

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



FIRST COMMITTEE
42nd meeting
held on
Tuesday, 24 November 1981
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 42ND MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39, 41, 42, 44 TO 47, 49, 50, 54 TO 56 AND 135 (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 A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/36/PV.42
5 January 1982

ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEMS 39, 41, 42, 44 TO 47, 49, 50, 54 TO 56 AND 135 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed to take action on the next draft resolution, I shall call on the representative of Denmark, who has asked to make a statement.

Mr. MICHAELSEN (Denmark): On 10 November 1981 Denmark introduced draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3 on the study on conventional disarmament. Our proposal was a follow-up to last year's resolution 35/156 A, in which the General Assembly gave its approval in principle for a study to be carried out on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces. As we stated in our introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3, we consider it most important that the question of conventional armaments be given a proper place in the international disarmament deliberations. The experts' study could form a sound, solid basis for our common discussions and consideration in this regard.

We have listened with great care to the comments on our draft proposal during the past couple of weeks. We are of course grateful for the support that has been expressed. But we have also listened carefully to the critical remarks reflecting the diversity of views on this matter.

In a spirit of compromise and wishing to secure the broadest possible support for the draft resolution, we have consulted a number of delegations in the Committee. In the light of these consultations, we have reconsidered our original proposal and presented a revised version in document A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1, which, we are confident, will meet most of the views expressed.

I should like briefly to mention the principal elements of the revised proposal we have now put before the Committee.

First, it requests the Secretary-General to establish the group of experts in accordance with the provisions of last year's resolution.

Secondly, it requests the United Nations Disarmament Commission to complete its consideration of the issue, thereby accommodating the views of those delegations that have expressed their concerns about the role of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

(Mr. Michaelsen, Denmark)

Thirdly, it agrees that the expert group should pursue its work after the 1982 session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, taking into consideration such conclusions as the Commission may submit to it and the deliberations at the 1981 substantive session of the Commission, in particular reflected in paragraph 21 and Annex III of the report of that session.

Finally, it requests that the report of the expert group be submitted to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

The revised proposal now submitted was, as previously mentioned, drawn up after consultations with a number of delegations. It is our sincere hope and expectation that it will receive broad support. After all, the conventional arms race is of major concern to all of us. In our view, the expert study could make an important contribution to a better understanding of the issues involved.

The CHAIRMAN: The revised draft resolution, A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1, will be one of the first draft resolutions to be considered and acted upon at tomorrow morning's meeting. I would therefore prefer that any comments on this revised draft resolution be made at that time.

If that is agreeable to the members of the Committee, we shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35, relating to item 42 (a), "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Committee on Disarmament". It is sponsored by 37 countries and was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 36th meeting of the Committee on 19 November. The sponsors are: Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Poland, Qatar, Spain, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam.

(The Chairman)

The members of the Committee also have before them document A/C.1/36/L.48, which contains an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35 proposed by Brazil, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

I shall now call on representatives who have asked to be allowed to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. MENZIES (Canada): Before the vote on the proposed amendment in document A/C.1/36/L.48 to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/36/L.35 on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, I wish to remind the members of the First Committee that during past sessions Poland and Canada have jointly presented a consensus-seeking draft resolution conveying the very strong desire of all Members of the Assembly that progress be made in the negotiation of a multilateral convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. Last year a number of countries joined in sponsoring such a resolution which was adopted by consensus. This year there were extensive negotiations seeking a text that would again convey the sense of the Assembly that high priority should be given by the Committee on Disarmament to the negotiation of a multilateral chemical weapons convention. Eventually, agreement was reached on a text which would command the support of all delegations.

In considering the proposed amendment in document A/C.1/36/L.48, we hope that members of this Committee will reflect on the procedural as well as the substantive aspects. The emphasis in document A/C.1/36/L.48 on giving a high priority to this subject and a Committee on Disarmament ad hoc working group on chemical weapons being given an appropriately revised mandate are sentiments to which most delegations, including my own, would subscribe. However, the specificity of that language is not acceptable to all delegations. Therefore, we must consider whether it is desirable to adopt an amendment that would break the hoped-for consensus.

Members will be aware that the Committee on Disarmament makes decisions by consensus only. We doubt that a draft resolution incorporating the more far-reaching words of the proposed amendment, even if adopted by a large majority,

(Mr. Menzies, Canada)

will have an impact comparable to the broader wording of the original draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35, which we believe was acceptable to all members of this Committee.

