of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. But as I said at the outset, that Final Document is very wide in scope and we believe that each and every delegation here will find in it one reason or another for the "satisfaction" expressed in the draft resolution.

That is why my delegation hopes that the draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. GONSALVES (India): I have been requested to speak on behalf of the group of non-aligned and neutral States to express our appreciation to the delegations of the United Kingdom and of France for having accommodated our concerns, in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.52/Rev.1. I should like on behalf of our group to offer a few additional observations representing our views on this subject and our understanding of the substance of that draft resolution.

The importance of United Nations studies in the field of disarmament was fully recognized at the tenth session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, as was reflected in paragraph 96 of the Final Document. Other paragraphs in section III, "Programme of action", refer to certain aspects of United Nations studies and to specific subjects on which the Secretary-General was asked to carry out studies based on proposals put forward by Member States at the special session. The General Assembly at its tenth special session also requested the Secretary-General to set up an Advisory Board to advise him on various aspects of disarmament studies to be carried out under United Nations auspices, including a programme of such studies.

(Mr. Gonsalves, India)

The idea behind those decisions was to develop a comprehensive approach to future studies in this field and to relate them to a strategy for disarmament and to negotiations geared towards the implementation of that strategy. Earlier studies carried out under United Nations auspices - such as those on the economic and social consequences of the arms race, the reduction of military budgets, questions of nuclear-weapon-free zones, the seismic detection of underground weapons tests and so forth - while useful in promoting awareness of the complexity of the problems involved, were undertaken on a more or less ad hoc basis and were not integrated into the context of disarmament negotiations.

In 1979 the Advisory Board identified three purposes for disarmament studies requested by the General Assembly: first, to assist in ongoing negotiations; secondly, to identify possible new areas for negotiations; and thirdly, to promote public awareness of the problems involved in the arms race and disarmament. Those purposes, in the opinion of the Advisory Board, remain valid within the overall objective of enhancing the role of the United Nations in disarmament, as reflected in paragraph 5 of the report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly at its fortieth session (A/40/744).

Since 1979, some 22 disarmament studies mandated by the General Assembly and dealing with a variety of topics have been completed. All except two recent ones have ended with the adoption of an agreed report and, in most cases, with consensus reached on the final report. Those studies, in which experts from a large number of countries in different regions of the world have participated, have reflected a broad range of objective information, in-depth analysis of complex issues, and the views and perceptions on those issues of many Member States of the United Nations. These multilateral efforts at examining disarmament and arms limitation problems,

(Mr. Gonsalves, India)

identifying areas of potential agreement or clarifying areas of disagreement are indeed very worthwhile undertakings and should not be subjected to constraints or procedural devices responding solely to political or budgetary concerns.

Instead, the experience gained over the years should be examined with a view to improving and enhancing the value of the studies. In other words, the aim of any review of the question of studies should be essentially one of looking into some of the problems which have arisen in the course of the preparation for studies and of seeking ways to resolve them without in any way impinging on the the freedom of each group of experts to decide how best to tackle the task entrusted to it. That could be done by suggesting various procedural avenues that could be taken to surmount problems encountered in the preparation of a particular study, on the understanding, of course, that each group would make every effort to adopt those procedures whereby it could arrive at the conclusion of a report for presentation to the General Assembly.

I have already expressed our appreciation to the sponsors of the draft resolution for having accommodated our concerns in the revised version of the draft resolution. It is my understanding that the draft resolution could be adopted without a vote.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from French): I should like to make a few remarks concerning draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.33. The question of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons has been on the agenda of the General Assembly since 1975, when it was added at the request of the delegation of the Soviet Union. Ever since then, it has been the subject of discussion in the General Assembly and in the Conference on Disarmament. The importance and urgency of the issue requires no further comment. It need only be noted that since 1975 the General Assembly has continuously come out in favour of such a prohibition.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

Mongolia is in favour of a rapid and total solution to this problem. In our view, it is necessary to conclude a comprehensive agreement prohibiting the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. At the same time, we are ready to conclude other agreements on any new types of weapons of mass destruction. We consider this to be a well-grounded and justified approach, based as it is on the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which appeals to States to follow up efforts to prohibit new types of weapons of mass destruction.

