United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
FORTY-SECONDSESSION
*Official Records**

FIRST COMMITTEE
38th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 10 November 1987
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 38th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)

CONTENTS

87-63225 1341V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/42/PV.38
16 November 1987
ENGLISH

Thr meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : The Committee will. continua with the third phase of its work, Before calling on any delegations that may wish to introduce draft resolutions, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee); I ehoula like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become eponeors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/42/L.41: Liberia; L.58/Rev.1: Liberia and Ethiopia, L.74: Romania and Ruanda; L.75: the Ukrainian SSR; L.611 Portugal1 L.40: the German Democratic Republic; and L.65: the Netherlands.

The CHAIHMAN (interpretation from Frerch): As no delegations have indicated the wish to introduce draft resolutions, we will now continue to take decisions on the draft resolutions relating to agenda items devoted to disarmament in cluster 7: A/C.1/42/L.7, L.26 and L.28. We will then consider four draft resolutions in cluster 9: A/C.1/42/L.46, L.58/Rev.1, L.62 and L.72iRev.l. The other draft resolutions in cluster 9 - L.23, L.30, L.50 and L.65/Rev.1 - are Still the subject of consultations.

We will then yo on to cluster 10 and take decisions on draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.12, L.18, L.35 and L.73. This afternoon, we shall attempt to take decisions on cluster 12 and, if possible, also consider cluster 13. That will depend on the progreee we will have made in our work this morning and on the consultations which we will be having with the various deleyatlons.

(The Chairman)

Before taking decisions an these draft resolution6 I call on those delegations who wish to make statements other than in explanation of their vote. There appear to be no speakers. I now call on those delegations who wish to explain their votes before the voting. There appear to be none so we shall proceed to vote on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 7 starting with draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.7.

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.7 was submitted under agenda item 66 (g) entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tentn special session" and subtitled "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war". Members will recall that the draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 2 November 1987. The followinq countries have sponsored the draft resolution: Bulgaria, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary and Romania.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladaah, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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: Australia, Belglum, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Bahamas, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.7 was adopted by 94 votes to 17, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : We now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.26, which is submitted under agenda item 66 (k) entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session" and subtitled "Prevention of nuclear war". It was submitted by the representative of Arqentina at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 3 November 1987. The draft resolution is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Argentina, Banyladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sudan, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote hss been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favourr Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libe ia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining : Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.26 wan adopted by 108 votes to 3, with 14 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.28 submitted by the representative of India at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee on 4 November 1987 under agenda item 63 (e) , entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly" and subtitled "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons". The sponsors of this draft resolution are: Algeria, Aryentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Romania, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favourr Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Daruetaalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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

Againstr Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fr ance, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abs taining: Greece, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Sao Tome and Principe

Draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.28 was adopted by 103 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation f rom French) : I call now on delegations wishing to explain their votes after the votiny.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland) : I wish to explain Finland's vote on draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.7, entitled "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war". Nuclear war is nowhere professed to be an element of rational policy. It is the declared policy of the tiovernment of Finland that nuclear weapons should never in any circumstances be used. It is for that reason that Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.7, as well as in favour of all the other draft resolutions in cluster 7.

Mr. ZHANG Yan (China) (interpretation from Chinese) : The Chinese delegation voted just now in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.28. We note that, apart from the necessary technical changes, the content of that draft resolution remains the same as that of resolution 41/60 F, adopted by the General Assembly last year. In that light, and continuing our support for the main thrust of the concept of the non-use of nuclear weapons, we still. consider that further consideration should be given to the wordiny of parts of the preamble of the draft resolution and the draft convention contained in the annex.

China's position on the non-use of nuclear weapons is well known to all. We have always held that before nuclear disarmament can be achieved, in order to reduce the danger of nuclear war and to create conditions for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, all nuclear-weapon States, particularly those with the largest arsenals, should commit themselves not to uae nuclear weapons in any circumstances against non-nuclear States or nuclear-weapon-free zones. They shoul then conclude an international convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, to which all nuclear-weapon States should be parties.

(Mr. Zhang Yan, China)

We are of the view also that today, at a time when nuclear-weapon stockpiles are so large, the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons cannot by itself eliminate the danger of nuclear war or quaiantee international peace and security for al?. countries. Present nuclear arsenals must be drastically reduced, and all nuclear weapons must ultimately be destroyed. Only in that way can we create concrete conditions for the elimination of nuclear war and help the world's peoples free themselves from the threat of nuclear war.