Representing a delegation which has put a lot of effort into developing a text for draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35 which would command consensus, I feel obliged to vote against the amendment, even though Canada does not disagree with the sentiment of the proposal in document A/C.1/36/L.48.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation has worked intensively with others in the hope of producing a draft resolution on a chemical weapons convention that would command consensus, the result of which is now contained in document A/C.1/36/L.35. We have conducted consultations in the firm belief that a consensus resolution would constitute the most encouraging support to those who are working on the elaboration of a chemical weapons convention in the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva. Therefore, my delegation cannot but express its regret that the introduction of the proposed amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35 is going to prevent us from obtaining a consensus resolution, for which my delegation and others have worked so hard to achieve. Let me make it quite clear, however, that the substance of the proposed amendment is entirely acceptable to my delegation.

In the light of the aforementioned considerations, my delegation will have to abstain in the vote on the amendment proposed in document A/C.1/36/L.48.

Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): The Polish delegation is in agreement, both as to the substance and the intention, with the draft amendment contained in document A/C.1/36/L.48. As a matter of fact, in our initial draft, which was the basis of our consultations with the delegations of Canada and Japan, a similar idea was included along with a number of others. However, during the process of consultations it appeared that that idea was not acceptable to some delegations and that no consensus would be reached if we insisted on that particular wording. That was why we agreed to a sort of "minimalistic"

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

draft in order to achieve consensus which, regrettably, is always the lowest common denominator -- and that is certainly the case with draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35.

However, I should like to recall that it has been a good tradition of this Committee, so far as chemical weapons resolutions are concerned, always to try to produce a draft acceptable to all delegations, because, as we all know, the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva works on the basis of consensus. That is the reason we have chosen to include our ideas in a number of separate draft resolutions -- for example, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1.

I should like to draw the attention of the sponsors of the proposed amendment to the fact that operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1 contains exactly the same wording as the proposed amendment to A/C.1/36/L.35 in document A/C.1/36/L.48.

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

We think that it would be preferable to stick to the consensus which was worked out, as the representatives of Canada and Japan pointed out before me, with considerable effort, especially since the same idea is contained in another draft resolution on the elimination of chemical weapons, namely, that contained in document A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1. So, while I stress again that we are in full agreement with both the substance and the intent of the proposed amendment, we would hope that the authors of the amendment will not press for a vote and thus break the consensus on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.35. If our hopes are not fulfilled and if a vote is to be taken, then my delegation would regretfully feel obliged to abstain on the draft amendment while I again repeat, being in full agreement with its substance and intent.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to a vote on the proposed amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35 contained in document A/C.1/36/L.48. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique,

Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Canada, United States of America

Abstaining: Bahamas, Cape Verde, Chile, Congo, Finland, Guinea, Honduras, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Mali, Niger, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Zaire

Proposed amendment A.C.1/36/L.48 to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35 was adopted by 101 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions.*

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

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations which wish to explain their vote on the amendment just adopted, or their vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35 as amended, before it is voted upon.

Mr. YANG Hushan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I should now like to explain the vote of the Chinese delegation on the draft resolutions contained in both A/C.1/36/L.35 and A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1.

The Chinese Government has consistently attached importance to the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons and is in favour of the complete prohibition and final destruction of all chemical weapons. We have actively participated in the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament on the question of the prohibition of such weapons and have expounded our view on the elements of the future convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons.

In view of the fact that the use of chemical weapons is a very real threat at the present time, we believe that the scope of our future convention should also include a ban on the use of such weapons. This would strengthen and definitely not weaken the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

In order to ensure the full implementation of the provisions of the convention, we also believe that it should provide for strict and effective international control and inspection measures, including certain necessary measures for on-the-spot inspections. Many medium and small-sized countries have called on the Committee on Disarmament to proceed next year with negotiations on the conclusion of a convention for the complete prohibition of chemical weapons. We support that demand. We believe that the super-Powers, which possess the largest chemical weapons arsenals and which are still engaged in the production, development, deployment and use of chemical weapons, should respond with concrete actions instead of obstructing the negotiations on various pretexts.

It is on the basis of the above-mentioned position and understanding that the Chinese delegation will vote on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/36/L.35 and A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1 on the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons.

