



---

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 39th MEETING**

**Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)**

**CONTENTS**

**CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69**  
**(continued)**

---

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC 2.750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48-69 (continued)

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

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Today the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic has the honour to introduce, for consideration in the First Committee, draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.55 entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons". We do so on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, and, of course, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The importance of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction was discussed in a special statement made by our delegation in the First Committee on 28 October 1987. Today we wish merely to emphasize briefly that the emergence of such types of weapons, which has been made possible through the misuse of the achievements of rapidly developing science and technology, would, to say the least, sharply destabilize the strategic situation and lower the threshold at which war using weapons of mass destruction might break out, hamper the possibilities of disarmament verification and widen the gap between the development of weapons and the efforts of the international community to eliminate them.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

The draft resolution now being introduced is devoted precisely to the goal of preventing the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction and the consequences mentioned above. The sponsors propose that, in order to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction, the Conference on Disarmament should keep the developments in this area constantly under review with a view to making, when necessary, recommendations on undertaking specific negotiations on the identified types of such weapons.

The draft resolution calls upon all States, immediately following the identification of any new type of weapon of mass destruction, to renounce practical development of such weapon and commence negotiations on its prohibition.

Lastly, all States are urged to refrain from any action which could lead to the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic has been sponsoring resolutions to this effect for a number of years now and would like to avail itself of this opportunity to thank those delegations who became our co-sponsors and all those delegations which have been supporting these resolutions. At the same time, we would be disregarding reality if we did not mention that, year in and year out, a number of Western States have been abstaining in the voting and one State has been voting against. In efforts to secure wider support for this draft resolution, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR and its co-sponsors have always been open to co-operation and have made changes in the draft resolution in order to take account of comments made to us. A brief review of the changes made recently would not be out of place here.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

In the light of those comments, we discontinued the inclusion in the draft resolution of a call for States to undertake unilateral obligations, which would be reaffirmed by a decision of the Security Council, to forgo the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction. Nevertheless, the pattern of voting remains the same.

We were told that the main obstacle to changing it was the idea of drawing up a comprehensive agreement prohibiting all new types of weapons of mass destruction since it was possible only to elaborate specific individual agreements on those types of weapons which had already been identified. That point was also duly taken into account in the resolution submitted at last year's session of the General Assembly. Only two States among those abstaining changed their vote to a positive one, and we appreciate their constructive response. For the rest, the voting pattern remained the same.

At the current session we made further changes. In paragraph 2 of the text being introduced today we took account of the objections raised at the forty-first session of the General Assembly against the idea of establishing a group of experts within the Conference on Disarmament to assist it in reviewing the developments in this area, with a view to making recommendations on the commencement of negotiations to prohibit the new types of weapons of mass destruction identified. What is envisaged now is only "appropriate expert assistance".

We also took into account the point that the resolutions should comply with the definition of weapons of mass destruction adopted by the United Nations Commission for Conventional Armaments in 1948. That definition is now the subject of the last preambular paragraph.

Two preambular paragraphs that had caused difficulty to some delegations were deleted.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

The first preambular paragraph was amended to take into account all the General Assembly resolutions adopted on the subject, including two resolutions sponsored by the United Kingdom in 1977 and 1978.

Several other changes were made in the operative part to accommodate the views of delegations, in particular regarding the language about a moratorium on the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction, which was included in paragraph 3 of last year's resolution, resolution 41/56.

During the current session of the General Assembly, our delegation has held detailed consultations with interested delegations from among those that had abstained. Those consultations were open and frank, and we appreciated that very much. For its part, our delegation displayed during the consultations a willingness to accept a number of proposals provided that they did not destroy the actual substance of the draft resolution.

In view of the substantial changes that have been incorporated into the present draft resolution in comparison with the previous General Assembly resolution, we are looking forward to a positive change in the voting pattern of those States that did not lend their support to this effort previously. Such a change in voting would dispel any possible impression that what underlies the refusal to support the draft resolution is not so much a concern about its language as an unwillingness to take effective measures to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction.

The text of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.55 speaks for itself and does not require any additional explanations. The sponsors express the hope that in taking a decision on this draft resolution, all delegations will be guided solely by a desire for a more secure future for us and for our children.

Mr. von STULPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): It is an honour for me to introduce today draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.48/Rev.1, entitled "Consideration of guidelines for confidence-building measures", on behalf of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany and the following co-sponsors: Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Hungary, Poland and Sweden. The revised draft resolution will be circulated as an official document tomorrow. The text as it stands at present is available as an advance copy at the desk at the back of the room.