Mr. MOLANDER (Sweden): Sweden voted in favour of all three of the draft resolutions just adopted. However, my delegation would like to make a few comments on each of them.

Concerning draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.7, introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic, I should like to reiterate that the Swedish Government sees unilateral declarations by nuclear-weapon States committing them not to be the first to use nuclear weapons as an important concept in the efforts to reduce the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war. We hope that all nuclear-weapon States will find it possible to make such declarations. It is obvious that the establishment of an overall balance in conventional forces at a lower level would facilitate such commitments.

In the view of the Swedish Government the firm commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons made through an international instrument of a legally binding character would be an important contribution to successful efforts to prevent nuclear war. That is one reason for the support my Government gave today to draft resolution R/C. 1/42/L.7. However, such an international instrument should deal solely with the concept of the non-first-use of nuclear weapons and should not contain any further elements not directly related to it. In fact, the Swedish

(Mr. Molander, Sweden)

Government considers that the prohibition of the use or threat of use of force in international relations laid down in Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations is mandatory and sufficient. What is required is rather improved compliance by Member States with the existing prohibition and with the obligation, also laid down in the Charter, to settle their international disputes by peaceful means.

Secondly, regarding draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.26, on the prevention of nuclear war, introduced by the representative of Argentina, Sweden this year again voted in favour of the draft resolution. We did so because my Government fully endorses the operative part of the draft resolution, specifically its request that the Conference on Disarmament undertake negotiations with a view to achieving agreement on appropriate and practical measures which could be negotiated and adopted individually for the prevention of nuclear war. However, my delegation feels that the preambular part contains elements which do not fully reflect international developments in this field and the more positive atmosphere in the debate in this Committee. The attainment of the objectives set forth in the operative part could be enhanced only if relevant positive international developments were duly taken into account.

(Mr. Molander, Sweden)

Lastly, regarding draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.28 on a "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons", my country has again voted in favour of this draft resolution introduced by the representative of India. We have done so, as in previous years, because Sweden supports the concept of prohibiting in an international legal instrument the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons. Such a prohibition corresponds to an international norm which is gradually gaining acceptance. It is therefore time to study how the utter moral reprobation of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons could be translated into a binding international agreement as part of a process leading to general and complete disarmament.

However, with regard to the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, my delegation has reservations as to the interpretation of the Charter of the United Nations. In fact, if the use of nuclear weapons were incontestably to be a violation of the Charter, there would obviously be no need for another instrument.

Mr. ROWE (Australia) : The Australian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.26 on "Prevention of nuclear war". We strongly support the objective of the prevention of nuclear war by all possible means. My delegation would, however, have preferred to see the resolution drafted in such a way as to give due recognition to the fact that the issue of the prevention of nuclear war cannot be dealt with in isolation. One of the most important ways to prevent a nuclear war is through the prevention of all wars.

My delegation also supports the establishment of an ad hoc committee on this issue in the Conference on Disarmament. Although the Australian delegation is not certain that such an ad hoc committee could undertake negotiations on the matter at this stage, we should like to see the conference on Disarmament consider and

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

identify possible areas for its detailed examination of the issue, similar to the ad hoc committee established for the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Accordingly, the Auatralian delegation urges the Conference on Disarmament to establish an ad hoc committee at its 1988 session, so that it can undertake discussion of an issue of priority concern in the field of disarmament.

Australia voted against @raft resolution A/C.1/42/L.7 on "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war" because we do not believe that Lhe aim of preventing nuclear war is advanced by a priori and unverifiable declarations about the use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. BRACEGIRDLE (New Zealand) : New Zealand would like to explain its vote on two draft resolutions in this cluster: A/C. 1/42/L.7 on "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war" and L.28 on "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons". New Zealand voted against both of those draft resolutions.

In New Zealand's view, those draft resolutions attempt to address nuclear weapons in isolation without taking into account certain balancing considerations, Such as a need for agreement on massive reductions in conventional weapons. New Zealand does not support draft resolutions that, in its view, lack the necessary balance and will not encourage an accommodation of different approaches to security. We do not feel that they offer practical suqyestions which would help to achieve the balanced reductions in nuclear weapons that we all desire.

in New Zealand's view, the overriding need is to achieve substantial reductions in nuclear weapons as quickly as possible. Nuclear deterrence plays a central role in the security arrangements that have existed since the Second World War. In that time there has been no global conflict. The price has, however, been an arms race in which the nuclear-weapon States, and in particular, the two largest

(Mr Bracegirdle, New Zealand)

nuclear-weapon States, have competed to develop larger and more sophisticated arsenals of nuclear weapons, to such a point that those arsenals in their current massive array now have the potential to destroy all life on the planet. The international community as a whole has a responsibility to find other means to ensure international security. A vision of that goal was provided at the Reykjavik summit meeting Last year, and the first steps are now being taken in that direction.