Mr. KOR BUN HENG (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French):
Before our Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/36/L.35 as amended and A/C.1/36/L.36, my delegation would like to make the following statement.

If there is one people today whose children daily fall victim to chemical and bacteriological weapons, it is the people of Kampuchea. This explains how very much aware my delegation is of all the measures needed to put a final and complete end to these monstrous weapons. We wholeheartedly urge here that an immediate end be put to the use of bacteriological weapons against the people of Kampuchea. We also wholeheartedly hope that other people will not know the tragic fate of the Kampuchean people at present.

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic Kampuchea)

My delegation is outraged, however, to see that the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/36/L.35 and A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1 include those who are massacring the people of Kampuchea with chemical and bacteriological weapons. By becoming co-sponsors of those two draft resolutions they prove once again how cynical they are. This is a revolting insult to the memory of thousands of Kampuchean victims of the most odious crimes .. and I am referring to chemical warfare only.

In our debates in the Committee many delegations have forcefully denounced the pernicious rhetoric of the representatives of Viet Nam and the Soviet Union, rhetoric in total contradiction with their **criminal acts**. It has become clear that Soviet and Vietnamese expansionism makes use of this forum for their own propaganda manoeuvres and distortions, and continue to camouflage their policy of aggression and expansion towards world domination.

For all these reasons, my delegation will not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1. However, it would like to avail itself of this opportunity to express its profound gratitude to all those sponsors representing countries which really seek to defend the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

M. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation voted in favour of the amendment in A/C.1/36/L.48 proposed by the Swedish delegation and a certain number of other delegations. We did so with some reservations, which we should like to have appear in the records of this Committee.

On the one hand, we do not believe that it is appropriate for the First Committee and the General Assembly to make an explicit recommendation to the Committee on Disarmament about its working methods. I am referring specifically to the recommendation concerning re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons. Clearly, re-establishing the Working Group goes without saying and creates no problem. But this is not an item within the competence of the authority of the General Assembly, nor do we believe that a "revised mandate" is of itself likely to enable the Committee on Disarmament to arrive as speedily as possible at an agreement on a convention on chemical weapons. We are convinced that the completion of negotiations depends essentially not on a mandate but on the positions which the negotiating countries might take on the substantive aspects of such negotiations and on the possibility of reaching agreement.

Nevertheless, the French delegation voted in favour of the amendment, despite our reservations about its wording, because we are convinced that in fact the Working Group's mandate is no longer in accord with the present purposes of the work with which the Working Group is entrusted, and that no doubt it is useful - indeed, even necessary - to adjust the mandate to the actual work of the Working Group. That is why we voted in favour of the amendment, despite the reservations I have expressed about the wording.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation was able to agree to the amendment contained in document A/C.1/36/L.48 as a matter of content. It will shortly, a fortiori, agree to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35 as amended.

However, in support of the statements made by other members of the European Community, I should like to voice my delegation's disappointment that the commendable effort of those who have worked hard to bring about a consensus on this resolution have not been successful. My delegation would have preferred to see resolution A/C.1/36/L.35 adopted in its original form. It fully supports the arguments presented in this regard by the delegations of France and Japan.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union supported the amendment contained in document A/C.1/36/L.48. We are prepared to revise the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons if the revised mandate will help to further work on a multilateral convention which will prohibit chemical weapons.

At the same time, our support for the amendment should by no means be construed as meaning that we have changed our attitude on the Committee on Disarmament, the single multilateral body for holding talks on curbing the arms race and on disarmament. We continue to believe that no one is entitled to instruct the Committee on what sort of organizational steps it should take. In accordance with its existing rules of procedure, the Committee itself has the right to decide on all matters, including the question whether the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons should or should not be revised.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The Finnish delegation abstained in the vote on the amendment in document A/C.1/36/L.48. In addition to our misgivings about its content, the emphasis still lies on the context in which it was presented. Indeed, we attach great importance to consensus in dealing with the disarmament questions to which the international community has given the highest priority. We shall shortly support draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35 as amended, but we shall do so with regret, as a co-sponsor, that the Committee failed this year to adopt, without vote, its main resolution on chemical weapons.