Members of the First Committee may recall that on the occasion of the 1986 deliberations of the United Nations Disarmament Commission on the draft guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for the implementation of such measures on a global or regional level, consensus was almost reached. It was only on three paragraphs of the document that agreement remained elusive. Accordingly, two alternative versions were printed in the guidelines contained in document A/41/42, annex II.

In the mean time, my delegation has begun consultations with members of the group of States which, on the occasion of the 1986 United Nations Disarmament Commission deliberations, still had some difficulty with the text proposed by the Chairman for those three paragraphs, and we are optimistic that consensus language may be found for the three paragraphs in question. We have therefore decided that, without heaping too great a work-load on next year's already very busy Disarmament Commission, there is a good chance that the finalization of the draft guidelines could be successfully carried out by establishing, for example, an informal working group reporting to the Committee of the Whole of that body. In this vein, the request in paragraph 1 for submission of the draft guidelines for consideration to the General Assembly at its third special session devoted to disarmament has been changed to a request that the Disarmament Commission should consider them with a view to finalizing the draft.

(Mr. von Stulpnagel, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

Behind my delegation's commitment to those draft guidelines for confidence-building measures on a global and regional scale lies my Government's conviction that confidence-building measures, especially when applied in a comprehensive manner, have the potential to contribute significantly to the enhancement of peace and security and to promote and facilitate the attainment of disarmament measures. That potential is at present already being explored in some regions of the world where the States concerned, while remaining mindful of the need for global action and for disarmament measures, are joining forces to contribute by the elaboration and implementation of confidence-building measures, to more stable relations and greater security, as well as to the elimination of outside intervention and to enhanced co-operation in these areas.

This process is by no means limited to Europe alone, where the successful conclusion of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe has opened perspectives for the further relaxation of tensions and for increasing security in the region, and therefore in the world. It is sufficient to mention the ongoing process in Central America for the enhancement of peace and security in the region, in which the Government of Costa Rica has played and is playing a prominent role.

The guidelines under discussion have been drafted with these and other significant experiences in mind, and they purport to provide further support to these and other endeavours on a regional and global level. They do not, of course, exclude the simultaneous application of other security-enhancing measures, nor are they intended to detract from the need for more far-reaching arms control and

(Mr. von Stulpnagel, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

disarmament measures. Rather, they are a most useful corollary to those measures, as has been acknowledged in the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The Federal Republic of Germany and the other sponsors commend draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.48/Rev.1 to the Committee.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to introduce briefly a number of changes that have been made to this draft resolution and on which there were broad consultations. My delegation had presented those proposals for change. The text was amended following consultations with a number of interested countries. The amendment consists merely of inserting in the second sentence of paragraph 2 the expression "bearing in mind the characteristics of each region and when the regional situation so permits".



(Mr. Rodriguez, Peru)

Paragraph 2 would thus read as follows:

"Expresses its firm support of all regional or sub-regional endeavours, taking into account the characteristics of each region and when the regional situation so permits, as well as unilateral measures, directed to strengthening mutual confidence and to assuring the security of all States involved, making possible regional agreements on arms limitation in the future". (A/C.1/42/L.73/Rev.1, para. 2)

That revision makes the text more flexible and, in our view, should ensure support by the largest possible number of delegations.

I wish also to inform members that a number of delegations have joined in sponsoring the draft resolution. The sponsors are now as follows: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Uruguay and Yugoslavia. The additional sponsorship shows that the desire for regional disarmament is shared by most of our countries.

My delegation is especially gratified to see among the sponsors the five Central American countries signatories of the Guatemala peace agreement, which includes measures in keeping with the language of this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I call now on representatives who wish to make statements concerning the draft resolutions in cluster 10.

Mr. PUGLIESE (Italy): I should like to speak on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/42/L.35, concerning transfer of conventional armaments, which was submitted by the delegation of Italy on 27 October 1987. As already stated by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy, Mr. Andreotti, in his statement to the General Assembly and as confirmed in my statement to this

(Mr. Pugliese, Italy)

Committee on 23 October, the Italian Government believes that the problem of the transfer of conventional armaments is an issue of great importance for everyone in terms of the maintenance of peace and efforts to reduce international tension.

The Italian Government is convinced in particular that restraint and greater openness concerning the transfer of conventional armaments should be promoted, with a view to keeping those armaments at the lowest possible level. It was therefore our aim to draw the attention of both the First Committee and the entire General Assembly to this important matter.

We are, however, aware of the complexity and the technical, practical and political difficulties involved in this problem, and we recognize that further reflection and examination are needed to reach a possible basis for common understanding on the various facets of the problem.