New Zealand will continue to support draft resolutions which offer suggestions that will help to encourage the welcome process that has now begun. In OUK view, the process of the reduction of nuclear weaponry ha5 to be facilitated by an agreement to deal with imbalances in conventional forces.

It will also be important in this process to pay more attention to the place Of regional security arrangomente in ensuring international Stability. We have been trying to do this in our region of the world, recoyniziny that circumstances will be different in different regions. For OUK part, we think that our security and that of our region would be enhanced if nuclear weapons are not deployed in the area.

We therefore hope that the goal in this Committee and in other forums will be to look for ways in which all of us, individually and collectively, can make a contribution to global security. This will mean a world in which stability and security are guaranteed for all while we move towards the goal of a world free from the threat of nuclear annihilation.

MK. NANNA (Nigeria): I wish to explain the support of my delegation for draf t resolution A/C. 1/42/L. 7. My delegation feels that the concepts implied in the last preambular paragraph pertain more to the doctrines of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Treaty. We would wish that those concepts were not reflected in the draft resolution.

(Mr. Nanna, Niger ia)

However, the general thruet of the draft resolution is acceptable to my delegation. That explains our positive votu on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : We shall now proceed to cluster 9 containing draft resolutions A/C. 1/42/L.46, L.58/Rev. 1, L.62 and L.72/Rev.1. Before taking any decisions on thoae four drafts, I call on delegations for explanation8 of vote before the voting.

Mr. MADSEN (Denmark! a I wish to make a statement on behalf of the twelve member States of the European Community on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.46, regarding Uiearmament Week. In the view of the Twelve, an informed public opinion on diearmament issues, and in particula. on the interrelationship of factors concerning international stability and security and their consideration within the framework of the United Nations and in other forums, is an important elsment in the pursuit of progress within the fields of arms control and diearmament. The wider circulation in all Member countries of objective information on military matters and on arms contra1 and disarmament questions would contribute towards a better understanding of these complex issues.

(Mr. Madsen, Denmar k)

It is against this background that the Twelve can support the objectives of Disarmament Week, which has this year, as in previous years, been mar ked in member countries of the Twelve by non-governmental activities. The Twelve are, however, not able to support draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.46. We recognize that attempts have been made to improve the text compared to last year's resolution. We still have problema, however, and among others with operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution in which the relevant specialized and other agencies are invited to intensify activities, within their areas of competence, to disseminate information on the consequences 01 the arms race. The Twelve have, on a number of occasions, emphasized that the United Nations disarmament activities should contribute to concrete meaaurea of arms control and disarmament. Specific deliberative and negotiating bodies have been established within the United Nations system for this purpose. Rather than encourayiny the specialized agencies to engage in activities that are likely to detract from the important tasks for which they have been specifically mandated and which are frequently of particular benefit to developing countries, the General Assembly should, in our view, concentrate on ways of making maximum use of the exietiny disarmament machinery of the United Nations. For these reasons the twelve member States of: tne European Community will abstain on draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.46.

Mr. BAYART (Monyolia) (interpretation from French) : Before taking a decision on draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.46 on Disarmament Week, 1 should like to make a few oral amendments to the draft resolution.

First of all in the third preambular paragraph,

(spoke in English)

the word "urgent" in its first line is deleted.

The next amendment is in the fourth preambular paragraph. The words "as we I 1 as the new initiatives to thi:; end" are deleted.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

In the next amendment the fifth preambuler paragraph, beginning "Mindful of the world-wide mass...", is deleted and replaced by the following paraqraphr

"urging all Member States not to interfere with the rights of the citizens to organize and participate in the anti-war and anti-nuclear-weapons threat demonstrations and movement,"

The last amendment concerns operative parayrapn 7. In the first line, after the words "united Nations", the words "mass media" are replaced by "information organs". The phrase will then read as follows:

"Further invites the Secretary-General to use the United Nations information organs as widely as possible...".