A number of States have favoured a different approach: conducting negotiations on agreements to prohibit new types of weapons wherever those weapons are identified. As a result of these divergent approaches, no tangible progress has been made so far in prohibiting new types of weapons of mass destruction based on new principles and on new scientific discoveries. To help find a way out of this impasse, the Soviet Union submitted to the Conference on Disarmament, in July 1985, a new proposal requesting the Conference to keep constantly under review, with the assistance of a periodically convened group of experts, the questions of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons with a view to making, when necessary, recommendations on undertaking specific negotiations on the identified types of such weapons.

(Mr. Bayard, Mongolia)

Thus that Soviet proposal takes into account the different views expressed by other States, including the Western States. We trust that that proposal and the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/40/L.33 which reflects its sense will receive favourable acceptance. There is no doubt that, whenever a new type of weapon of mass destruction is identified, commitment by States to undertake negotiations on its prohibition with the simultaneous introduction of a moratorium on its development in practice would be a significant measure towards freeing mankind of the threat of the appearance of new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. NGOVUKA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): I wish to make a brief statement on two errors that were made yesterday afternoon in our vote on two draft resolutions submitted by the African Group: the first deals with the denuclearization of Africa, and the second with the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

The votes yesterday did not reflect my Government's position. Zaire's position on those two draft resolutions is clear: we are in favour of those two draft esolutions. The delegation of Zaire will correct its votes in the plenary Assembly and I should like this statement to be reflected in this Committee's records.

The CHAIRMAN: I assure the representative of Zaire that his statement has been duly noted by the Secretariat.

Mr. TINCA (Romania): Before we take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 4, I need some clarification.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, that you announced that it was your intention this morning to postpone action on some draft resolutions in cluster 4. I am not sure if draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1 was included among them. I know that

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

consultations are continuing on that text and I should like some clarification from you about your intention with regard to that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Indeed, I did not include draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1 in the list of those on which we shall defer action.

I shall now call on delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes before we take decisions on the draft resolutions in cluster 4, as indicated.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): I should like to explain my delegation's votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.56, L.66/Rev.1 and L.67.

With regard to draft resolution L.56, my delegation will be unable to support it because, in our view, it is based on concepts and perceptions that pertain to the climate of confrontation and suspicion between the two super-Powers and their respective military alliances. We do not think that that text will contribute to the adoption of concrete measures in the field of disarmament.

My delegation would like to express our appreciation to the sponsors of draft resolution L.66/Rev.1 for their willingness to accommodate suggestions made in the course of its elaboration and which my delegation considers to be improvements of the original text. Such improvements have made it possible for my delegation to vote in favour of it.

Finally, my delegation will participate in the action to be taken by the Committee on draft resolution L.67 on the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons by abstaining from casting either an affirmative or a negative vote. We hold the view that the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons concerns all nations, particularly those which do not possess such weapons and regardless of their membership of instruments dealing with the matter.

Brazil has consistently taken an actively positive attitude towards non-proliferation. We are convinced that the way to achieve that objective cannot

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

contemplate the adoption of or support for discriminatory solutions. Nor can existing agreements in the field of disarmament continue to be regarded by the nuclear-weapon Powers as a means to legitimize their exclusive possession of atomic weapons. By the same token, such agreements should not be used to condone the increasing vertical and geographical proliferation of those weapons by the existing nuclear-weapon Powers.

My country continues to support the achievement of a new and lasting consensus on ways and means to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its dimensions, as envisaged in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In our view, such a consensus must be based on the five principles adopted in resolution 2028 (XX), which was initiated by the eight non-aligned members of the then 18-nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC). Much to our regret, those principles failed to find adequate reflection in the text of the current Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, elaborated by the two co-Chairmen of that Committee. We still hope that it will be possible to achieve a régime that will prevent all forms of proliferation of nuclear weapons in an effective and non-discriminatory manner.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): My delegation wishes to explain its position and make certain observations on compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements dealt with in draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1.

The importance of compliance with existing agreements in the field of the limitation of armaments and disarmament should not be called into question. Verification and compliance are indispensable factors of all agreements. The efforts made so far, crowned by international agreements, would lose their meaning if those two elements were disregarded.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

Yugoslavia considers that each individual agreement should contain the procedure to be followed in case of its violation by a country that had acceded to it. However, compliance with agreements should not be artificially singled out from the context of the concrete agreement to which it relates. Compliance with an agreement can be dealt with only in accordance with the procedure envisaged by the respective agreement. The issue of compliance should not be considered as a separate institution and as the issue per se.

