United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
FORTY-THIRD SESSION
Official Records*

FIRST COMMITTEE
41st meeting
held on
Thursday, 17 November 1988
at **3.30 p.m.**
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 41et MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ROCHE (Canada)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS [51 to 69, 139, 141 and 145] (continued)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/43/PV.41
23 November 1988
ENGLISH

88-63248 8633V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4.40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 51 TO 69, 139, 141 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN; Before I call for the introduction of draft resolutions I shall call on Mr. Sohrab Kheradi, Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) I I should like to inform the member6 of the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions : draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 65, India; and A/C. 1/43/L 22/Rev.1, the United Kingdom.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on &legations wishing to make statements.

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): Members may recall that, on behalf of the Group of African States, I introduoed draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.72 on the dumping of nuclear and industrial wastes in Africa. Following the decision adopted by the Heads of State and Government at the last summit meeting of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) in Addis Ababa, the Group of African States in New York was mandated to place before the forty-third session of the General Assembly an item entitled "Dumping of nuclear and industr ial waster in Africa", which was added to the agenda as item 64(k).

The Group of African States introduced that draft resolution taking into account the dangerous practices engaged in recently in Africa. Cer ta in tranenational corporations have, in fact, recently been dumping waster in some African countries, greatly harming its environment and ecology as well as jeopardizing the health of Africans themselves.

Therefore, in keeping with the mandate juet mentioned, draft resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 72 was in troduced, condemning any practice of dumping nuclear and industrial wastes in Africa, requiring that an end be put to that dangerous, immoral and illegal practice and requesting all Member States to ensure effective control of the transportation of industrial and other wastes. Members have also seen the contents of operative paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of draft resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 72.

It subsequently turned out that certain &legations had introduced a seoond draft resolution on the same subject - the dumping of radioactive wastes - which presents certain similarities. That led the Group of Af r ican States to make a concerted effort to combine draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.72 and A/C.1/43/L.62 in order to introduce a single draft resolution on the subject on behalf of the Group of African States in the First Committee.

(Mr. Baqbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

Our efforts have been crowned with a certain success, given that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 62 has been improved and the main points are taken into account in the operative part of A/C. 1/43/L. 62/Rev. 2. It is in that context that the Group of African States intended to introduce the new version of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.72, which is now A/C.1/43/L.72/Rev.1, which I have just submitted on behalf of the Group of African States to the Secretariat for distribution to all members of the First Committee. We do so in the hope that a decision will be taken on that draft resolution.

Thus, the draft which will be distributed is to be seen as an improvement on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.72, for it takes into account suggestions that may be found in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L/62/Rev. 2. We have therefore asked the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.62 to look at A/C.1/43/L.72/Rev.1 and to judge to what extent their concerns, constructive ideas and proposals have in fact been taken into account.

It is in that context that consultations have been conducted with you, Sir, by the Group of African States, so that in waiting for the new document , which incorporates the essential ideas of the two draft resolutions, to be distributed to all members of the Committee, members will have the chance to study in depth and be enlightened by draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 72/Rev.1, which takes into account draft resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 62/Rev. 2.

The Group of African States has asked me to request the Committee not to reach a decision before the document has been distributed, so that members of the Committee have the chance to examine it closely and determine the extent to which the combined resolutions reflect the general feelings.

We have reached a stage in our work where it is time to reach decisions, to take action, to put practical recommendations to the General Assembly, and that is

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nsengeya, Zaire)

why I do not wish to go into detail. I hope that all delegations will have a chance to study the operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.72/Rev.1 and to realize the efforts that went into drafting a single draft resolution on the dumping of industrial wastes, which has been entitled "Dumping of radioactive wastes". It no longer applies just to African countries but to all members of the Organization who are themselves also affected by those practices which we believe to be dangerous both to the environment and to the health of human beings.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden): I am very pleased to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75, entitled "Study on the role of the United Nations in the field of verification". I do so on behalf of Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Botswana, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Thailand, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zaire and Sweden.

This new text is the result of long and delicate negotiations between Canada, France and the Netherlands on the one hand and Sweden on the other, representing the countries of the Six Nation Initiative, namely, Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

The new &aft rrrolution stresses that the issue of verification of and compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreementa is a matter of concern to all nationr. It recalls thot the United Nations is already playing a useful role in the field of verification. Furthermore, it recognizee *that* the United Nations, in accordanoe with its role and responsibilities *under* the Charter, can make *a* significant contribution in the field of verification, particularly of multilateral agreementr. The *draft* rerolution requests the Secretary-General to undertake, with the assistance of a group of qualified governmental axper ta, an in-depth ● tuw of the role of the United Nations in the field of verification which would, inter alia, provide specific recommendations for future action by the United Nations in this context.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 75 is being submitted after extensive oonaultationr. It goer without raying that none of the negotiating parties can be fully satisfied with the final result. The text doer, however , contain *a* number of important elemen ta whi ch we believe cunmand broad eupport in this Committee. It i s our hope that this draft rerolution will in fact be adopted without a vote.

Considerable efforte have been made to draft *a* text which would be acceptable to everyone seriously interested in promoting the cause of adequate verification in the field of disarmament and arms limitation. It is no coincidence that many countries from all groups have shown real interest, and have made constructive contributiona in this field, and *that* the Disarmament Commission has done much constructive work on these issues in the past two years. Indeed, ver ification is not the unique domain of any one delegation or group of delegations. The general principles of verification drawn up by the Disarmament Commission have been endorsed in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75. It is of great importance that the Secretary-General is to be assisted by a group of governmental

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

export8 which, we hope, will be inspired by the spirit of consensus that has characterized the work on this subject in the United Nationr.

Speaking now on behalf of the countrier of the Six-Nation Initiative, I should like first of all to express our appreciation to the delegationr of Canada, France and the Netherlands for the spirit of compromise and good will they have shown in the negotia tions.

The countr ies of the Six-Nation Initiative would certainly have liked to see a more ambitious approach reflected in the draft resolution. At the same time, we were anxious to attract as wide support as possible for the i&a of an increased role for the United Nations in the field of verification. We think that goal is beet promoted through a single draft resolution enjoying the broadest possible support in the General Assembly. The Six will continue to work for their idea8 in this area in a constructive spirit.

Let me repeat that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 75 hope that the text will en joy the support of the whole Committee and can be adopted by consensus.

Before concluding I wish to announce on behalf of the countrier of the Six-Nmtion Initiative that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 2 will not be put to the vote.