(continued i.n French)

These amendments are made following consultations with the delegations involved and reflect a compromise. The sponsors hope that in its present amended form the draft resolution will marshall as broad support as possible among members of our Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : We shall now take decisions on the draft resolutions in cluster 9. We shall start with draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.46, as orally amended by the representative of Monyolia. This draft is entitled "Disarmament Week" and it comes under agenda item 66 (i) , entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". This draft was introduced by the representative of Monyolia at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November 1987. The following countries are sponsors of this draft resolution: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam. The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If there is no objection, it is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.46 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : We shall now pass on to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.58/Rev. 1, which was introduced under agenda item 63 (f) and is entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly: United Nations proyramme of fellowships on disarmament". This draft was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 3 November 1987. The programme budget implications of this draft *are* contained in document A/C.1/42/L.78. The following countries are sponsors of that draft resolution8 Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Federal Republic of Germany, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Indonesia, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darusealam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt , Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahir iya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigc r ia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa? Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: None

Draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.58/Rev.1 was adopted by 129 votes to 1.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : We shall new pass on to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.62. The agenda item involved is item 63 (c) and the title is "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly". This draf t, which is entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa", was introduced by the representative of Madagascar on behalf of the African Group at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November 1987. The only sponsor of the draft is Madagascar. A r ecorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrarnian 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: None

Draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.62 was adopted by 131 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : We shall now pass on to the last text in in cluster 9 that requires examination by the Committee this morning, draft resolution document A/C.1/42/L.72/Rev.1. It is submitted under agenda item 63 (h) and is entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly: United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America". It was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee, on 4 November 1987.

The following countries have sponsored the draft; Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have indicated that they wish to have the draft adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.72/Rev.1 was adopted.

Mr. RAKOTONIRAMBOA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French) : I should like to draw the attention of members of the First Committee to the fact that at the time I had the honour of presenting draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.62, concerning the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, on behalf of the members of the Group of African States, I explicitly requested that as usual the draft resolution be adopted by consensus and, as far as I know, no one asked for a vote on the draft resolution.

For the record of the First Committee, I should like to say that the Group of African States does not wish the fact that a vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.62 to be considered as creating a precedent.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : The statement of the representative of Madagascar has been noted. I would ask delegations to be somewhat more helpful in indicating specifically the manner in which they wish their draft resolutions to be adopted. I would then have the information before me. Had I known that it had been requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote, I would certainly have followed that procedure.

Mr. SCHIALER (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish) : On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.72/Rev.1, on the United Nations Rsgional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America, just adopted without a vote, I should like to express our deepest appreciation to Member States represented in the First Committee for their support for this regional centre. MY delegation believes that this support is a very favourable element and that it augurs well for the centre and is a stimulus to consolidating and strengthening its activities in order to further mutual support and co-operation in a spirit of harmony and solidarity. We consider those elements to be indispensable for the establishment of peace and disarmamert and for the promotion of economic and social development in Latin America.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : Before proceeding to deal with cluster No. 10, I shall suspend the meeting for some consultations.

The meeting was suspended at 12 noon and resumed at 12.40 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : The Committee has completed its consideration and adoption of the four draft resolutions in cluster 9. The meeting was suspended for consultations before proceeding to consideration Of another cluster of draft resolutions. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes on the draft resolutions in cluster 9.

Mr. NUMATA (Japan) : Japan wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.58/Rev.1, "United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament" . Japan considers the United Nation6 fellowship proyramme very important in promotiny expertise in disarmament, especially *in* the developing countries. For that reason, my Government annually invites the participants in the programme to Japan, including visits to Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

While we thus support the programme and voted in favour of draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.58/Rev. 1, we feel bound to express reservations about renaming the programme as set forth in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. As is clear from the relevant section of the Secretary-General's report, A/42/693, it was not possible, given the Present financial situation of the United Nations, to start the new programmes of regional disarmament training and disarmament advisory *services.* In the view of my delegation, the priority should, under these circumstances, be placed on restoring the number of fellowships - which has been reduced from the original 25 to 20 - as and when the financial situation improves, rather than on the kind of expansion implied by the renaming of the programme.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the United Kingdom's vote on some of the draft resolutions in cluster 9.

First, draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.46, "Disarmament Week. " My delegation was expecting a vote on that draft resolution, and we would have abstained had there

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

been one. There will have to be a vote when that text comes before a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

Secondly, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.58/Rev. 1, on the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament, we firmly support the programme. However, I should like to say that the confirmation given in document A/C.1/42/L.78 that no additional appropriation would be requested under section 2B of the Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989 is something to which we attach importance. Against that financial background, we have reservations about the proposal in the draft resolution to rename the programme. We believe that such a move would, at this stage, be premature, and we hope that the formal change of title will be put into effect only when it reflects the actual situation, that is, when the advisory and training services are well established.