If we follow the approach contained in draft resolution L.66/Rev.1, we could, wittingly or unwittingly, delay the achievement of the basic goal: that is, the conduct of substantive negotiations on the priority issues of disarmament. In a certain way, we would link progress towards disarmament with a subjective assessment of whether or not a signatory party complied with the obligations assumed. Moreover, we would turn the issue of compliance into the subject-matter of controversy and unnecessary dispute. Likewise, the legitimization of compliance as a separate issue could be used to derail the negotiations on disarmament whenever it suited one side or the other.

For those reasons, Yugoslavia will abstain in the vote on draft resolution L.66/Rev.1.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With regard to vote which will take place on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.56, the Soviet delegation would like to bring the following considerations to the attention of the Committee.

This draft resolution reflects an imprecise idea of the military potential of States, which could be provoked by the absence of objective information, and could lead States to the implementation of an arms programme that would accelerate the arms race, in the belief that the dissemination of information of this kind could

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

promote confidence and the conclusion of concrete agreements in the area of disarmament. Thus, the draft resolution places the transparency of military budgets, as it is called, practically as a pre-condition to measures of disarmament and arms control. We do not at all agree with that conclusion. The history of disarmament negotiations confirms that it is not a question of transparency. In our view, the reason why there is no progress towards disarmament rests with the absence of a political will to bring the arms race to a halt and the absence of a deposition to reach agreements based on legality and equality.

We believe that it is impossible to acquire the needed confidence in relations between States without the elimination of the causes for the distrust. We are convinced that military transparency in itself, separate from disarmament measures - and I stress "disarmament measures" - would not only not lead to arms control but would, on the contrary, only intensify the arms race.

No flow of information on disarmament or any survey on the comparability of military data or similar exercises could replace real efforts to limit the arms race. In effect, hundreds of thousands of words have been written in articles on transparency. Nevertheless there is still no progress in negotiations. It is another matter to exchange information on arms and the arms race as part of the process of negotiation - to put it on the negotiating table, if you wish - with achievements and concrete measures based on concrete agreements. This is the exchange of information which is not only not to be excluded but which is desirable and can be achieved. The experience which has preceded other disarmament measures makes this point. But the exchange of information should be done together with concrete disarmament measures and not in isolation, not as an isolated measure, not, certainly, as a pre-condition, for the holding of negotiations.

Unfortunately, draft resolution L.56 on "Objective information on military matters" not only is not related to concrete disarmament measures but in its

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

substance subjects those concrete measures to pre-conditions. The delegation of the Soviet Union will therefore vote against that draft resolution.

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela)(interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to refer to draft resolution L.66/Rev.1, on which we intend to vote in favour. With regard to this draft resolution, we should like to indicate that we understand that the scope of the draft is not limited to the agreements or treaties concluded bilaterally on disarmament matters, but rather that it encompasses all agreements, treaties and other international instruments relating to disarmament, including those which have been concluded multilaterally, in respect of which we know that some provisions have not been complied with by some States which have adhered to them or are parties to them. This is the understanding we attach to this draft, in particular to the sixth preambular paragraph, which mentions that "compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements by States parties is... a matter of interest and concern to the international community" and operative paragraph 1, which "Urges all States parties to arms limitation and disarmament agreements to implement and comply with the entirety of the provisions subscribed to".

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 4, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.9/Rev.1. It was introduced by the representative of Cyprus at the 28th meeting on 6 November 1985. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.9/Rev.1 was adopted by 108 votes to 1, with 22 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.30. It has 21 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 35th meeting on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Cameroon, Colombia, Cuba, Czechlosvakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. The draft resolution has programme budget implications that are contained in document A/C.1/40/L.77.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.30 was adopted by 126 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.33. It has 24 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic at the 36th meeting on 13 November 1985. The sponsors are: Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.33 was adopted by 106 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.52/Rev.1. It has two sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 34th meeting on 12 November 1985. The sponsors are France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.52/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.56. It has 11 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 36th meeting on 13 November 1985. The sponsors are: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Algeria, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burma, China, Congo, Cyprus, Ghana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lesotho, Mexico, Nicaragua, Saudi Arabia, United Republic of Tanzania

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.56 was adopted by 88 votes to 13, with 16 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1. It has nine sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the United States of America at the 33rd meeting on 11 November 1985. The sponsors are Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, New Zealand, Norway and the United States of America. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1 was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.*