Mr. MORRISON (Canada) : My delegation, speaking also on behalf of France and the Nether landr, La happy to express support for draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 75, entitled "Study on the role of the United Nation8 in the field of verification" and submitted under agenda item 139, entitled "Verification in all its aspects".

On behalf of Canada, France and the Nether lands, I would like to express our appreciation to the delegation of Sweden, representing the Six-Nation Initiative, for the spirit of compromise and good will shown in the negotiations.

(Mr. Morrison, Canada)

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75 represents the culmination of a long period of intensive consultation and negotiations spanning many months. It rrflectr a compromise and adelicatebalance among diff● ❐♓■♍ approaches. Although it doer not contain all that we would have wished, we consider that it represents *a* realistic, reasonable *and* ma ture ·pproach. It in *a* draft resolution which, we believe, will ● ♎❖♋■♋ significantly the con.sideration of verification in *all* its aspects.

It is appropr iate to recall some of the baokground behind ef forte over the past few years within the United Nations in the field of verification. The first General Assembly resolution devoted to this subject war resolution 40/152 O, which was initiated by Canada in 1985 and adopt..d by consensus. Two subsequent resolution8 have been adopted, also by consensus. Moreover, the Disarmament Commission, in 1987 and 1988, established working groups on verification whose work has been characterized by consensus.

It is noteworthy that in 1985, when the first rerolution was adopted, there was considerably less reoognition than there is today within the United Nations of just how indispensible adequata and effective verification is to the process of reaching and implementing meaningful arms control and disarmament agreements. Indeed, one Of the important successes Of efforts Within the United Nations has been to increase awareness within the international community of the significance of verification.

One of the main reasons why consensus has been maintained throughout the United Nations process is that we have been realistic about our goals. There has been a clear recognition that in or&r to advance this issue we must do so in a step-by-step fashion. It is in this way that a practical and valuable role for the United Nations can be defined, a role that can both generate and maintain widespread politioal support from the entire international community.

Mr. Morrison, Canada)

The draft resolution which has been introduoed today represents a further movement in this step-by-step process, an approaoh which is firmly founded on widespread support. It uses as i ts foundation the *past* consensus that has developed *on* this issue. Moreover, *it* proposes *a* further constructive *step* in this process: *a* study by *a* United Nations group Of experts. Such *a* study will allow the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of qualified governmental experts, to bring to bear teahnioal skills in order to assist in the def inition of an appropr iate and useful role for the United Na tions in the field of ver ification, in the first plaae of multilateral agreements and, f urthormore, of regional and bilateral agreements if the parties thereto so desire. In our view, their work, like that already conducted by the United Nations, should be characterized by realism and by consensus. Any recommendations put forward will be relevant, have an impact and lead to praatiaal results only if they refloat the common views of the members of the group.

We *are* convinced that the United Nations *urn* make *a* significant contribution to verification. We do not see such *a* role a3 interfer ing in any way *With* the provisions of existing agreements. On the contrary, the United Nations role, *as* the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affair8 ha8 said on more than one occasion, must be to facilitate, not to interfere with, the process. Wecan□ . . upon the lessons provided by existing agreemente, notably those between the United States *Of* America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, to help us determine what constitutes an appropriate role for the United Nations.

We urge that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 75 be adopted by oonaenauo, and to facilitate such a result we are pleased to ray that we will not ark that draft resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 1 be put to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now turn to cluster 13. Tho representative of Austria ha8 asked to make a statement.

Mr. INZKO (Austria) I My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.50 and L.66 submitted this year with regard to the report of the Conference on Disarmament because Austr is attaches great importance to the role the Conference plays in international disarmament affairs.

The agenda of the Conference ha8 on it issues of the highest priority, such as the multilateral ban on Chemical weapons, the comprehensive nuclear-teat-ban treacy and the comprehensive program of disarmament. While favour ably aasesaing the substan tial progress made in some of the es tabl ished ad hoc committees of the Conference, it is also our opinion that more effort should be devoted to solving outstanding issues on a technical as well as on a political level.

My country attacnes the highest priority to the conclusion of an effective, verifiable and global ban on all chemical weapons. It is in that context that we call upon all participants in the negotiations to pursue their work with regard to the possible negative consequences if the work on the chemical-weapons convention is not finalized at the earliest possible moment. It is that conviction that leads us to continue to support all efforts in this respect. Amongst those efforts, we consider the active and constructive sharing of all participants in the negotiations to be essential.

However, note should also be taken, in texts of draft resolutions, of positive resul ts achieved. In that connection we should like to mention the result obtained within the Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, which will allow us to finish our work on that issue in the form of a report to the General Assembly at its session next year.

Among the issues on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament we see the establishment of an ad hoc committee on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty as

(Mr. Insko, Aurtr la)

being of outstanding importance. In our opinion, it is not ● noUgh to call Upon the Conference on Disarmament to establish an ad hoc aommittee on all agenda items. We must requeet all States members of the Conference to do their utmost to reach compromise in order to facilitate the establishment of such a body.

While it seems that the limitation of membership of the Conference on Disarmament has served its purpose for some time now, it is the v.ew of the Aus tr ian delegation that an enlargement of member ship to include the moat interested, as well as for the most active, participating non-member States should be a logical next step. Further , all interested non-member States ahould be provided with better access to participation in the work of the Conference. Any further delay in taking such decisions cannot but be regarded as discrimination against sane of the States most interested in disarmament affairs.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those delegation8 wishing to make ctatements in explanation of vote before the voting on the follawing draft resolutions in cluster 131 A/C.1/43/L. 24, L. 46, L.50, L.54/Rev.1, L.65 and L.66.

Mr. DEMBSKI (German Democratic Republic): During the general debate my delegation explained its basic posi tion concerning the work of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. I should like to make a few more remarks in connection with the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.50 and A/C.1/43/L.66, "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

Both the discussions at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and those here in the First Committee confirm that the Conference on Disarmament is being accorded a specific role in the further pursuit of the disarmament process. Against the background of the generally acclaimed positive result8 in Soviet-American negotiation8, multilateral negotiations have gained in urgency. Complementary negotiations at the bilateral and multilateral

(Mr. Dembski, German Democratic Republic)

levels conduce to the ● dvanaomont of the process of arm limitation and disarmamont at a faster rate. My dolegation therefore sharer the view - which has also been ● xpreued in the draft rerolutiona ◆■♎♏❒ oonrideration - that the Confermae must intensify its work. In our view, in addition to an early conclusion of negotiations on a oonvention banning chemical weapons, priority should be given to overcoming ● t8gnation in the oonrideration of nuclear issues. There should be no delay in moving an ta practical work, At the Same time, efforts should be intensified to open further negotiations at tne Conference aimed at reaching agreement on ● ffeative measures *of* arms limitation and disarmament. I refer ● 8pouially to a prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

In order to tackle the tasks that lie ahead of it, the Conference should, at the ● ♋❒●♓♏♋♦ possible date, agree to and implement measures designed to enhance the effectiveness of its work. My delegation commends the efforts undertaken towards that end within the framework *of* the Conference, notably those of the Group of Seven, with Ambassador Fan, the representative of the People's Republic of China, at its helm.