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Belgium voted in favour of the amendment in document A/C.1/36/L.48. However, we regret that this last-minute manoeuvre makes it impossible to arrive at a consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35, of which we are a co-sponsor. It would no doubt have been better if the Assembly had refrained from giving specific instructions to the Committee on Disarmament about the way in which it is to conduct its work in respect of chemical weapons, and if it had acted in such a way as to preserve complete freedom for an agreement to be reached in that Committee on this question.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35, as amended by A/C.1/36/L.48.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia*

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

Against: None

Abstaining: United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35, as amended, was adopted by 127 votes to none, with one abstention.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations which wish to explain their votes after the voting.

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

We voted in favour of the draft amendment in document A/C.1/36/L.48, which amended draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35, because we share the underlying intention of that amendment. At the same time, we recognize that the effect of the passage of the amendment was to make it necessary to have a vote on the draft resolution on chemical weapons, A/C.1/36/L.35, an item which has traditionally been passed without a vote.

In voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35, we regret that this year the General Assembly has not been able to make a recommendation by consensus on this important subject.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): The United States deeply regrets that the traditional consensus on the draft resolution just passed has been prevented this year for the first time. My delegation deeply appreciates the efforts of Canada, Japan and the other sponsors to put together a consensus on this draft resolution.

The amendment which this draft resolution now includes was introduced despite the fact that the consequence of such action was well known. The substance of the amendment is inconsistent with the organizational arrangements for the Committee on disarmament, as recorded in paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly. Under those arrangements, the Committee itself is to decide its internal procedures for dealing with the issues on its agenda. The United States cannot support any infringement of the Committee's authority.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

The United States had intended to support draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35 before this unfortunate amendment was incorporated. We did so, because the United States strongly supports the objective of effective prohibition of chemical weapons. Together with most other States, we are of the firm view that, to become a reality, such a prohibition must include verification measures that would provide adequate assurance of implementation and compliance. Some States, however, refuse to accept international on-site verification, and their negative position on this issue remains the most important obstacle to the achievement of the objectives set forth in this draft resolution.

My Government is currently reviewing issues relating to chemical weapons and, pending the completion of that review, reserves its position regarding the way in which efforts to ban such weapons can be pursued in the most effective manner.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35, as amended.

We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1. This draft resolution relates to agenda item 42 (a), "Chemical and Bacteriological (Biological) Weapons", and is entitled "Report of the Committee on Disarmament".

This draft resolution has 13 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 35th meeting of the First Committee on 19 November. The 13 sponsors are: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam.

(The Chairman)

I now call on the representative of the United States of America, who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States): In explaining the vote the United States delegation just cast on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35, Ambassador Fields stated that the United States strongly supports the objective of the effective prohibition of chemical weapons. We also indicated that opposition by some States to effective international verification is the main obstacle to achieving that objective.

I reiterate that support in connexion with the draft resolution before us. As to the draft resolution itself, however, it duplicates a great deal of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.35 and also contains points which, if the sponsors were really interested in ensuring the best conditions for progress towards a prohibition of chemical weapons, they should have raised a number of years earlier.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

I remind this Committee that the United States ceased production of chemical weapons 12 years ago, in 1969. In fact, we are not producing such weapons even today, although in view of the continuing and massive Soviet chemical weapons programme we have no choice but to take steps soon to redress that balance. Despite the unilateral and drastic curtailment of United States chemical weapons capability since 1969, the Soviet Union has relentlessly continued to produce and deploy a variety of modern agents and multiple delivery systems for chemical weapons. Today, the United States has only one chemical weapons production facility. Even that facility, however, is inactive and in disrepair. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, maintains and operates at least 14 chemical-weapons facilities. A larger offensive chemical-warfare organization is an organic part of the Soviet armed forces. The Soviet Union includes, as part of its forces, about 100,000 personnel with specialized chemical-warfare training who are assigned down to the company level. In contrast, at present the United States has only 5,700 troops trained in chemical-warfare defence. This is approximately a 15 to 1 ratio between the Soviet and American troops trained in this area.