*Subsequently, the delegations of Bahrain, Jordan and Oman advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Congo advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/40/L.67. That draft resolution has 48 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 36th meeting of the First Committee, on 13 November 1985. The sponsors are Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, 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 States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Cuba, France, India, Israel, Niger, Spain, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.67 was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon representatives wishing to explain their positions or their votes on draft resolutions in cluster 4.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): Sweden holds the view that each group of experts assisting the Secretary-General in carrying out disarmament studies should itself decide on the methods to be used in fulfilling its task in accordance with the specific mandate in each particular case. There is, thus, no need for adopting general guidelines to cover each and every study. Given the great variety of questions which have been the subject of United Nations disarmament studies, it is difficult to see general guidelines serving any meaningful purpose. We understand from the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom on 12 November, when he introduced draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.52, that his delegation shares that view. Our support for that draft resolution is based also on the understanding that there is no intention to limit in any way the rights and possibilities of Governments regarding taking new initiatives with respect to United Nations disarmament studies.

The draft resolution just adopted contains in the fifth preambular paragraph a reference to the non-completion of final reports on two studies. One of those two studies is based on an initiative by Sweden. I refer to the comprehensive study on the military use of research and development.

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

In his report in document A/40/533 of 14 August 1985, the Secretary-General made reference to a letter from the Chairman of the Group of Governmental Experts. In the letter of the Chairman of the Group annexed to the Secretary-General's report, it is stated that agreement was reached on the draft report, with the exception of one sentence. The Chairman of the Group therefore stated that it had not been possible to reach agreement on the draft report as a whole. The Secretary-General reported that further ways had been explored to reach a possible solution, but they had not led to results that found general acceptance.

As is well understood by everybody in this Committee, the desired consensus applied to the work of most groups of governmental experts requires a minimum of co-operation on the part of all Governments and experts involved. Without some spirit of compromise such studies cannot succeed. That applies to the Comprehensive study on the military use of research and development, which, to the regret of my Government and many others, has not been brought to a successful conclusion. There can be no doubt where the responsibility for that outcome lies.

The Swedish delegation finds it deeply regrettable that, owing to this narrow area of disagreement, this timely and important draft report has not been published. Our regret is all the more profound as the draft report contains a wealth of interesting information as a result of the persistent and dedicated work by the Group of experts. There is thus every reason for the United Nations to return to this crucial subject.

The Swedish delegation would like to underline that the problems related to the study just referred to are specific and unique and should not be used as a pretext for criticism of the institution of United Nations studies in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

Sweden also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1, and I wish to make the following explanation of vote.

We attach the greatest importance to the observance of international law and believe that full implementation of and compliance with all international agreements entered into are necessary for upholding its strength and authority and for preserving international peace and security. This firm principle prompted us to join in sponsoring and actively support resolutions 37/98 D and 39/65 E concerning provisional measures aimed at upholding the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol on Chemical and Bacteriological Warfare, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive chemical-weapon convention. The Swedish Government has also put experts and laboratories at the disposal of the Secretary-General if needed for the implementation of those resolutions.

Furthermore, concern about compliance with the bacteriological-weapon Convention induced us to play an active role in bringing about the Review Conference on that Convention which, by its resolution 39/65 D, the General Assembly has decided should take place next year.

It is, inter alia, against that background that we have joined in the appeal to all Member States to support efforts aimed at the solution of questions of non-compliance expressed in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1.

In that draft resolution, furthermore, we attach particular importance to the fact that its third preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 focus on the need for agreements to be fully implemented and that the entirety of the provisions must be complied with. Those aspects were in the forefront during the recently concluded Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Sweden is particularly concerned that, since no agreements have been reached on effective measures relating to the cessation of the arms race at an early date, on nuclear disarmament and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, the aspirations contained in the eighth to twelfth preambular paragraphs of the NPT have still not been met and that the objectives under article VI have not yet been achieved. The implementation of article VI of the NPT is essential to the Treaty, and we urge that the nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty demonstrate their commitment to that article.

The 1963 partial test-ban Treaty is another agreement where full implementation of the entirety of its provisions is of particular importance in my delegation's view.

There should be no doubt with regard to Sweden's stance on questions of compliance and non-compliance. At the same time, however, I wish to stress that our active involvement in questions of compliance has always been directly related to specific agreements. We believe that possible concern about non-compliance must be dealt with on a case-by-case basis and directly in the context of the obligations in question. Consequently, we have doubts that the general political and philosophical debate on these questions would serve the purpose of enhancing and strengthening compliance with international law. Compliance or non-compliance must not become a politically controversial issue of a general character.