The Warsaw Treaty States put forward aomprehenrive proporals in a document entitled "Towards increasing the ● ffeativene8a of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva", which has been submitted to the Conference. The German Democratic Republic believes that it would be of particular value to take measures in the following directions: first, to recognize the right of all States to participate in one way or another in the negotiations, whiah would, above all, serve to enhance the universality of agreements; secondly, to increase the intensity of work and to make more time available to the Conference; thirdly, to simplify procedures with regard to the ● rtablirhmrnt of subsidiary bodies of the Conference under individual agenda items by agreeing on a *uniform* negotiating mandate for them; fourthly, to

(Mr. Dembski, German Democratic Republic)

involve more ● xpwta in the work of the Conference; fifthly, to convene meetings at the foreign-minister level on special occasions.

In the view of my delegation the improved political condi tions today provide ● f: ourable ● nvircwrmnt for bringing the potential of the Conference more fully to bru on the future , in keeping with its role as thr single multilateral negotiating forum on global ● rmr-lhitation and disarmament issues. With that understanding the German Democratic Republic will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C. 1/43/L. 50 and A/C. 1/43/L. 66.

Mr . KOTEVSKI (Yugoslavia): I should like to ● xprorr my delegation's position concerning draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.50 on the report of the Conference on Disarmament. At thr lart two sessions of thr General Assembly my delegation explained its vok on similar draft resolutions related to the report of the Conference on Disarmament. On those occasions we pointed out that Yugoslavia ● ♦♦♋□♒□♎ the greatest importance to the work of the Conf erence on Disarmament and that the Conference, as the single multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, had no doubt an exceptionally important role to play in negotiations on questions of disarmament, particularly those to which the United Nations har assigned the greatest priority and urgency and which have been under consideration for a number of years.

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugorlavia)

We continue to brlirve that the Final Document of the first special session Of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is quite explicit in this respect. We consider that the Conference on Dirarmament mhould not be a body in which only certain selected questions of disarmament are considered but rather that the Conference should negotiate on all quertionr on its agenda. We therefore think that it is necessary to give an additional, strong impetus to multilateral negotiationr on all issues that concern the security of countries, particularly in circumstances in which progress is evident in some important fields of disarmament and in which the need for the complementarity of bilateral, regional and multilateral negotia tions has been broadly accepted.

It is to be regretted that this year again such an approach to the Conference on Disarmament and to its role in the negotiations is not evident in draft rerolu tion A/C. 1/43/L. 50.

My delegation also regrets that this year's efforts to produce a single solution failed to achieve results. Unfortunately , draf t resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 50 does not eliminate our reservations regarding its essence, that is, the relationship between the General Aaeembly and the Conference on Disarmament as a negotiating body on diearmament ieeuee. We consider that the General Assembly hae the right to, and should, stress the priority issues of disarmament and should request the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate on them.

Once again, therefore, we cannot agree with the concept and approach contained in the draft rerolution and, particularly, with the essence of operativs paragraph 4. What we would like to see is a clear message to the Conference on Disarmament to address itself to negotiating the key ieeuee of disarmament. We consider that the General Aeeembly has the right and the responsibility not only to take note of the report of the Conference on Disarmament, but also to assess the work of the Conference and to give clear poli tics1 signals with regard to its

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

future negotiations. This is necerrary precisely because of the importanoe we attach to the Conferrnce on Disarmament and the role it should play in multilateral negotia tions on disarmament.

For those reasons my delegation is unable to support the draft rerolution contained in A/C.1/43/L.50 and will abstain in the vote.

Mr. BENYAMINA (Algeria) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to explain its vote before the voting on draft reaolution A/C.1/43/L.50.

In our view a draft rrrolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament murt satisfy at least two needs, namely, it muet recall the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the unique multilateral framework for negotiating disarmament issues end express an assessment *of* the work aocanpl ished by the Conf erence, tak ing account, if relevant, of the progress made during the past year while calling for a redoubling of ef forte in negotiations in the context of the ad hoc committee8 on priority questlone.

Draft reeolution A/C, 1/43/L. 66, of which my delegation is a sponsor, does satisfy those two minimum requirements while draft reeolution A/C.1/43/L.50 does not. On the contrary, it raises serious difficulties which my delegation wishes to emphae ize. First, we must remember that a draft resolution on the issue cannot be entirely procedural.) it must also reflect an assessment on the substance of the Committee's work. The temptation to reduce it to procedural aspects reveals an attempt to evade the General Assembly's right as a universal body to deal with the work of the Conference, which is a body with limited membership.

On the other hand, a reading of operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 50 highlights the scrupulous care that was taken to avoid the word "nego tia tions". That is an aspect of great concern to my delegation, which is dedicated to strengthening multilateralism.

(Mr. Benyamina, Algeria)

In fact, denying the Conference on Disarmament its essential negotiating function not only calls into question the Final Document of 1978; it deprives the international community of any forum in which to negotiate disarmament agreements. From that point of view, no substitution of words, in particular those of operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, can replace the functions universally and unanimously given to it in a document adopted by consensus.

Those are, briefly, the thoughts that prompted the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.50 have had in mind for the past two years. Hence, it would have been desirable if this year a real effort had been made to try to find grounds for agreement before submitting draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.50, which is even less satisfactory than the text [illegible] last year and on which my delegation abstained in the voting. This year, therefore, with a draft which is somewhat acceptable, my delegation will again be obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.50.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.50, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament" because we feel that the ideas contained in it and its strictly procedural character deprive Member States who do not participate in the Conference on Disarmament of their unquestionable right to speak out on the substance of the work of the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. It is for that reason that Mexico, together with 24 other countries, presented draft resolution A/AC.1/43/L.66, which will be put to the vote later today.