As we all know, the issue of a chemical-weapons prohibition has been before the international community since the mid-1970s. In 1977 we also began bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union to develop, for submission to the Committee on Disarmament, a joint initiative for a multilateral convention prohibiting the production, development and possession of chemical weapons. If the sponsors of this draft resolution are sincerely concerned that production of chemical weapons can impede negotiations on such a convention, why are they calling for restraint in this area only now and why are they asking that only new types of chemical weapons should not be produced, as if the older and more accident-prone types of such weapons were less lethal and irrelevant? The answer is obvious. The purpose of the sponsors of this draft resolution is not to facilitate achievement of a chemical-weapons prohibition. What they are attempting to do is to inhibit counter-measures required by the vast Soviet chemical-weapons programme by allowing that programme to proceed at full speed. Given the list of sponsors, this blatant disregard for the principle of balance and equity should surprise no one.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1 is not only superfluous, but it is also clearly one-sided. Rather than to contribute to progress towards the objective of a chemical-weapons prohibition, it merely seeks to shift the blame for lack of such progress. The United States will accordingly oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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 Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: United States

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Somalia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1 was adopted by 95 votes to 1, with 30 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of Japan, who wishes to explain his vote.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1. My delegation has difficulty in accepting the idea, contained in its operative paragraph 5 in particular, which calls upon all States "to refrain from production and deployment of binary and other new types of chemical weapons as well as from stationing chemical weapons in these States where there are no such weapons at present".

In the view of my delegation, acceptance of this idea may have a detrimental effect by prejudging the outcome of the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons, now going on in the Committee on Disarmament. For that reason my delegation was not able to support the draft resolution just adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded our work on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.36/Rev.1.

We shall now begin action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.44, relating to agenda item 55 (a), "General and complete disarmament: report of the Committee on Disarmament". The draft resolution has 19 sponsors and was introduced by Turkey at the 36th meeting of the First Committee on 19 November. The 19 sponsors are: Bahamas, Chile, Ghana, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, New Zealand, Niger, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey and Uruguay.

If no delegation wishes to explain its vote before the voting, we shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.44.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.44 was adopted by 118 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.*

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

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.44 in view of the fact that the question of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament comes within the purview of the Committee itself and also the fact that, in the consideration of this matter at the last session of the Committee, many of the socialist, non-aligned and other States that are members of the Committee did not favour the idea of reviewing the membership of the Committee on Disarmament for the next few years.

Mr. MEGALOKONOMOS (Greece) (interpretation from French): Greece voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.44, and we were a sponsor of the draft resolutions in previous years on the same subject, because we are keenly interested in anything pertaining to disarmament and the work of the Committee on Disarmament. For that reason my delegation wishes at this time to give a brief explanation of its vote.

My delegation is aware of the delicate problem of the review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament, which we very much fear is likely to require a certain amount of time. That is why we express the sincere hope that the draft resolution we have just adopted will encourage the Committee on Disarmament to adopt without too much delay measures to facilitate to the utmost the participation of States not members of the Committee in the work of that Committee.

Mr. KOMIVES (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.44, which has just been adopted. It did so because the draft resolution prejudices the decision of the second special session on disarmament in connexion with the review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament and because this question comes within the purview of the Committee on Disarmament. With regard to this question, my delegation wishes to put forward two points for consideration.

(Mr. Komives, Hungary)

First, the question of the composition of the Geneva Committee was intensively discussed during the 1981 session of the Committee on Disarmament. As a result of the discussion the almost generally supported view emerged that, because of the relatively short period of time that has elapsed since the inception of the present Committee on Disarmament, there is no urgent need for any change in the composition of the Committee on Disarmament.

Secondly, the Hungarian delegation is of the opinion, which is certainly shared by many delegations, that the lack of tangible results in the work of the Committee on Disarmament was not in any way due to its size, composition, structure, methods of work or rules of procedure. It was mainly and primarily due to the lack of political will on the part of certain States. At the same time, it must be admitted that there are possibilities of improving the effective functioning of the Committee on Disarmament. That Committee has already started to consider this issue and will continue to do so in 1982.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.44.

We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.21, relating to agenda item 51 (d), "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: study on the relationship between disarmament and development." The draft resolution has 31 co-sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 18 November. The sponsors are: Austria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Panama, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The Budget Division has informed me that the expenses involved in producing the requested publication will be met through existing resources for the publication programme of the Department of Conference Services.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors have suggested that draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.21 be adopted without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to that suggestion.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.21 was adopted.

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

Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom): I should like to make a few remarks about draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.21 concerning the United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament and development.