It is in that spirit and on the basis of those considerations that the Italian delegation has decided not to press draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.35 to the vote.

Before concluding, we should like to point out once more the importance we attach to this subject. We shall consider the possibility of returning to it on an appropriate occasion, after further consultations.

Mrs. URIBE DE LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation too wishes to refer to agenda item 62 (c), specifically the question of the transfer of conventional armaments. The fact that the question of the transfer of conventional armaments is avoided in many United Nations forums is revealing; this makes it appear that delegations are unaware of or unconcerned about this question, but that is not true of my delegation or of other delegations which joined us in welcoming enthusiastically draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.35, just referred to by the representative of Italy.

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano,  
Colombia)

We would rather not have spoken of the moral aspects of this problem, a problem today causing alarm among many. But it seems paradoxical that while historic agreements are being signed on the reduction of the world's nuclear arsenals, conventional conflicts are growing worse and the sales of illegal weapons - which in the third world have turned many small conflicts into unnecessary wars - are flourishing. Agreements are near signature on the elimination of whole classes of missiles, and other similar disarmament agreements are under consideration, yet the countries in question are themselves involved in weapons trafficking in the developing world.

We are aware of the complexity of the problem; perhaps it would not be solved by a General Assembly resolution, so long as there are countries prepared to use their national budgets to buy armaments and so long as there are others that nurture the weapons industry, thereby exacerbating conflicts and tension for the sake of grisly lucre.

We cannot continue to evade this question; we must consider the matter in depth and not ignore the death these arms sales leave in their wake.

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano,  
Colombia)

My delegation, together with other delegations, sought to co-operate in the elaboration of a more universal text than draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.35 on the transfer of conventional weapons. We also wanted the Committee to adopt a draft resolution reflecting our concerns on this question, a subject that we consider to be of vital importance and on which we shall continue to insist.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The First Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions relating to the disarmament agenda items contained first in cluster 10. As I said earlier, the first draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.12 is still the object of consultations. We shall therefore take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.18. Given the statement he has just made on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.35 the representative of Italy does not press the Committee to take action on that draft resolution. After the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.18 we shall therefore move immediately to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.73/Rev.1. If the Committee has time it could take up cluster 12, which includes draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.40 and A/C.1/42/L.64.

This morning we intended also to take cluster 13, but because certain consultations are under way on cluster 13 the Committee will not be in a position to consider the various draft resolutions in cluster 13. On the other hand, if there is enough time we could, if the Committee agrees, revert to cluster 5, two of the draft resolutions of which have been left in abeyance, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.2 and A/C.1/42/L.10. After we consider clusters 10 and 12, the Committee may wish to decide whether it can take action on those other two draft resolutions.

I shall now call on the representative of Ghana for an explanation of vote before the voting on the draft resolutions in cluster 10.

Mr. DUMÉVI (Ghana): I have asked to speak to explain the vote of the Ghana delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.73/Rev.1, on which this Committee will soon take a decision. Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.73/Rev.1 is a considerable improvement on the original draft resolution, A/C.1/42/L.73. None the less it has not answered major concerns of the Ghana delegation. Therefore the Ghana delegation will, as it has done in previous years on similar draft resolutions, abstain on this draft resolution.

We support the principle of regional conventional disarmament, which is among the priority areas delineated in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We do so because we believe that a regional approach could form a useful basis for global disarmament. For meaningful regional disarmament, however, there should be an acceptable balance of mutual responsibility and obligations on the part of States in the region or subregion and that implies the assurance that no particular State or group of States in a region would, in the process of disarmament, have an undue military advantage over other States. Similarly, subregional disarmament is bound to be inhibited if certain States - bluntly put - will not refrain from military pacts that could give some a palpable advantage.

The truth is that a regional State cannot advocate regional disarmament while maintaining a military pact with a major military Power outside its region. Such arrangements not only seriously undermine the confidence essential for successful regional conventional disarmament, but also raise serious doubts about any declarations that might be made in the course of a multilateral commitment to disarmament.

As in previous years on similar draft resolutions my delegation has noted that some co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.73/Rev.1 seem to have overlooked

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

long-standing, post-independence military agreements between their respective countries and a major military Power. No one can question their sovereign right to conclude such agreements with Powers that are ever ready to flex their military muscles. What needs to be ascertained is what assurances are entailed for other States that are not party to such military arrangements. Indeed, such military arrangements automatically and inherently confer on the treaty parties a relative military advantage over other States in the region.

To postulate regional disarmament while benefiting from a superior foreign military advantage smacks of a double standard, to say the least. It is, therefore, not convincing and, as of now, is unacceptable to Ghana.