Mr. KOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to express its views on the vote on draft resolutions submitted under item 67 (b) of the agenda, on the report of the Conference on Disarmament.

(*Mr.* Kokeev, USSR)

Am is well known, in accordance with the Final Document of the *f* irst ● peoial ● emmion of the General Ammembly devoted to disarmament, the Geneva Conference is the mole multilateral negotir ..ng body. However, we must note with regret that the potential *of* the Conference as a negotiating body is by no means being fully utilized. For that reason, we feel it is important for the General Assembly once again authoritatively to ● upport the oomprehenmive ● tepping-up of the Geneva forum as *one* of *the* most *effeotivr* means for giving the disarmament process now under way an uninter rupted and continuous character .

In our view, the Assembly's interemt in achieving thome goals is fully merved by draft resolution A/AC.1/43/L.66 which was introduced by the repcementative of Yugoslavia. It reaffirms the general negotiating mandate of the Conference and addresses with complete olarity the need for the adoption of specific meamurem on concrete high priority issues on its agenda.

(Mr. Kokeav, USSR)

Naturally the Soviet Union will vote in ● upport of this draft resolution.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. SO, as we see it the appeal for a oontinuation and intensification of the work of the Conference could be formulated in thim draft rerolution much more energetically. Nevertheless, the Soviet delegation believe8 it pormible to support this draft resolution based on the understanding that operative paragraph 4 not only does not exclude but on the contrary presupposes that there will be a positive oontinuation and a beginning of negotiation8 on high priority issues submitted to the Geneva body for oonmideration.

The delegation of the USSR ● xpremmee the hope that the adoption thim year Of the above-mentioned draft resolutions will not mean their merely formal approval but will have practical consequences in enhancing the efficient use of the Conference on Disarmament. In particular we believe it important to mtep up work at the beginning *of the* next regular session of the Conference to agree on mutually acceptable mandates for the special committees on all the agenda item8 in order finally to bring the consideration of a number of urgent problems out Of a procedural dead end and to begin substantive wor k on substantive issues.

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish) : My delegation wishes briefly to explain its position on draft reeolution A/C.1/43/L. 50. Last yeer my delegation voted in favour of a similar draft resolution which had been introduced in connection *with the* work of the *Conference on* Disarmament. Regrettably, the draft resolution which hae been submitted this year is a considerable step backwards in our opinion from the one that was adopted last year. Last year 's resolution represented a very praiseworthy effort and compromise and a8 a result of it my delegation and other delegation8 who co-aponeored another draft resolution on the same subject, voted in favour of it.

(Mr . Taylharda t , Veneauela)

This year certain elemente have been introduced, other elemen tm have been deleted and the result is that the draft rerolution is unaooeptable to us. The third preambular paragraph contains a new notion) a new concept ham been added to the definition of the Conference on Disarmament. It is called the single multilateral negotiating forum for global disarmament questions. That phrase is new and has not been uaed previously. We are not sure what goal is being pursued and we feel that the role the Conference on Diearmament should be playing is now being diluted.

Last year the similar draft rerolution we considered recognized the central role of the Conference on Diearmament in the area of diearmament. Thie year reference is made to its vital role. Here again we have a new idea which changes the orientation and scope *of* the document before us. Thie year the paragraph that was operative paragraph 2 in last year's reeolution, in which the Conference on Diearmament is called the role multilateral negotiating forum, has been deleted. In our opinion that is *a* fundamental paragraph.

Finally, operative paragraph 3 contain8 an appeal to States to contribute as effectively au possible to the fulfilment of the Conference's tasks. 18 the role played by member Statee being questioned7 Is the effectiveneee of their role at the Conference being questioned? The Conference on Disarmament has not achieved its goals primarily because of the lack of poll tical will of some of the member States participating in it. For all theee reasons my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft reeolution A/C.1/43/L.50.

Mr. SHARMA (India) I My delegation has asked to speak to plaoe on record its views on draft remolution A/C.1/43/L.50, entitled "Report Of the Conference On Disarmament". Thr Committee ham been premented with two draft resolutions bearing the mane title. There are similarities in the procedural content of the two draft resolutions. Both "consider and take note of the report of the Conferenoe on Disarmament" but there the commonality ends. The differenaem in the substantive oontent are large and, as a comparison with rerolution 42/42 K shows, they have even increased.

We believe that the *Conference on* Disarmament has an *important role* am the single multilateral negotiating body, a role that was &fined in the Final Document *Of* the first special session devoted to disarmament adopted in 1978. That role mumt be reaffirmed and strengthened. That is poss ible only if the Conf • renoe on Disarmament intensifier its effort8 by undertaking • ubstantive negotiation8 in keeping with itm mandate.

Draft remolution A/C. 1/43/L. 66 gives emphasis to this aspect because it attaches importance to the work of the Conferenoe on Disarmament. We believe that the General Assembly with its universal membership ha8 the responsibility to urge the Conferenae on Disarmament to fulfil itm designated role. In view of the above, my delegation is cons trained to absta in on draft resolution A/C. 1/4?/L. 50.

Mr. CHOHAN (Pakistan): Pak istan voted last *year in* f avour Of resolution 42/42 K on the report of the Conference on Disarmament in the hope that in due course its sponsors would see the merit of the rerolution submitted by Mexico, of which Pakistan wae a co-sponsor. However, this year's draft remolution A/C.1/43/L.50 is a regression from last year 's. It is merely procedural in character, doer not in itm operative part reaffirm the oentral role of the Conference on Disarmament am the mole multilateral negotiating forum in the field

(Mr. Chohan, Pakistan)

of disarmament, as lut year 's did, and door not permit member States to pronounce themselves on or to • maemm the work Of the Conference on Disarmament. Under the circumstances my delegation will • bmtain on draft remolution A/C.1/43/L.50.

Mr. AL-KITTAL (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The delegation of Iraq wishes to state its position on a general qurrtion relating to agenda item 67 (b). We believe that it is time that the question of expanding the membership of the Conferenoe on Disarmament should be given greater attention and that the necessary measures should be taken to increase the member ship in that international body which alone undertakes international multilateral negotiations on disarmamen t. Pending such action all impediments to the participation of States non-members debiting to participate in the Conference must be • 1irninatad and • uuh contr ibution mumt become the right of all States.