The United Kingdom supported the initiation of this study and took a close and active interest in the work of the Group of Experts, and we have just joined in the adoption of the draft resolution submitting the report which the Experts made to the Secretary-General. However, there are a number of aspects about the conduct of the study which my Government finds disturbing.

It is a great pity that after three years of hard work by the Experts - and I should like here to pay a tribute to them for their efforts - it was not possible to produce a consensus report. No fewer than ten Experts, including the United Kingdom member of the Group, were obliged to make reservations on certain parts of the report because in their view adequate discussion was not permitted, nor was sufficient time allowed for the reconciliation of differing points of view. Indeed, after lengthy discussion of minor issues, a voting procedure was introduced to dispense swiftly with contentious points. This is not adequately reflected in the letter of transmittal and the draft resolution that was before us. *It is my Government's view that such studies should be conducted on the basis of consensus and that the practice of voting through proposed textual amendments is highly undesirable.*

(Mr. Marshall, United Kingdom)

On matters of substance, the United Kingdom shares the tentative conclusions in the final chapter of the report. However, as Mrs. Thorsson indicated in her statement to this Committee on 26 October, the relationship between disarmament and development exists only as part of the more complex triangular disarmament-development-security relationship. It is unrealistic to expect progress in any of these fields in isolation, and we therefore hope that the Report's report will not be considered outside the context of the international security situation.

(Mr. Marshall, United Kingdom)

The United Kingdom also regrets the unbalanced data contained in the report. It is significant, for instance, that the Soviet Union, one of the world's highest military spenders, is recognized by international authorities to have one of the lowest records of overseas aid for development. Unfortunately, the general insufficiency of data relating to the Warsaw Pact in the study prevents this and other facts from emerging as clearly as they might.

It is my Government's hope that the study on the relationship between disarmament and development will act as a spur to an improvement in all three elements of the triangular relationship between disarmament, development and security.

Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): The delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Poland, on whose behalf I am speaking today, have been actively and consistently working for the attainment of the main objectives of the international community, ensuring peace and international security and promoting peaceful international co-operation. The members of the community of socialist States make concerted efforts with a view to ending the arms race and promoting disarmament. In their activities the socialist countries are guided by the firm conviction that disarmament and arms limitation, especially in the nuclear field, are indispensable prerequisites for the economic and social progress of all peoples. In their view the negative effects of the arms race do not result merely in the deterioration of political relations among States. Gigantic appropriations that go into producing armaments and maintaining armies place a heavy burden on the economies of all States. On the other hand, by claiming an ever growing share of the material and intellectual resources of mankind, the arms race makes it more difficult, if not impossible, to cope with the complex tasks posed by economic development. In particular, the continuation of the arms race will render extremely difficult the solution of such global and increasingly pressing

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

problems as narrowing the gap between the levels of economic development of various regions and countries, food production, the development of fundamentally new sources of energy, extensive exploration of oceans and of outer space, effective health care and environmental protection.

The socialist countries on whose behalf I am making this statement strongly believe in the direct and close relationship between the struggle for peace, security and disarmament on the one hand and the goals of development on the other. The specific initiatives in that regard advanced by our countries at the United Nations, especially on the reduction of military budgets, are well known.

It is in this context that we view the report of the Secretary-General containing the study on the relationship between disarmament and development in document A/36/356. Our delegations wish to express to the Group of Experts, and in particular to its Chairman, Mrs. Inga Thorsson, their appreciation of the work that the Group has performed in preparing the study. We also listened with great attention to the interesting introductory remarks made by the representative of Sweden at the meeting of the First Committee on 20 October.

We have noted with satisfaction that the report has been the subject of discussion not only in the First Committee but also in the Second Committee. In our view such an organization of work has been very useful in identifying and thoroughly exploring all important areas of that topic.

We consider the publication of the study drawing the attention of the international community to the close relationship between disarmament and development to be particularly opportune during the preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The report deals with many important aspects of the problem under review and contains correct conclusions, among which we wish to single out specifically the following: the arms race is incompatible with the objective of establishing a new international economic order; resources released by the curbing of the arms race and concrete measures of disarmament could be used for the well being of peoples, for the improvement of economic conditions in developing countries, to fight inflation and mass unemployment in some countries and to enhance economic growth in all countries.

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

On the other hand, we feel that the report underestimates the positive significance of some of the earlier agreements on the limitation of the arms race, especially in the field of strategic arms.