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): My delegation would like briefly to explain its negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.30 on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race.

A report on this subject was submitted to the General Assembly as recently as in 1982. We do not believe that developments since then call for another report

(Mr. Akalovsky, United States)

and we have therefore concluded that another report on this topic at this particular time would be unnecessary. Furthermore, we believe that the cost of such a report - over $1 million - involving additional appropriation of $150,000 is therefore unwarranted.

Mr. van SCHAIK (Netherlands): I wish to place on record the views of the 10 member States of the European Community, as well as Portugal and Spain, with regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/40/L.33, entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons".

The countries on whose behalf I am speaking have over the years actively supported negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament aimed at concluding multilateral agreements concerning specific well-defined and identified weapons of mass destruction. We are of the opinion that only when the possibility of the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles has been clearly established will it be possible fruitfully to enter into negotiations aimed at an adequately verifiable prohibition of those weapons.

We remain strongly opposed to the development and production of any new type of weapon of mass destruction. Such new type of weapon of mass destruction should be prohibited if and when identified. We therefore agree with those who maintain that constant vigilance is required with regard to potentially dangerous developments in science and technology which could lead to the development of weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles.

The Ten, Portugal and Spain are convinced that the Conference on Disarmament is the appropriate forum to monitor developments in this field, initiate action, whenever the need is felt by the Conference, and with any expert assistance that the Conference would deem appropriate.

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

The Ten, Portugal and Spain note with some satisfaction that draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.33 differs from its predecessors in so far as it now focuses on what is called "specific negotiations on the identified types of such weapons". They consider that to be a step towards a more realistic approach of the question of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction.

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

We regret that, in spite of the somewhat modified position the sponsors of this draft resolution have taken, efforts undertaken to reach a consensus resolution have not yielded the desired result. In the view of the Ten, Portugal and Spain, such a result could have been within reach if the draft resolution had not spelled out in detail in what procedural form the Conference on Disarmament should invoke possible expert assistance. In our view there are at present no indications that new types of weapons of mass destruction are imminent. The establishment of an expert group would therefore be neither necessary nor desirable. In fact, its establishment would be premature since the group would have no real work to do. In addition, in our view, another legitimate objection that could be raised against such a group is that the proper expertise can hardly be determined as long as we do not have at least some idea of the specifics of the new types of weapons of mass destruction to be identified.

The Ten, Portugal and Spain regret that, as a result, they have not been in a position to support draft resolution L.33.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): My delegation voted in favour of the adoption of draft resolution L.56 since it represented the continuation of the action which my country supported on the occasion of its initiation during the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. Objective information on military matters is indeed an important element which might, together with some other, more important prerequisites - such as, sincere political determination - contribute to the effectiveness of negotiations on disarmament issues. But, on the other hand, one should not overestimate the effects of a lack of objective information on the armaments programmes of States, on the acceleration of the arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race, and on the heightening of international tension, which is implied in this draft resolution.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

However, bearing in mind the intention of the sponsors to point to one of the possible ways of contributing to the promotion of relations and confidence among States with a view to achieving general and complete disarmament, my delegation has voted in favour of it.

Mr. WISNOEMOERTI (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1, entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements", because we have doubts as to the purpose which it is intended to serve. The obligation to comply with agreements or treaties to which a country has become a party of its own volition is a basic principle of international law and thus self-evident.

My delegation has difficulty with operative paragraph 3 in particular. An aggrieved party in a case of non-compliance or suspected non-compliance should first have recourse to the existing compliance machinery under the relevant agreement or treaty. To widen the scope of the non-compliance issue outside the parties to the agreement or treaty called for in this paragraph will not, we believe, lead to the attainment of the purported objective of the paragraph.

Mr. GONSALVES (India): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution L.66/Rev.1. We readily acknowlege the critical importance of compliance with agreements on disarmament and arms limitation. We entertain serious reservations, however, about excessive and separate emphasis on compliance in general, without relation to specific disarmament agreements, on which progress has been disappointingly limited. Indeed, in our view, the approach of singling out the issue of compliance, reflected in draft resolution L.66/Rev.1, is likely to impede, rather than to promote, progress on disarmament agreements.