(Mr. Al-Kittal, Iraq)

Such • otionm ue mbmolutely necessary if the Conferenoe on Disarmament is to become • n international forum ● xpreroing the wides t range □↗ v iews held by the international con.munity.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 50, my delegation expressed its reservations on ♋ • imilu draft resolution lart year and continues to hold reservati:ns on the our rent one.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee is now ready to take action on draft res'lutions in cluster 13. First , we shall take action on draft resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 24.

The draft resolution war introduced by the representative of Cyprus at the 26th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November.

A recorded vote ham been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Alger is, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist F&public, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, ● Gongo, Costa Rica, Côte d' Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovak la, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Wines, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Niger la, Oman, Pak istan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Social ist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venetuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugomlavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United Status of hnerica

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

Draft remolution A/C.1/43/L. 24 was adopted by 109 voter to 1, with 21 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 46. The programme budget implication8 *for* this draft resolutions are contained in document A/C. 1/43/L. 78.

The draft resolution waa introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 26th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November, and ha8 the following sponsors: Argentina, Australia, Austria, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslav la.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour J Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, But undi, Byelor uss Ian Soviet Soc ial ist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Coats Rica, Côte d' Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech-lovak la, Denmar k, Djibouti , Dominican Republic, Ecuador , Egypt , Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, ho People 's Democra tic Republic, Lesotho, Liber ia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakimtan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra bone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sur iname, Swaz iland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Repub lics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46 was adopted by 122 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now takr action on draft rrrolution A/C. 1/43/L. so.

The draft rrrolution was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 32d meeting of the First Committee on 9 November, *and* has the following sponsors: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway and Spain.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d' Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi *Arabia*, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United *Kingdom* of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonaria, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, to People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft rorolution A/C. 1/43/L. 50 was adopted by 73 votes to none, with 53 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft rerolution A/C. 1/43/L. 54/Rev.1.

The programme budget implications of this draft rerolution are contained in document A/C.1/43/L.77.

The draft rorolution was introduced by the representative of India at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November, and har the following sponsors: Byelorussian SSR, Hungary, India, Indoneria, Poland, Romania, Sri hnka and Venezuela.

A recorded vote har been requested.

A recorded vote wae taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Social ist Republic, Cameroon, Cen tral African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d' Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic *of),* Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liber la, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Niger la, Oman, Pak ietan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, 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, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Greece, Iceland, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Singapore, Tur key

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 54/Rev.1 war adopted by 109 votes to 7, with 14 abs ten tions.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn nw to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 65. This *draft* reeolution wae introduced by the repreeentative of Yugoelavia at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee, held on 9 November, and is sponeored by the delegation8 of Algeria, Bangladesh, Colombia, Cuba, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indones ia, Madagascar, Ma lays ia, Morocco, Pakietan, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tunisia, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote wan taken.

In favour : Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladeeh, Barbadoe, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burk ina Faso, Burma, Burundi , Byelor uss ian Soviet Soc ial is t Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cypr us, Coeohorlovak la, Democr atic Kampuchea, Denmar k, Dj ibouti , Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fij i, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic *of,* Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Xreland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liber ia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg , Madagascar, Malawi, Malays ia, Maldivee, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Roman ia, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra tone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri hnka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syr ian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Soc ial let Republic, Union o f Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoelavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Aga inst : None

Abetainingr United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Staten *of* America

Draft reeolution A/C.1/43/L. 65 was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 2 abs ten ti ons.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 66. Thie draft resolution wae introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 31st meeting of the Fir et Comni ttee, held on 9 November, and is sponsored by the delegationa of Algeria, Bangladeeh, Brazil, Burma, Cuba, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoelavia and Zaire. A recorded vote hae been requerted.

A recorded vote wan taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, 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, Cameroon, Cantral African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduran, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaiaa, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liboria, Libyan ✌❐ ● b Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Niger la, Oman, Pak istan, Panama, Peru, Phil ippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sr i hnka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialirt Republic, Union of Soviet Sccialiat Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tansania, Uruguay, Venesuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugorlavia, Zaire, Zamb la, Zimbabwe

Against: Frame, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Staten of America

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

Draft reeolution A/C.1/43/L.66 was adopted by 117 votes to 3, with 14 abs ton ti one.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on delegations wiehing to epeak in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United Staten of her ica) I The United Staten has asked to epeak in order to explain i ts vote cn draft reeolution A/C. 1/43/L. 46, en ti tled "Comprehensive United Nations ● tucly on nuclear weapons". Our delegation's vote against this draft resolution is consistent with our frequently expressed concern about the proliferation of projeote which place additional financial preeeure on the already strained budget of the United Nations. We note that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 46 is juet one of eeveral draft reeolutione introduced at thin session

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

which request that the Secretary-General undertake new ● tudiea and ● ◆♌○♓◆ reports. We are informed also that, in addition to budgeted conference costs, an additional appropriation of 8192,800 would be requi.ed to perform thr rtudy requested in draft resolution A/C 1/43/L. 46.

In our View, the proposed comprehensive study cn nuclear weapons, which is ● xoeedingly broad in scope and which would duplicate and reiterate information already available in open literature, does not warrant such an expenditure and consequently ouch a do *facto* priority in comparison with other critical United Nations activities.

I should like also to express our delegation's reasons for not being able to ● upport draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1, on ● oiontific and technological developments and their impact on international security. We vim it as both inappropr iate and impractical to a ingle out technological developmen ts for international monitoring. In particular, we have ● erioue reeervaticne about paragraph 1. That paragraph would task the Secretary-Qeneral to collect, evaluate and report cn information areembled, among other ways, from a network of State agencies gathering information on the military implicationa of all scientific and technological developments. Thin would almost certainly be an unending source of international f tic tion. Further, thin vague provision provides no insight into the scope of the monitoring effort or the end focus of this *effort.* Without better *def* inition, our delegation is unable tc endorse such action that could intrude on broad areas of ● cience and technology and dierupt normal military research and development.

Also, the United Staten would like to explain ite vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.65, on the third ● pecial session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The United Staten was unable to join in a consensus ● doptiar of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.65 for the following reasons: The ● eventh preambular

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

paragraph refers to thr validity of the Final Document of the firet special ● oeeion of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The third ● Qe?ial eeeeion on disarmament prompted a comprehensive ● xpoeition of the oontraeting views of a large number of States, and the many days of debate and drafting demonstrated quite clearly that there now ● xiete a profound dieparity of views on many of the disarmament issues addressed *in* the *Final* Document *of the* firet special session on disarmament.