Successful regional disarmament also implies, in our view, an obligation on third parties to refrain from all transfer of arms, let alone the stationing of troops in countries that claim they are committed to regional disarmament. Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.73/Rev.1 has not adequately addressed this essential aspect of the matter, but let me hasten to restate in conclusion that Ghana supports the concept of regional disarmament and will reconsider its position at the appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.18 and A/C.1/42/L.73/Rev.1 contained in cluster 10.

Under agenda item 62 (c), entitled "General and complete disarmament", draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.18, entitled "Conventional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of China at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 4 November 1987. The sole sponsor of that draft resolution is China.

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 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, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, 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, 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, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: India

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.18 was adopted by 126 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We shall now proceed to consider agenda item 62 (g), entitled "General and complete disarmament". Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.73/Rev.1, entitled "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale" was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee, on 4 November 1987. The draft resolution is sponsored by the following countries: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

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 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, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, 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, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Ethiopia, Ghana

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.73/Rev.1 was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.



The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I shall now call on those delegations who wish to explain their vote.

Mr. NUÑEZ (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.73/Rev.1, which has just been adopted. We welcome the fact that this draft resolution should recognize that in the implementation of regional disarmament measures account must be taken of the characteristics of each region and that those measures will be applicable whenever the situation so permits.

However, there are other factors which are included in the study on all aspects of regional disarmament which was adopted by the General Assembly and which we cannot overlook but must keep in mind when we speak of regional disarmament. To begin with, regional conventional disarmament cannot be viewed in isolation from the wider context of general and complete disarmament and in particular from the priority need to proceed to the effective adoption of nuclear disarmament. Regional disarmament cannot be achieved to the detriment of the security of any of the States in the region. Moreover, as pointed out in the study to which I have referred, efforts in favour of general and complete disarmament cannot merely be broken down by regions with each region deciding what is or is not viable.

I would add that for disarmament in a given region to serve the purpose of strengthening regional security it cannot be carried out to the exclusion of what is happening in other regions or at world level. It is worth while, in addition, always keeping in mind the fact that when we speak of regional conventional disarmament, respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity of States, right to self-determination and the principles of non-interference in internal affairs are of paramount importance; otherwise, as pointed out in that study on all aspects of regional disarmament, those countries which are the victims of such violations would have difficulty in agreeing on the implementation of such measures.

Mr. MASHHADI-GHAHVEHCHI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.18 and A/C.1/42/L.73/Rev.1. The Islamic Republic of Iran advocates plans which contribute to the de-escalation of tension, but, at the same time, this may threaten the countries of the region by further exposing them to threats from outside. We therefore believe that the implementation of such resolutions will be practical and possible only if outside Powers, particularly the domination-seeking and super-Powers, commit themselves not to take advantage of the situation and not to impose their presence on the region. Therefore, such a commitment is a prerequisite for the implementation of those resolutions. Otherwise, we shall see the same situation as we have witnessed in our region.

Mr. ROWE (Australia): The Australian delegation believes that there is a pressing need to halt and reverse the conventional arms race and has voted in favour of both draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.18 on conventional disarmament and draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.73/Rev.1 on conventional disarmament on a regional scale.

My delegation believes that the high priority justifiably attached to nuclear disarmament should not preclude the need for concurrent measures in the field of conventional disarmament. Both nuclear and conventional disarmament need to be looked at in the light of their interrelationship and their concurrent impact on global and regional security. For example, the Australian delegation believes that significant measures of conventional disarmament would make an important contribution to the prevention of nuclear war. Accordingly, we wish to point out that the emphasis on nuclear disarmament in paragraph 3 of L.73/Rev.1 has, in our view, the effect of somewhat diluting the recognition contained in that draft resolution of the concurrent priority that needs to be attached to conventional disarmament.

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

My delegation would also like to comment on the explicit endorsement given to unilateral measures in paragraph 2 of L.73/Rev.1. We do not believe that durable measures of disarmament are likely to be achieved through unilateral action. Australia also attaches special importance to qualitative and quantitative limitations on conventional arms transfers and to reductions in military budgets and expenditures. In that respect, we fully support the endorsement given in L.73/Rev.1 to the important contribution regional initiatives can make to the realization of conventional disarmament on a regional scale, as we believe that one of the best prospects for action on limiting arms transfers occurs at the regional level.