The importance of the SALT II treaty resides in its providing for major and far-reaching limitations, both qualitative and quantitative, on Soviet and American strategic offensive weapons, including the genuine reduction of those weapons. As is generally well known, the blame for the fact that the treaty has not yet become operative does not lie with the Soviet side. In fact, the USSR has repeatedly asserted that it is prepared to resume strategic arms limitation talks with the United States relying on what has already been achieved and with due respect for the principle of equality and equal security.

As regards the suggestion concerning the establishment of an international disarmament fund for development, it should be emphasized that the provision for any such mechanism within the framework of the United Nations with a view to financing development would be meaningful only if tied to genuine reductions of the military budgets of States, primarily the permanent members of the Security Council. While the report rightly questions the expediency of introducing an armaments levy to finance the development fund, the socialist countries cannot accept the suggestion that the idea of an international fund is generally regarded as being not only the most consistent with the United Nations concept of disarmament and development but also the most feasible. In our considered view, the most reliable and simple way of securing additional resources to provide for development assistance is to be found in the reduction of military budgets. Proposals to this effect have already been approved by the United Nations. The flexible approach of the socialist countries, which submitted specific proposals on the initial reductions of military budgets, and their readiness to seek agreement on the reduction of military budgets in terms of percentages or in absolute figures, or to freeze them initially, represent good bases for practical arrangements. Such arrangements, naturally, would call for political will on the part of other United Nations Member States with important economic or military capabilities, including the permanent members of the Security Council.

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

The socialist countries view as unfounded the contention in the study that the lack of information about the military efforts of States is one of the main factors contributing to the arms race. Equally, they do not share the positive assessment of the efforts pursued within the United Nations with regard to setting norms for military budget cost accounting. Such assessments and the recommendation concerning a fuller compilation and dissemination of data on the cost of the military preparations of States and the military use of human and material resources tend to obfuscate the true cause of the continuation of the arms race, namely, the lack of political will on the part of some States to undertake genuine disarmament measures.

In the opinion of the socialist States the collection of additional information about the military expenditures of States and the elaboration of a military spending comparability system and various cost accounting methods are divorced from reality. Such an approach makes it impossible to tackle the problem of reducing military budgets, which must be settled if additional funds for development are ultimately to be released. The impression cannot be resisted that such an approach in the United Nations is being used by some countries to cover up their unwillingness to agree to the reduction of their military expenditures.

In concluding we wish to affirm the principal conclusion of the report, that the world can either continue to pursue the arms race with characteristic vigour or move consciously and with deliberate speed towards a more stable and balanced social and economic development within a more sustainable international economic and political order.

Those remarks have been made in explanation of our position on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.21 and in order to broaden and supplement the debate on the report. Our delegations express the hope that they will be taken into account in the course of the subsequent examination in the United Nations of the question of the relationship between disarmament and development.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.21, relating to the United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament and development. The Federal Republic of Germany has supported the study from the outset. It was represented in the Group of Experts and made a contribution to the Group's work in a constructive spirit. Of the commissioned scientific research reports which the Experts used in their work, five came from the Federal Republic of Germany.

The input which my country was able to channel into this study corresponded to the priority of the subject. In a world which has to concentrate its efforts to surmount famine and misery, the financial sacrifice for armament in its present global dimension is a challenge to political intellect and to the moral convictions of all States. Federal Chancellor Schmidt told the first special session devoted to disarmament:

"If we succeed in limiting armaments and cutting our military expenditures we shall be releasing funds which can be used to make additional transfers to the developing countries." (A/S-10/PV.5, p. 83-85)

In the work of the Experts the multifaceted nature and complexity of the problems which have to be surmounted in attaining this objective have become manifest. The report is a valuable basis for further work. There is justification for its emphasizing the need for even better co-ordination of relevant activities within the United Nations. The report also makes clear that real progress can be achieved only on the basis of reliable facts. My country will continue to support all efforts of the United Nations aimed at closing the information gaps which still exist both in the military realm and in the area of States' contributions to development assistance.