My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution L.67, even though it merely takes note, in procedural fashion, of the fact that the Final Document

(Mr. Gonsalves, India)

of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) was adopted by consensus and, though the draft resolution does not seek substantive endorsement by the General Assembly of the results of that Conference, my delegation would, at the same time, wish to place squarely on record its inability to share the view, widely expressed in this Committee, that that Conference was an unmitigated success in the direction of disarmament. The nuclear-weapon States have abysmally failed to comply with their commitments to halt and reverse the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons and to conclude a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Their concern was, and unfortunately remains, limited to the prevention of horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. The discriminatory character of the NPT régime, which we have consistently stressed, is becoming increasingly evident, and both we and the international community at large have been deeply disappointed that, at the Third Review Conference, the self-evident shortcomings of the NPT, both in its provisions and in its implementation, were not objectively and adequately highlighted and that the identification of specific measures to remedy this situation was conveniently glossed over.

Mr. RENIE (France)(interpretation from French): The French delegation wishes briefly to explain its abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.30. We believe to be inappropriate the recommendation in operative paragraph 1, in which the Secretary-General is requested to "bring up to date, with the assistance of a group of qualified consultant experts appointed by him ... the report entitled 'Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and Military Expenditures'". The task in fact duplicates the preparatory work of the Conference on disarmament and development and, more precisely, the mandate entrusted to the Preparatory Committee for this Conference in terms of documentation. In the view of the French

(Mr. Renie, France)

delegation, the updating requested in operative paragraph 1, apart from its financial implications, is not something that seems desirable.

The French delegation would also like to explain its abstention in the vote on draft resolution L.67. France is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, for reasons which have been repeatedly set forth in this Assembly. We were neither participants in nor observers at the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty. In choosing to abstain, rather than not participating in the vote, we intended to make it absolutely clear what our reservations are with regard to a number of points in the Final Declaration of this Conference. We also intend in this way to underscore the fact that, in spite of certain statements in this Declaration, we do not consider that a document adopted among the signatories to a Treaty can in any way be applied to non-signatories of the Treaty which did not participate in the Review Conference.

The French delegation would like to place on record, however, that we associate ourselves fully with the objectives of non-proliferation and that, for our part, we adopt all necessary measures to this end.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1. The Soviet Union has consistently and vigorously supported strict compliance with obligations assumed by States under international agreements. In the course of its more than 60 years of history, the Soviet Union has been a party to several hundred bilateral and multilateral international agreements, and for us, compliance with any obligations assumed by the Soviet Union is a hallmark of our foreign policy.

In general, therefore, we are in favour of the proposal in the draft resolution which is aimed at bringing about compliance with international agreements. At the same time, however, we condemn the use of the question of compliance with agreements as a pretext either for postponing the entry into force of international agreements or the opening of negotiations or for breaking off negotiations currently in progress. We also condemn unfounded assertions with regard to non-compliance with agreements as aimed at covering up a negative attitude to arms limitation and disarmament agreements.

We also wish to draw attention to the fact that the Soviet Union condemns the practice of not bringing into force agreements already concluded on arms limitation and disarmament, particularly those that have been signed at the very highest level by Heads of State. We call for the entry into force of agreements already concluded on arms limitation and disarmament. As the operative part of the draft resolution points out, we call upon all States parties to arms limitation and disarmament agreements to implement and comply with the entirety of the provisions subscribed to.

Unfortunately, the international community cannot pride itself on a large number of bilateral and multilateral agreements on arms limitation and disarmament. As members know, many of the existing agreements have been the targets of criticism and attempts to weaken them. We call upon all parties to

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

preserve the great and precious results that have been achieved in the past through arduous and difficult international negotiations, and we call upon everyone to abide by them strictly, as we do in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. LACLETA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish briefly to refer to Spain's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.67. First, I should like to repeat that, as we have said on various occasions in the past as well as here in the First Committee during the general debate on disarmament questions, the Government of Spain shares the policy and objectives of non-proliferation and has accordingly placed all Spanish nuclear installations under the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Nevertheless, for reasons I need not repeat here, Spain is not a contracting Party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), and it was for that reason that we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): My delegation has been obliged to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.30 just adopted by the Committee. The preambular section of the draft resolution recalls that paragraph 93 (c) of the Final Document requested the Secretary-General periodically to submit to the General Assembly reports on this question. My delegation believes it would have been preferable to delay commissioning this latest report until the forty-first session of the General Assembly, since it would then have had the benefit of the documentation prepared for the International Conference on disarmament and development to be held in 1986 and, of course, of the results of the Conference itself. This would have enabled the report on the economic and social consequences of the armament race to avoid possible duplication and thus to limit costs.