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

Thum, while we do not discount the historical importance of the Final Document, it would be inaccurate to treat it am a compendium of universally ● ccaptod principles in today 's real world.

Thrrr are other provisions of the draft resolution that cause concern. Unprecedented attention was foowrd during the ● pooial session on the question of conventional disarmament, yet operative paragraph 1 inexplicably misdirects the attention of its readers through the insertion of the phrase "particularly in the nuclear field".

Moving to operative paragraph 3, we question whether the United Nations is thr momt appropriate forum for the rrrolution of disarmament issues. Some issues are best resolved in bilateral and regional forums, and some multilateral disarmament efforts are appropriately aonduoted in other forums. The world-wide chemical-weapons ban, for example, is best negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament, in our view.

Operative paragraph 4 is also misleading, in our opinion. We are not aonvinoed that one of the functions of special sessions is to provide a new direction for disarmament negotiation6 or that one of the tasks of special sessions is "assessing the results of the efforts of Member States in moving forward deliberation8 and negotiations on all disarmament and related issues".

In conclusion, we consider that the third special session devoted to diearmamnt provided valuable insights into disarmament issues, but we are not satisfied that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.65 provider fair treatment to this important topic.

Mr. NOETZEL (German Democratic Republic) : My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1, proceeding from the valid assessment in paragraph 39 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, namely :

(Mr. Noetzel, German Democratic Republic)

● Qualitmtivr and quantitative disarmament measures are both important for halting thr • rmm race. Efforts to that end must include nmgotiationm on the limitation and armmmtion of the qualitative improvement □↗ ● rlarnmntm,

● mpmoially weapons of mass destruction and the development of new means of warfare • o that ultimately scientific and technological achievements may be used solely for peaceful purposes." (S-10/2, para. 39)

We share the views ● xprrwod at the third ● pmoial ● ruion devoted to disarmament during the consideration □↗ ● gmndm item 12 that the qualitative development and the growing accumula tion of weapons add a f urther dimension to the arms race, *that* there is increasing recognition of the faot that qualitative ● rpoota of the arm race remain closely linked to the dynamics of international ● raurity, and that new technologies have significant ● ppliaationr in the process of arms limitation and disarmament and i ts verification. I should like to reaffirm the position of my delegation, as expressed in document A/S-15/26, paragraph 9, that it is necessa.v to prevent the use of now ● oimntifio and technological achievements for creating new types and s ystems of weapons and that it is imperative to • nrura that ● oimntifia and technological progress is used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

We consider a renewed effort in the direction shown in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1 u a timely initiative for the following reasons: The use of the most modern technologies in the development of new weapons ● ymtemr is bound to open now channels for the arms race. Specific new weapon8 ● *yrtoma* are increasingly considered to be destabilizing in their effects, thum ● ndangrring stability. Specific qualities of nrw weapons ● ymtomm, such am miniatur ization or mobility, arm bound to make verification more diffioult. In addition, it ham become obvious that the misuse of now technological ● ahimvanmnta *for* military

(Mr. Noetzel, German Democratic Republic)

purposes diverts enormous resources that would be urgently required for the solution of the global problems of mankind. Such recent positive developments as the implementation of the Treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles should not be endangered by the introduction of new or modernized weapons systems.

Another aspect that would, in our view, be promoted by the draft resolution is the intensification of international co-operation in scientific and technological research and development, as well as the collection and increased exchange of relevant information. The implementation of the proposals presented by the USSR - for instance, for international co-operation in the exploration and peaceful uses of outer space, including the establishment of a world space organization - would be a first step in that direction.

My delegation does not believe that scientific and technological progress must inevitably lead to a qualitative arms race. The continuing involvement of scientists and qualified experts in addressing the problem so that new scientific and technological developments are not exploited *for* military purposes but used for the common benefit of mankind should, therefore, be fully supported.

In the view of my delegation, all those reasons speak in favour of a renewed effort to follow and analyse new developments in science and technology, in particular with regard to their potential military applications, and to evaluate their impact on international security. My delegation will be ready to co-operate in that effort.

Mr. COURTNEY (Australia): My delegation would like to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/C. 1/43/L.54/Rev.1, A/C. 1/43/L. 64 and A/C. 1/43/L. 66.

(Ms. Courtney, Australia)

My delegation voted in fmvour of draft remolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1, which we consider to be innovative. Aumtralia supports the oentral thrumt of that draft resolution, namely, that in the light of historical ● xperierwe it maker good sense to think through mymtematioally and in advance the likely ramifications of the application to military purpomem of emerging scientific mnd teahnologiaal advances.

Australia doer not, however , share the impl ication of the fourth *paragr aph of* the preamble that scientific and teohnologioal developmenta applied to military purposes must neoemmarily have a negative impact on the security environment. Indeed, the con trary oan occur. Aumtralia therefore oonmiderm it important that operative paragraph 1 uallm for a process of evaluation and does not prejudge the outcome.

Australia voted in favour of draft remolution A/C.1/43/L. 65. We would, however, 1 *ike* to ● xptemm our concern that operative paragraph 3 rem. ins ambiguous in describing the United Nations am

> "the most appropriate forum for all Member States to contribute actively and collectively to the consideration and remolution of disarmament issues that have a bearing on their secur ity ".

That oould imply that there are no other forums within which the States Member s of the United Nations can deal with and resolve dimarmament issues. Clearly, that is not the came. There are a number of other ● xieting and potential forums which at timer night in faot be more appropr iate, &pending on the particular circumstances of a situation and on its political and regional context. We decided, however, to oamt a positive vote becaus, we endorse the call for the strengthening of the role of the 'hited Nations in the field of disarmament *through* multilateral consideration *of* issues which have a bearing on the security of all Member States ● ndr as appropriate, on the remolution of such issues.

(Ms. Courtney, Australia)

In that sense we have interpreted operative paragraph 3 as characterizing the fact that the United Nations is the most representative forum for its Member States as a whole to deal with arms limitations and disarmament issues.

I should also like to refer briefly to resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 66 which deals with the report of the Conference on Disarmament. My delegation continues to regret the fact that there are two resolutions on this subject and we would far prefer to see a single text which could be adopted by consensus. The Conference On Disarmament works by consensus and its annual report is adopted by consensus. That clearly indicates that resolutions in the First Committee should also be susceptible of consensus. We hope that next year concer ted efforts can be made to find a single text capable of support by all members of the Committee.