In relation to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.18 presented by China, I would reiterate that neither exclusive emphasis on nuclear disarmament nor denial of the nuclear problem and exclusive preoccupation with conventional disarmament would be appropriate and that both have to be looked at in their interrelationship, with special attention to how they impinge jointly on the security situation both globally and in individual regions. Both nuclear and conventional disarmament are needed and must be equally applied, as is recognized in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Accordingly, the emphasis on nuclear disarmament introduced in the fourth preambular paragraph of China's draft resolution has to be interpreted in the broader context of war prevention and disarmament, recognizing that, together with negotiations on nuclear disarmament measures, there should also be negotiations on the balanced reduction of armed forces and of conventional armaments based on the principle of undiminished security of the parties with a view to promoting or enhancing stability at a lower military level, taking into account the need of all States to protect their security.

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

It is on this understanding that the Australian delegation fully supports draft resolution L.18.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.18, in support of conventional disarmament, as it did last year. We also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.73/Rev.1, taking into consideration the understanding that this draft resolution takes into account the characteristics of each region and that its provisions are applicable when the regional situation permits. This does not in any way imply a change in the policy of my Government with regard to negotiations with any régime in our region that it does not recognize.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We have now come to the end of the list of speakers who wished to explain their vote on draft resolutions in cluster 10. We shall now take up draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.40 and A/C.1/42/L.64 listed under cluster 12.

I shall now call on those representatives who would like to make statements or explain their positions before the Committee takes action on these two draft resolutions.

Mr. HALACHEV (Bulgaria): I should like to make a general statement before we vote. On 6 November 1987, my delegation introduced draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.64, entitled "Confidence-building measures at sea". In submitting the draft, as I stated at the time, the sponsors proceeded from the understanding, reflected in the report of the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission (A/CN.10/102), as well as in the statements of a number of delegations during our debates this year in the First Committee, that the area of confidence-building measures at sea is one in which there exists an opportunity to reach early and generally acceptable agreement. We still hold that view. I should also like to

(Mr. Halachev, Bulgaria)

reiterate that the intention of the sponsors was not to depart from the general and comprehensive approach to the question of naval armaments and disarmament. We sincerely hope that our draft resolution will facilitate the discussion which is now under way and the elaboration of specific recommendations by the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly.

(Mr. Halachev, Bulgaria)

We still feel that this draft could meet with the approval of all delegations. After intensive consultations with other interested delegations, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.64 were glad to find that many of them shared our concerns and that there exists an almost universal convergence of views on the immediate course of action that should be followed in the discussion of the question of naval armaments and disarmament, including confidence-building measures, in order to achieve substantive results.

Acknowledging this fact, in the spirit of co-operation and willing to promote concerted action by all Member States, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.64 have decided not to press this draft resolution to a vote. This step is also meant as a practical response to the appeal for a reduction in the number of resolutions in this Committee. We are of the opinion that the provisions of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.40, entitled "Naval armaments and disarmament", if implemented to their full extent, would bring about an effective discussion devoted to an end result on naval armaments and disarmament, together with confidence-building at sea. That will be in full accordance with the objectives of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.64.

On this understanding, my delegation joins the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.40, in the hope that all delegations will take a positive stand on this draft, so that it will obtain the consensus which would enable the United Nations Disarmament Commission to submit recommendations to the General Assembly at its forty-third session. My delegation will spare no effort for the achievement of that goal.

Mr. HU Xiaodi (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Since the question of nuclear and conventional disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in outer space have become of increasing concern in the world today, the Chinese delegation is of the view that the inscription of the question of naval disarmament on the international agenda is both appropriate and necessary, because it not only relates to the question of nuclear and conventional disarmament, but also has its own characteristics. Therefore we attach importance to the question of naval disarmament and have sent our expert to the United Nations Expert Group on Naval Questions.

In 1984 and 1986, we presented, respectively, to the Secretary-General and the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the basic position of the Chinese Government on the question of naval disarmament, and actively participated in the consideration of that question in the Commission. As we have done in the two previous years, once again this year we have become a sponsor of the draft resolution entitled "Naval armaments and disarmament".

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.40 of this year is a follow-up to Assembly resolution 40/94 F of 12 December 1985. That resolution provided that the purpose of the United Nations Disarmament Commission's consideration of the question of naval disarmament was:

"facilitating the identification of possible measures in the field of naval arms reductions and disarmament, pursued within the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament, as well as confidence-building measures in this field ..."

The Chinese delegation is of the view that such a wording is appropriate because, while stressing the naval disarmament measures, it did not neglect the question of confidence-building measures in this field. Therefore, resolution 40/94 F and its follow-up resolutions have always received our support.

(Mr. Hu Xiaodi, China)

My delegation hopes that the Disarmament Commission, at its session next year, will, in accordance with the mandate given in resolution 40/94 F, further its work in depth and, while not neglecting the question of confidence-building measures, will devote more attention to the question of naval disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I now request those delegations who wish to explain their vote before the vote to be kind enough to do so on cluster 12 before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on them.