Thirdly, I should like to comment on draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.62 and L.72, relating to regional centres for disarmament in Africa and Latin America respectively. The United Kingdom was happy to join in the consensus on both draft resolutions. In doing so, and in the absence of a Secretariat statement of Programme-budget implications, the United Kingaom proceeded on the basis that the draft resolutions raise no such implications and that the Centres will continue to be funded by voluntary contributions.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): As delegations are aware, the United States engages in and supports regional approaches to arms limitations. Our delegation has demonstrated that support by joining in the consensus adoption of draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.62 and L.72/Rev.1 concerning the United Nations Regional Centres for peace and disarmament in Africa and Latin America, respectively. The United States has been able to support those draft resolutions on the understanding that they call for the Regional Centres to function solely on

(Mr. Friedersdorf , Unrted States)

the basis of existing resources and of voluntary contributions from Member States. The United States takes this opportunity, however, to underscore its concern it the fact that these draft resolut lons are nevertheless resulting in an expansion of the physical plant of the United Nations during a period of fiscal austerity. Our delegation therefore wishes to express its hope that when the Secretariat reports to the First Committee on the activities of those Centres next year, the reports will show financial contributions to the Centres from the Governments of the regions concerned, at a level commensurate with t' s political support that they have demnnetrated on the draft reeolutions adopted today.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.46, my delegation did not aqree to the adoption of that draft resolution without a vote. My delegation would have called for a vote on that draft resolution and would have abstained, and we ask that that fact should be reflected in the record.

The United States has abstained on many of the predecessors of the draft resolution because their sponsors have insisted on including unrealistic and hyperbolic language in a draft resolution that ideally would be of a procedural nature and en joy adoption by consensus. Last year the United States .ced against General Assembly resolution 41/86 D on this subject because it invited the specialized technical agencies, particularly the International Atomic Energy Agency, to involve themselves unnecessar ily with disarmament mat tere outside the scope of their respective mandates. General Assembly resolution 41/86 D also referred to a number of proposals by the sponsoring delegations that the United States does not support. This year the United States deleyation undertook consultations with the delegation of Mongolia in an attempt to so modify the text of General Assembly resolution 41/86 D as to enable the United States either to abstain or to support it. The draft resolution that the Committee has adopted is a result of those consultations.

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

The United States delegation remains concerned over much of the hyperbolic language in this draft resolution. Nevertheless, the text has been improved sufficiently to permit our delegation to abstain on it this year. The United States delegation hopes that the sponsors of this draft resolution will enter into bona fide consultations with us on this subject early next year in the hope that next year's draft resolution may truly be adopted by consensus.

The United States has been and continues to be a strong supporter of the programme of fellowships on disarmament. Representatives of our Government continue to address meetings of the fellows in both Washington and Geneva, and consider such exchanges to be of mutual benefit. Moreover, our delegation appreciates the recognition given in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.58/Rev. 1 to United States activities on behalf of the programme.

Nevertheless, the United States remains unable to support additional expenditures associated with the implementation of existing United Nations programmes. Operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution explicitly endorses the increased spending levels for this activity that the General Assembly adopted in 1985; it does so in spite of the fact that even with that increased financing this year's programme accommodated only 20 fellows rather than the scheduled 25.

For those reasons, the United States delegation regrets that it remains unable on financial grounds, to support draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.58/Rev. 1, on the United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament.

Mr. MADSEN (Denmark): When action was taken on draft resolution A/C. 1/42/L.46, on Disarmament Week, my delegation, speaking to explain the position of the 12 member States of the European Community, expressed their intention to abstain. The draft resolution was nevertheless adopted without a vote. I must

(Mr. Madsen, Denmark)

refer again to our statement, which contained a declared intention to abstain; that intention is maintained. We must, of course, reserve our right to auk for a vote when the draft resolution comes before ths plenary Assembly.

Mr. NIEUWENHUYS (Belgium) (interpretation from French) : I wirh to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolutions in cluster 9: A/C.1/42/L.46, L.58/Rev.1, L. 62 and L.72/Rev. 1. My delegation was very pleased to support the last three of thoee draft resolutions.

With respect to draft resolution6 A/C.1/42/L.62, on the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Diearmament in Africa, and A/C.1/42/L.72, on the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America, my delegation conaiders that the centres could make a positive contribution to regional disarmament. Regional diearrnament is a concept of which Belqium has for many years been a proponent.