With respect to resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 66, my delegation would like to point out that operative paragraph 1 may be open to interpretation with respect to the term "the international community". My delegation does not read that paragraph as precluding regional or other multilateral negotiations in other international for urns.

Finally, my delegation does not interpret operative paragraph 4 as calling for negotiating mandates on agenda items in the Conference on Disarmament before all its members agree that such mandates are appropriate. That interpretation is, of course, completely in accordance with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament as the paragraph itself indeed suggests.

Mr . VARGA (Hungary) : On behalf of the Hungarian delegation I would like to put forward some considerations concerning draft resolution A/AC.1/43/L.54/Rev.1

(Mr. Varga, Hungary)

● ntitlrd "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on inter national secur ity", whioh was introduced by the delegation of India and which my delega tion co-sponsored.

The realities of the arms ace today and, more specifically, its qurlitativr ● rpeatr and implications, point to the potential danger emanating from the possible military application of the achievements of the ongoing ● cientifio and technological rrvolu tion.

The inherent threat of an ● vrr-ooelsrating growth *of* nuolrar war-fighting capabilities, stemming from the nearly automatic use *of* scientific and technological advances for military purposes, would suf fice to prove the timeliness of evaluating scientific and technological developments with potential military appl ica tionr.

In addition, the ● mergonoo of a *new* gener ation *of* conventional weapons with tremendous devastating force, gradually transforming allegedly defensive postures into preemptive deep strike options, oannot but dangerourly erode the basis for future conventional stability requiring balanced armed forces and oonvrntional armaments.

The elaboration of disarmament measures and agreements is thur intimately intertwined with problems related to scientific and teahnologiaal developments, the solution of which specifically requires collective efforts, both intelleotual and political. There is an urgent need to address all the problems referred to in the draft resolution with a view to halting the armr race and, as a first step, preventing its further qualitative proliferation.

My delegation drew the attention of Stake participating in the international Conference on the Relationship between Dirarmament and Development to the difficulties that so-called dual-purpose technologirr might create first of all in

(Mr. Varga, Hungary)

the case of weapons of mass destruction, for elaborating disarmament measures; as in the case of the chemical weapons convention; for ascertaining that existing disarmament treaties are being observed; and in the case of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction; or for ensuring universal application of agreement elements, as in the case of the non-proliferation Treaty. At the same time, my delegation proposed, as a potential common endeavour to cope with those challenges, that greater openness of scientific activities should be created, co-operation among scientists should be developed in areas where disarmament agreements might prevent application of scientific and technological developments for military purposes and possibilities explored for disarmament measures stemming from the emergence of dual-purpose technologies.

It is with these considerations in mind that the Hungarian delegation supports the adoption of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1 and stands ready to co-operate in the implementation of this highly important initiative.

Mr. RIDER (New Zealand): New Zealand has decided to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1 entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security" because of the difficulty we have with the central premise of the resolution. The concept that scientific and technological research with military applications will necessarily have negative consequences for international peace and stability is, in our view, debatable. It is quite conceivable that developments and weaponry could enhance security. New Zealand is not an ardent supporter of over-growing expenditures on military research. Quite the contrary. We wish to explain our vote for that very reason.

My country is a strong supporter of the principle that scientific and technological research for peaceful purposes needs to be given the highest priority.

(Mr. Rider, New Zealand)

We therefore have some ● ymp8thy with that abjeative of the resolution. However, the wording of this par ticular text and tho processes)(♦ ● nvimagem would not be helpful in achieving the ends nought.

Mr . LAMAZIERE (Br a8 il) : The Br azil Ian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1 on ● oiontifia and toahnologiaal developments and their impact on international security barring in mind ● omr pr inciples that inform our general position on matters of disarmament and taking into aaoount thr high priority that mumt be given to the qualitative aspects of the arms race. with ● poaifia regard to thr ● aientifia and toahnologiaal components of the draft resolution, I want to stress my delegation's firm aonviation that any attempt to monitor the military application of new ● aientifia and teahnologiaal developments must not aontribute to aonvrrting the ● truatural imbalance created by the trahnologioal ● uporiority of some countries into a permanent feature of the world

● 0.n..

In that oonnneation, I want to recall remolution 3 (IX) on new and emerging areas □↗ ● uionae and technology for development adopted unanimously by the Intergovernmental Committee for Science and Technology for Development at its ninth session and endorsed i n General Assembly resolution 42/192. That resolution emphasizes the need for all countr ies, and especially the developing countr ies, to acquire and ● trmngthon their capabilities to develop, assess, harness, adopt and transfer ● aionce and kchnology. For that reason we want to underline that any ● xeraimr whose objective is to follow future ● aientifia and technological developments must not constitute a base to hinder effective and efficient transfer Of technology, particularly more advanced technology, especially to the developing countries for their absorption in those aountriem in order to promote their optimal utilization.

(Mr. Lamaziere, Brazil)

It is our understanding that the content of the draft resolution we have just approved in no way contravenes the objective of fortering broader and more effective international co-operation on oienae and technology, especially in the areas of pioneering research and that its focus in clear and it8 scope clearly defined.

Mr. van SCHAIK (Netherlands): My delegation wishes to explain it8 voter on draft remolu tions A/C, 1/4 3/L. 66, *A/C.* 1/4 3/L. 54/Rev .1 and *A/C.* 1/4 3/L. 46.

My delegation *wan* not in a position to vote in favour of draft remolution A/C.1/43/L.66 bscaure that draft resolution contains language that goes beyond what waa agreed upon in the Conference on Disarmament when the Conference, by consensus, approved the report. In the text of the draft resolution some useful e lements are reflected, for example in operative paragraph 2, dealing with negotiation8 on chemical weapons. However, we aannot agree with the language in other paragraph*, in particular the last paragraph of the preamble and operative para:raphs 3 *and* 4, which we *do* not consider realistic because of the emphasis they place on negotiationa on all agenda items.

The sponsors of draft reeolution A/C.1/43/L. 50 on the name subject were motivated by the desire to achieve consensus. We regret that thin time consensus hae not been achieved on our text and we regret also that we did not ruoceed in our endeavour8 to reach a compromise with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 66.