If no one wishes to speak, I assume that the Committee is now ready to take a decision on the draft resolutions in cluster 12.

We shall start with agenda item 62 (e), entitled "General and complete disarmament". Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.40, entitled "Naval armaments and disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the thirty-sixth meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November 1987, and has been sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, China, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Iceland, Indonesia, Mexico, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

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 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, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives,



Mali, Malta, Mauritania, 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, 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: India

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.40 was adopted by 128 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Draft resolution A/C.1/L.64, under the heading "General and Complete Disarmament", item 62 (e), introduced by the delegation of Bulgaria at the thirty-fourth meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November, has been withdrawn. The sponsors do not wish to have it put to the vote.

The Committee has concluded its consideration of the two draft resolutions comprising cluster 12.

I shall now call on any delegations which wish to explain the votes just taken on cluster 12.

Mr. MASHHADI-GHAHVEHCHI (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.40. Our positive vote is based upon our firm belief that resort to force or threat of force is inadmissible in international relations. The presence of foreign navies and armadas in adjacent waters of other countries in pursuance of gunboat diplomacy poses a grave threat to international peace and security and is a clear manifestation of naval armament. We are therefore of the opinion that the imposition of limitations for alien navies in adjacent waters of independent countries is imperative and that foreign navies must be limited to protecting and defending their national frontiers and their territorial waters.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We shall now take decisions on the two draft resolutions in cluster 5 which were left in obedience for consultations.

It appears that the sponsors of the drafts are now in a position to place them before the First Committee for approval.

I shall first call upon any delegations which would like to make general statements, apart from explaining their votes.

Miss SOLFSBY (United Kingdom): I wish to explain the changes that the co-sponsors have made to their text in draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.2, which has appeared in revised form as A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1.

Changes have been made to bring the draft up to date as regards developments in the bilateral negotiations, in particular the recent high-level meetings in Washington and Moscow. Thus, in the preambular and operative parts the draft takes account of the firm agreement of the United States and the Soviet Union to sign a treaty totally eliminating all their intermediate- and short-range missiles at the forthcoming summit meeting in Washington, starting on 7 December, between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev.

Equally, the revised draft highlights the new agreement to give fresh impetus to the efforts to achieve 50 per cent cuts in their strategic nuclear weapons, with a view to achieving a treaty which could be signed at a further summit meeting in Moscow next year.

The revised text also recognizes the agreement of the two sides to consider thoroughly at the forthcoming summit meeting the development of instructions on the observance of and non-withdrawal from the anti-ballistic-missiles Treaty. Naturally we, and I am sure all members of the Committee, welcome this further progress towards the objectives of the bilateral talks, which we all support.

I should also mention that changes have been made to the original draft in order to take account of points made by some non-aligned countries.

I should like to take the opportunity to say that the co-sponsors have tried hard, with the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.10, to merge the two draft resolutions but, sadly, that did not prove possible. That was not through any lack of trying on our part, nor, I know, on the part of the representative of Zimbabwe.

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

It is our wish and hope that the draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1 will be adopted without a vote. In our view, the current propitious circumstances in the bilateral negotiations make it appropriate to send a united message to the two participants in advance of the forthcoming summit meeting.

Mr. DJMEVI (Ghana): I wish to explain the position of the Ghana delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/L.2/Rev.1 and A/C.1/42/L.10, as it is my understanding that the Committee will be taking a decision now on the two draft resolutions.

The agreement in principle by the United States and the Soviet Union to eliminate their land-based medium- and short-range missiles is a welcome development. The international climate could not be better. The overwhelming wish expressed in the statements of several delegations, including my own, is that the summit meetings planned for Washington and Moscow may open the way for further East-West dialogue in other areas of disarmament and give momentum to the disarmament process.

The Ghana delegation had therefore hoped that this general wish would have been reflected in a single resolution, a collective message to the two countries as they prepare for their summit meetings in Washington and Moscow. It is therefore a matter of deep regret that, instead of a single draft resolution, this Committee has to take a decision on two drafts on the same subject. It is even more regrettable that this should happen at a time when this Committee is concerned with the need to rationalize its methods of working by merging resolutions dealing with identical subjects.

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

In our view the two draft resolutions could have the effect of weakening the impact that a single draft resolution could have made. Our understanding of the explanation give by the representative of the United Kingdom a few moments ago is that, in spite of efforts to get a single text, it has not been possible. We think that most regrettable.