My delegation also abstained because of the financial implications of the draft resolution, as contained in document A/C.1/40/L.77. Moreover, we regret that

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

the provisions of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution do not do enough to try to limit the drain on scarce financial resources, of which we all have to be conscious.

Mr. ISSACHAROFF (Israel): The delegation of Israel wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.67, adopted under agenda item 68. My delegation abstained in the voting on that draft resolution in view of Israel's deep and serious reservations regarding the extraneous, politically motivated and unfounded references to Israel in the Final Document of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. My delegation rejects those specific references, which also single out Israel unjustifiably, in their entirety.

I would like to emphasize that the foregoing in no way reflects on Israel's position in regard to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or detracts from Israel's support for the principle of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to explain its absentention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.67, which has just been adopted. As everyone knows, Cuba is not a signatory of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and therefore did not take part in the preparation, discussion and adoption by consensus of the Final Document of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT.

In the case of the NPT, as with the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the aggressive and hostile policy of the United States towards Cuba and its illegal occupation of a part of Cuba's territory with a military base are obstacles on the path towards our adherence to that Treaty. While we share the objective of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, we uphold the unimpeachable principle of maintaining our right to a free option as to our means of defence so long as the aggressor Power does not forgo its belligerent attitude and return to Cuba the territory it has usurped.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): I wish briefly to explain my delegation's votes on two draft resolutions: A/C.1/40/L.52 and L.56.

My delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.52, entitled "United Nations disarmament studies". We have supported a number of initiatives in this connection, and have proposed some of them ourselves. In our opinion, as far as certain issues are concerned, studies are useful and should be undertaken if their basic objective is to contribute to taking effective and practical steps towards solving the important problems of curbing the arms race and achieving disarmament. In that connection, we regret very much that the study on the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects could not be completed. We think that a greater effort should have been made by all delegations to achieve a positive result.

At the same time, the preparation of studies should not become an end in itself or an instrument for diverting attention from practical measures in the field. Studies cannot be a substitute for such measures, and therefore their significance should not be exaggerated.

My delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.56, entitled "Objective information on military matters". Our stand is based on our position of principle that exchange of information can be useful only under the conditions of practical negotiations on specific disarmament questions aimed at elaborating appropriate agreements. Only in those circumstances and within the framework and scope of a concrete agreement could such exchange of information be an effective contribution to speeding up negotiations. Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.56 tries to make of this question a separate issue, an end in itself, thus exaggerating its importance. This could be an impediment to, rather than facilitating, the achievement of positive results in negotiations.

Mr. DHANAPALA (Sri Lanka): The Sri Lanka delegation would like to explain its abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1. There are two reasons for that abstention: first, my delegation is concerned at the number of new draft resolutions put forward at this session, which in our view serves only to distract us from the Programme of Action, with its clear priorities as set out notably in paragraph 50 of the Final Document adopted at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1 is, in our view, such a draft resolution. The existing climate of international tension and the nuclear-arms race are caused by reasons that are deeper and more serious than non-compliance with existing disarmament treaties. We support compliance and confidence-building measures, but in the final analysis there is no substitute for positive measures of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

Secondly, we found it difficult to support draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1 because, while compliance with disarmament treaties - or any treaties for that matter - is a very important issue, we believe that the provisions of each treaty must legislate compliance with the treaty in question, and that this is a matter for the parties concerned. We have recently concluded the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Final Document of which stated that the objectives of article VI of the Treaty have not been realized. That non-compliance, we believe, may be discussed in this forum as a result of the provisions of paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1. Similarly, the General Assembly could well be called upon to discuss and resolve similar questions of non-compliance, burdening its already heavy agenda and diverting us from the all-important quest for further measures of general and complete disarmament.

Mr. LAKHOUIT (Morocco) (interpretation from French): This is my delegation's first statement this week, and we wish first of all to express the sympathy and solidarity felt by the Government and the people of Morocco towards the Government and the people of Colombia in connection with the disaster which recently befell that country.

My delegation wishes briefly to explain its votes in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.33 and L.66/Rev.1.

My delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.33 for the simple reason that we fully support the convictions and objectives expressed therein by the sponsors of that draft resolution, particularly the reference to paragraphs 39 and 77 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, according to which only qualitative and quantitiative disarmament measures can lead to agreements in this sphere. Moreover, my delegation is a member of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament; that is why it firmly supports the idea that the Conference should, with the assistance of a group of experts, make recommendations on undertaking negotiations on the question.

My delegation also supported draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1. It is well known that the Kingdom of Morocco is a member of or signatory or party to most international conventions and instruments relating to disarmament. By signing and adhering to these instruments, Morocco has always been convinced not necessarily that such treaties contain ideas which have been realized, but that their provisions will be implemented in the future. In its support of this draft resolution, my delegation did not have in mind only international conventions, but principally bilateral conventions. Everyone knows that the leaders of the two super-Powers are meeting at Geneva; we hope that their talks will lead to positive agreements not only on burning regional matters but also, and most important, on disarmament matters and on affairs of interest to those two Powers.

Mr. ABDEL WAHAB (Egypt)(interpretation from Arabic): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1. While Egypt supports all disarmament arrangements and measures, and compliance with them, we believe that separate consideration of the question of compliance is undesirable and redundant given the existence of paragraphs on compliance in all disarmament agreements. In this connection, we wish to stress the importance of reaching, as a matter of urgency, agreements on disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, which is a matter of particular importance to us all.

In connection with the question of compliance, we wish to note the failure of some Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to comply with the provisions of that Treaty, particularly its article VI, concerning the prohibition of nuclear tests. That makes us question the need to repeat the provisions of such draft resolutions as A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1 in this Committee.

Mr. GYI (Burma): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.67, relating to to the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Burma fully subscribes to the principle of non-proliferation, but it is not a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, nor did it participate in the Third Review Conference. Therefore my delegation is not in a position to express its views on the Final Document, adopted by consensus at the Third Review Conference. For that reason my delegation abtained in the voting on L.67.

Mr. DIATTA (Niger) (interpretaton from French): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.67.

Niger is not a signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Hence it did not participate in the work of the Third Review Conference of the Treaty, and we do not feel bound by any document adopted by that Conference. That is why my delegation abstained in the vote on this draft resolution.

However, I should like to say that the Government of my country associates itself with all moves on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as important measures for the guaranteeing of international peace and security.

Mr. TONWE (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation would like to explain its abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.66/Rev.1.

The Nigerian delegation firmly believes that compliance with disarmament agreements is an extremely important issue and that all States parties to international treaties and instruments in this sphere should actually respect their obligations. The Nigerian delegation is aware that the stipulations of certain disarmament agreements, to some of which it is a party, have not been fully complied with by all States parties, but we should like to deal with specific cases of non-compliance on their merit.

(Mr. Tonwe, Nigeria

The Nigerian delegation does not therefore wish to deal with this important matter in a manner that might create any doubt about its conviction that the question of compliance is not an insurmountable obstacle to specific disarmament agreements.

Mr. KUNDA (Zambia): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.67, on the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

As is well known, Zambia is not a party to that Treaty. Consequently it was not part and parcel of the consensus that characterized the adoption of the Final Document on the Third Review Conference in September last. By the same token my delegation could not lend its concurrence to draft resolution L.67, by which the General Assembly would note with satisfaction that on 21 September 1985 the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons adopted by consensus a Final Document.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: Several delegations and groups of delegations have approached me with the request that the Committee not meet this afternoon in order to facilitate ongoing consultations. I propose to comply with that request because, as I have already stated, I intend to carry out the progamme of work with the necessary degree of flexibility. As Chairman, I shall of course always support efforts to allow delegations to come to the meetings better prepared and, hence, produce a better result.

However, I must stress that, starting tomorrow, we shall have to proceed expeditiously to take up the remaining clusters, in sequence as far as possible, beginning with cluster 9. We shall also have to take up those draft resolutions contained in cluster 4 on which action has been deferred, taking into account members' preparedness to take them up individually.

(The Chairman)

We shall hold two meetings on Wednesday and Thursday; on Friday we can schedule two meeting also, but we can have only one meeting on that day where mechanical voting facilities will be available to the Committee. So time is running short. We still have a number of draft resolutions on which to take action, and I therefore urge delegations to make optimum use of the time available for further consultations.

It is also my intention to take up some time tomorrow draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1, on which I understand the relevant documents will be reissues for technical reasons.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees with this proposed programme of work for the coming days.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.