In our statement introducing draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 50 we stated that we were open to suggestions for improvement of the text. *My* delegation would have been glad to explain certain adjustments that were made and that apparently were considered to be amendments - as compared to the text of 1987 - that were not favoured by some delegations here. Rut s ince delega tions did not approach us on

(Mr. van Schaik, Nether lands)

tnese point8 we could not explain our point or take their point8 into consideration. Indeed, we did identify common ground for pursuing thr type of negotiations that are aanmon in other areas leading to an agreed text . ... did it appear possible to find language in a separate trxt that would have reflected the common recogni tion, in purely procedural terms, of the recent report of the Conference on Disarmament and would have contained a request to the Conference on Disarmament to report again next year under the umual item on the agenda of the First Committee. We Pro however pleased to note that in the intensive discussions we had with the Yugoslav delegation, which introduaed draft rerolution A/C. 1/43/L. 66 - discussions which my dolegation appreciated - the Yugoslav delegation ● tated that it wan inspired by the same desire to reach consensus on the ● ubjrct and we hope that next year, when there will be more time available, del iberatione between interested countries will indeed lead to the consensus we are seeking. Consensus is and romaine in our view essential - ● mmantial beaaure it would be an ● oho of the consensus reached in Geneva by the 40 member8 of the Conference on Disarmament, and ● 88ential because only consensus would do jumtioe to the stature of thr Conference on Dimarmament, thr mole multilateral negotiating body on global disarmament questions.

My delegation wan, regrettably, unable to support draft remolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1, on the impact of scientific developments on international security. In our view, thin draft resolution expresses an unbalanced and negative judgement of technological developments that might have a military application, the underlying premise being that certain technological progress might result in a mot-back to disarmament ef forte. Indeed, although thin might be true in certain cases, the contrary came could also be advanced, notably that some technological progress with military application ham a stabilizing influence. We in the Netherlands wish to keep open the option of maintaining our defences in modern

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

shape and up to date. Thr application of teahnologiaal development8 for military purposes can be important for our securi ty am it can be for many other coun tr ies.

Finally, my dolegation abstained on draft rrmolution A/C.1/43/L. 46, which calls for a comprehensive update of the ● tudy on nuolear weapons. Although we listened oarrfully to the argument8 advanced, we believe that the developments that have taken place in the area of nuolear arms since the publication of the Secretary-General's report in 1980 do not sufficiently warrant an update a8 requested in draft resolution *A/C.* 1/43/L, 46. We are of the opinion that for the mix proposals submitted to the First Committee *for* Uni ted Nations studies On disarmament-related issues, pr iorities should be established in view of the limited resources available. We do not believe that the proposal contained in draft resolut' on A/C. 1/43/L. 46 deserves priority status as compared with some *of* the other studies, which will cover new ground.

Mr . von STULPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany) : I rhould like to explain my delegation's negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1. My delegation fully agree8 with the author8 of this draft resolution that the qualitative aspect of developments and trend8 relevant to the diearmament process are increasingly a matter for international attention and concern. While technology am much is neutral, and while scientific and technological progress should not be impeded, it is recognized that the qualitative development and growing accumulation of weapons in many parts of the world add a turther dimension to the arms race. But it is equally recognized that qualitative aspects of the arm8 race remain closely 1 inked to the dynamic8 of international securi ty .

My delegation holds the view that the implications of technological devrlopment for the arms-control process and for the maintenance of international peace and security are complex and many-sided. Technological change cannot be halted or reversed. Neither is it possible to distinguish clearly between

(Mr. von Stülpnagel,
Federal Republic of Germany)

weapons-related teahnologier or those developed primarily for peaceful non-military purposes since many teahnologier can be applied to both weapons development and to peaceful purposes. Moreover, not all appliaationr of new teahnologier to military purposes are threatening to the maintenance of international peace and security. Indeed, aertain kinds *of* military applications can aontribute to the ability of States to maintain security at lower levels of arms and armed forcer.

More specifically, applioationr of new technologies can aontribute positively to the armr aontrol and dirarmament process by facilitating effective and oonomioal verification *of* agreements. Thus, my delegation aannot share the thesis that the armm raae is determined by the technology. It falls within the provinae of politiaal decisions whether to implement aertain teohnologier or to renounce their implementation partially or totally.

The significance for international security of new and emerging technologies derives not Prom the nature of the technologies themselves but *from the* purposes to whioh they are applied. My delegation regrets that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 54/Rev.1 doer not take there criteria into account and dose not reflect the oomplex nature of the matter. My delegation very much hoper that the Secretary-General, in dircharging his responsibilities under this draft resolution, will take there concerns fully into account.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French) t With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.65, on the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to diearmament, my delegation was able, owing to the importance of the subject and the efforts made by many delegations to produce the text, to vote in favour of its adoption. We share the views expreeaed by the sponsors with regard to the result of the third special session, namely, that it served the purpose of increasing awareness of the areas in which future efforts should be concentrated.

However, I muet add that our delegation would have preferred that operative paragraph 1 contain wording that would better reflect my country's priorities in the field of diearmament, in partisular with regard to the role of nuclear diearmament in disarmament in general.

Mr. CAPPAGLI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish) : The delegation of Argentina voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.66 and abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 50, both on the report of the Conference on Disarmament. My delegation would have preferred to see a single consensus draft resolution. Unfortunately, notwithstanding the efforts made, that proved to be impossible.

This year, unlike last year, one of the draft resolutions submitted to the Committee does not clearly reflect the nature of the Conference on Disarmament. It does not make clear the fact that the Conference is the sole multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament, nor does it request it to intensify its work in accordance with paragraph 120 of the 1978 Final Document. Ebr those reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.50. We would have preferred to see the draft resolution employ the language that appears in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of General Assembly resolution 42/42 K.

It is our sincere hope that, in the future,efforts will be made to come up with a single draft resolution on this subject and that those efforts will be crowned with success.

Mire SOLESBY (United Kingdom)) My delegation abstained in the vo ·ing *on* draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 46, the purpose of which is to call for an updated verricn of ·he "Comprehensive study on nuclear weapons" originally completed in 1960. We did so because we feel that the request is premature, and that, for two reasons. First, the basic technical facts about nuclear weapons, which were well summarized in the original report, have not been changed by subsequent technical developmen ta. Secondly, the ongoing bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, if brought to a successful conclusion, could well have a dramatic effect on nuclear areenale. It does not seem appr opr late to launch a new study in the middle of those negotiations.

I murt also add that the original study drew conclusions about the possession of nuclear weapons and the principle of nuclear deterrence that are not shared by my Government.

Finally, I have to put on record that we cannot accept the request for an additional financial appropriation for the new study as shown in document A/C. 1/43/L. 78.

The CHAIRMAN: Tomorrow, the Committee will take action on all remaining draft resolutions in the remaining clusters.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.