The Ghana delegation will, however, vote positively for the two draft resolutions because of their general thrust. We would, however, express the hope that, should the need arise for a draft resolution on bilateral negotiations in the coming year, the sponsors would exert further effort and produce a single draft resolution.

Mr. FUNUNGWE (Zimbabwe): I should like to explain my delegation's vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.L/42/L.2/Rev.1. My delegation holds the opinion, shared by the great majority of States and peoples, that nuclear weapons are a special kind of weapon, a devastating kind, a kind whose use is unpardonable and inexcusable in any circumstances. Ordinary men and women and various non-governmental organizations have all pointed with alarm to the apocalyptic nature of the use of nuclear weapons. I think that in any discussion of nuclear disarmament, therefore, this level of universal consent should be reflected. This is not a question of mere semantics; by what we say we condition our actions. We cannot be persuaded of the necessity of combating the horror of nuclear war unless we first convince ourselves that it is a horror that must be avoided.

The Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries clearly recognized those facts when, in their appeal on disarmament in September 1986, they stated that the alternative today is not between war and peace but between life and death. This constitutes an urgent appeal to action, showing that all other matters must be secondary to the prevention of nuclear war and nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Punungwe, Zimbabwe)

That concern is not apparent in draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1. It sanitizes what is essentially an emotive and dangerous issue. It does not reflect the depth of international concern on the issue or the conclusions of significant sectors of scientific opinion on the matter, which is that, more than any other type of war, a nuclear war would be catastrophic for mankind. Because the draft resolution does not proceed from that essential premise it goes on to ignore important elements in the quest for nuclear disarmament, such as the issue of a test ban.

For a long time now the non-aligned countries have been of the view that such a ban is essential to ensure both the vertical and the horizontal non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. For the First Committee to adopt a draft resolution on the important question of bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations that refrains from referring at all to the need for a comprehensive test ban is, in our view, inadequate. For these reasons, my delegation feels obliged to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1.

Mr. NANNA (Nigeria): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1.

My delegation fully supports the ongoing bilateral talks between the two super-Powers. I recall that nearly all delegations, including my own, have welcomed the progress being made. It is encouraging for world peace and security. Indeed, in his address to the plenary Assembly, my Minister also welcomed the ongoing bilateral talks and wished the two super-Powers the best of luck in their endeavours to give the world peace.

My delegation would have preferred a single draft resolution on this subject so dear to the heart of the international community, and for it to be adopted without a vote. There are concepts in draft resolution L.2/Rev.1 that are not

(Mr. Nanna, Nigeria)

necessary in a draft resolution on this vital subject. My delegation will therefore abstain in the voting on this draft resolution in favour of the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1, submitted under agenda item 62 and entitled "General and complete disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 9th meeting of the First Committee, on 16 October of this year. It is sponsored by Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cameroon, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.2/Rev.1 was adopted by 84 votes to none, with 42 abstentions.



The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.10, "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations," which was submitted under agenda item 62, "General and complete disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Zimbabwe on behalf of the States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 4 November 1987.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: 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, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, 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: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.10 was adopted by 116 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I now call upon representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States): I would like to explain why my delegation was unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.10, "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations." Although there are some portions of the draft resolution that reflect the approach which surrounds our bilateral nuclear negotiations with the Soviet Union, there are others which, unfortunately, seek to portray our efforts in a distorted and unbalanced manner.

My delegation finds it peculiar, to say the least, when a draft resolution ostensibly written to wish us well recalls a document known to all for its abusive characterization of United States policy. We consider such a reference to be inappropriate and not at all helpful in our pursuit of bilateral issues with the Soviet Union.

Further, my delegation is not convinced that peace and security can be ensured only through general and complete disarmament under effective international control. There are other avenues available, including greater co-operation between countries and accommodation of political differences and reason applied to resolving those issues which set States apart from each other.

In addition, concerning the draft resolution's reference to nuclear-test-ban negotiations, we find the text to be inconsistent with the joint United States-Soviet ministerial communiqué's call for stage-by-stage negotiations on nuclear-testing issues. It is divisive to portray those negotiations in a context counter to or not in keeping with the stated objective of both negotiating parties.

Lastly, we find the invitation to keep the Conference on Disarmament duly informed of progress in negotiations wholly inappropriate, if only for procedural reasons. In any event, my delegation has not only taken every step to keep the Conference on Disarmament abreast of the details of negotiations, but we have similarly kept the First Committee and the General Assembly apprised of our efforts, and we have sought to do the same on a bilateral basis as well.