AR to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.46, my deleyation fully eubocribee to what has just bean stated on behalf of the Twelve by the representative of Denmark. Clearly, we have reservations on operative paragraph 5; we hope that at a later stage the text can be modified in ouch a way as to lead to general acceptance. Had the draft resolution been put to the vote, we would have abstained.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): Had draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.46 been put to the vote, the delegation of Israel would have abstained.

Mr. MORRI (Canada; : My delegation wishes to explain its position on one of the draft reaolutiona in cluster 9 on which the Committee has just taken action. With specific reference to draft reeolution A/C.1/42/L.46, entitled "Disarmament Week", submitted under agenda item 66 (i), my delegation fully expected that a vote would be taken. Hod a vote been taken, as we were led to expect it would oe, my delegation would have abstained.

(Mr. Morri, Canada)

We noted with pleasure the oral amendments put forward by the representative of Mongolia, and we hopr that in futurr greater consultations will lead to the adoption by consensus of a draft resolution on Disarmament We. . Surely, we ought to be able to agree that it is good that the United Nations ha8 a Disarmament Week; that it is good that individual8 and non-governmental organizations should take part. Canada works actively to promote the objectives of Disarmament Week and is a strong supporter o f its aims. A8 ha8 boon raid by other delegations, we look forward to continued consultation on this matter with a virw to having sucn draft resolutions adopted in tha future by consensus.

Mr. ANDEKSEN (Iceland) : My delegation would have abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.46 had it been put to the vote. We shall ● b8tain when the draft resolution comes before the plenary Assembly.

Mr. LUNDBO (Norway): I should like to state for the record that my delegation would have abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/12/L.46, on Disarmament Week, had the draft resolution been put to the vote.

Mr. de LA BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation naturally subscribes to the statement that has just been made by the representative of Denmark on behalf of the countries of the European Community. My delegation expected that a vote would be taken on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.46 and intended to abstain. We now note that certain formulations in that draft are more satisfactory than those which appeared in last year's text, but we still have reservations concerning paragraph 5.

Mr. LUEDEKING (Federal Republic of Germany): Like other delegations, my delegation also expected a vote to be taken on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.46. If there had been a vote, we would have abstained. The reasons for our abstention were explained in the statement made by the representative of Denmark before we dealt with the draft resolution.

Mr. SHUURMAN VOLKER (Netherlands): As stated by other delegations, my delegation expected that draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.46 on "Disarmament Week" would have been put to a vote. We regret that this was not the case. We would have abstained had there been a vote. We hope that in the future, consensus on this resolution can be achieved, and we hope for further consultations.

Mr. HOWE (Australia): I wish to state for the record that had draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.46 on "Disarmament Week" been put to a vote as we had expected, Australia would have abstained. I also wish to place on record that we share the views of others who have spoken on the desirability of trying to work for a consensus resolution on Disarmament Week, and we hope that this objective will be achieved at the next session of the General Assembly.

Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation also welcomes the fact that the draft resolution on the United Nations Regional centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America received the support that made possible its adoption by consensus. We should like to reaffirm our hope that

(Mr. Fischer, Uruguay)

the Centre will be able to attain the same objectives that motivate the peace efforts in which our countries in the region are engaged. In this connection, Uruguay, which has just resolved to make its own voluntary contribution, hopes and trusts that such contributions will become more widespread and general in the very near future.

Mr. GOKTURK (Turkey): I simply want to join previous speakers in stating that our intention was to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.46, and we shall certainly do so when the Assembly makes use of the voting machine available to it.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The voting machine can always be used so long as delegations request tnat it should be put to use. It is at the disposal of all delegations.

This afternoon we expect to take a decision on cluster 10 of our draft resolutions. Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.12 continues to be the subject of consultations. The Committee will therefore not be in a position to consider it. However, we have draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.18, L.35, and L.73/Rev.1, which can be considered by the Committee.

We shall then pass on to cluster 12, which contains draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.40 and L.64, and, if we have sufficient time and if the machine permits, we might take up cluster 13, which contains draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.16, L.61 and L.69. Since consultations - constructive consultations - are continuing with a view to merging certain draft resolutions, thus satisfying the expressed wishes of numerous delegations ta have the number of our draft resolutions reduced, we can do no better than encourage such consultations. I should therefore like to request the Secretariat not to schedule a meeting of the First Committee for tomorrow afternoon, so that those consultations can proceed.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p-m-