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

For those reasons, recognizing the well-placed intent of the draft resolution and its sponsors, we have abstained in the voting.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): Canada has asked to speak in order to say a word in explanation of its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1 and L.10 in two capacities: first, as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1 and, secondly, as a delegation that voted in favour of both of these important draft resolutions.

I would like to congratulate the delegations that made a particular effort to effect a merger on draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1 and L.10, and I think particularly of the efforts made by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Zimbabwe.

Having said that, I have to express our concern about the inability of the Committee to get its act together on a single draft resolution that would speak of an event - the bilateral negotiations - that is central to the well-being of the world today. We recall the successful efforts made by you, Mr. Chairman, under your own chairmanship, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.3 some weeks ago, that brought about a consensus for the Chairman's decision on bilateral negotiations. We are a little puzzled that the same kind of spirit that prevailed at that time could not be effected today, with the result that we have a splintered viewpoint expressed out of the Committee into the world community.

I conclude by simply noting that in Canada's view the Committee has got to find a way to resolve its differences on these vital questions. Do we need more time to effect such mergers? If so, then let us be more serious about the rationalization process to streamline conditions in the Committee. Do we need more spirit of compromise in the negotiations that take place for mergers of draft resolutions? If so, then each of us should look into our own hearts and desires for what we want the Committee to do.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

Lastly, there is a fundamental question that remains: can the Committee find the way to speak with one voice to the world on the crucial arms-limitation and disarmament questions of our time?

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to explain my delegation's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1, on bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations. As members know, Venezuela was among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.10 on the same subject. We viewed with interest the efforts of the sponsors, under way for some time, to merge the two texts with a view to achieving consensus. Unfortunately, they did not yield the expected results.

My delegation fully shares the views that prompted delegations to sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1. While the two texts refer to the same subject, their approaches differ. Both are intended to stimulate the bilateral negotiations, but the motivations that led to them are quite different.

In the case of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.10, of which Venezuela was a sponsor, the fundamental motivation was the need to move closer to the goal of general and complete disarmament. Certainly, Soviet-United States negotiations are an important step in that direction, but they still represent only a single step towards the final objective of general and complete disarmament.

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1, on the other hand, seeks in some ways to evaluate events connected with bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States, in some ways prejudging the international community's opinion, about agreements concerning whose terms we do not yet know.

Moreover, the fifth preambular paragraph refers to instructions to be given by Governments to their respective delegations to those bilateral negotiations; we do not feel it is for the United Nations to address the question of what instructions Governments should give delegations participating in the negotiations.

For those reasons, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1.

Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to explain why it abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.2/Rev.1 in spite of the very commendable efforts of its sponsors to take account of the views expressed by many delegations.

The main reason we abstained was what we viewed as the text's excessive emphasis on the concept of the security interests of all States, which is mentioned both in the preambular part and in operative paragraph 3. We think it goes without saying that current agreements are based precisely upon the security interests of all sides.

In this case, smaller countries prefer to emphasize that the unchanging goal of all disarmament negotiations, whether bilateral or multilateral, should always be the maintenance and strengthening of international security, which is not necessarily the sum of the security interests of individual States or groups of States.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I should like at this stage to summarize the Committee's action on draft resolutions to date.

The Committee has taken action on all draft resolutions in cluster 1. In cluster 2, we have taken action on all draft resolutions apart from A/C.1/42/L.36 on verification; we have deferred action on that draft resolution as consultations continue.

The Committee has taken action on all draft resolutions in clusters 3, 4 and 5. Consultations continue on all four draft resolutions in cluster 6. We have taken action on all draft resolutions in cluster 7, while consultations continue on all five draft resolutions in cluster 8.

(The Chairman)

This morning, we took action on four draft resolutions in cluster 9; four others remain: A/C.1/42/L.23, L.30, L.50 and L.65 and Corr.1, on which consultations continue. The only outstanding draft resolution in cluster 10 is A/C.1/42/L.12/Rev.1, on which consultations are under way.

(The Chairman)

Consultations continue on all five draft resolutions in cluster 11. We have completed action on the draft resolutions in cluster 12, A/C.1/42/L.64 having been withdrawn by its sponsors. Intensive consultations are under way on the three draft resolutions in cluster 13.

In the light of the progress of consultations, I propose that at tomorrow morning's meeting we take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 14: draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.6, L.13, L.17, L.33, L.37/Rev.1, L.39, L.47, L.55, L.60/Rev.1, L.70 and L.76/Rev.1.

I urge all delegations involved in consultations concerning draft resolutions on which action remains to be taken to make every effort to complete their work as soon as possible so the Committee may take action on all draft resolutions before it. I would ask delegations kindly to let us have their views on the outstanding draft resolutions in due time.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.