In our view, the report itself could have contributed more clearly to closing this information gap. We have a certain number of methodological reservations concerning the use of statistics in many sections of the report. This critical remark is only one of several which could be made with respect to both the contents of the report and the method used in its elaboration.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

Unfortunately, despite three years of hard work, the Experts did not succeed in achieving a consensus on all issues. Some divergencies of view persisted. I should have thought that these should have appeared as an integral part of the report. Instead, they were excluded on the basis of majority votes in several instances. We regret that the method applied -- consensus or majority decision -- was repeatedly changed. As a consequence, no less than 10 Experts, including the Expert from the Federal Republic of Germany, found themselves compelled to voice reservations on a certain number of points in the report. Our reservations as to the contents of the report relate to a number of points in chapter II. These reservations are reproduced in the annex.

In spite of the methodological shortcomings and the aforementioned reservations as to substance, all the Experts were finally able to agree on the conclusions and recommendations of the report. That is a promising result. The Federal Republic of Germany has therefore been able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.21. In so doing it was guided by the conviction that all States of the world -- industrial countries in both the East and the West, as well as developing countries -- share the responsibility, their divergent views notwithstanding, to see to it that, within the framework of a comprehensive world-wide security partnership, concrete solutions are found to the fundamental problems dealt with in this important study.

Mr. NOIRFALISSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Belgium has just joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.21. We have done so because we are aware of the importance of the subject of the study on the relationship between disarmament and development in document A/36/356.

Nevertheless, we note that certain members of the Group of Governmental Experts appointed by the Secretary-General to prepare the study made specific reservations with regard to certain parts of the report. We share a number of these reservations and we regret that it did not prove possible to take account of them in the preparation of the study.

(Mr. Noirfalisse, Belgium)

The study would undoubtedly have been considerably improved had all the Experts agreed with every part of it. Consequently we hope that the views expressed by States on the study will be taken fully into account by the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, as well as the study itself, which we have just decided to submit to it.

We believe that if that is done we can look forward to the thorough consideration this subject needs and to fruitful results.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Japan): The Government of Japan fully recognizes the importance of the relationship between disarmament and development. We should be pleased if more resources could be released as the result of disarmament achieved on the basis of the collective will of all States, and could be reallocated to world economic and social development, including that of the developing countries.

In this context my delegation wishes to recall that the Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. Zenko Suzuki, pointed out the importance of this subject at the North-South summit meeting held recently in Mexico, and that Japan's Foreign Minister, Mr. Sunao Sonoda, in his statement during the general debate at this session of the General Assembly, placed particular importance on disarmament problems and North-South problems.

I should like to add that Ambassador Kakitsubo participated actively in the work of the Group of Experts, under the distinguished guidance of Mrs. Inga Thorsson of Sweden. My delegation would like to pay a high tribute to Mrs. Thorsson and the other members of the Group of Experts for their efforts and to welcome the report submitted to this session of the General Assembly.

The Government of Japan believes that a number of suggestions contained in the report need to be considered in depth and that the forthcoming consideration of the report at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to be held next year, could be of great importance.

As a sponsor of the draft resolution, my delegation is gratified that it has just been adopted without a vote.

Mr. PROKOFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union fully supports the statement just made by the delegation of the Polish People's Republic and his comments on the study of the relationship between disarmament and development in document A/36/556.

In addition, let me say how deeply we regret that the viewpoint of the Soviet expert was not duly reflected in the report, since the last part of the preparation of the report was carried out with too much haste, as a result of which the experts did not have an opportunity to study the final text of the report in any detail or to make necessary emendations.

Mr. COOPER (United States of America): In joining in the consensus on A/C.1/36/L.21 my delegation would like to reaffirm our deep and continuing commitment to the twin goals of disarmament and development. With this in mind my country supported the United Nations Group of Experts studying the question of disarmament and development in deed and in action, as well as in principle. A United States Expert participated in the Group and my Government contributed \$175,000 to finance supporting research - the second largest contribution, after Sweden's. While we have supported the work of the Expert Group, we, along with other nations, have expressed reservations about some sections of the report.

Before addressing some of these concerns, I should like to outline the view of the interrelated issues of disarmament and development held by the United States.

Since the end of the Second World War much of mankind has been preoccupied with the urgent challenge of economic development. The gains registered by developing countries in this relatively short period have been remarkable. Over the last 30 years developing-country economies have grown faster than the economies of industrial nations have ever grown during any comparable stage of development. Life expectancy has risen from 32 years just before the Second World War to 50 years today - an increase that Western nations required the entire nineteenth century to attain. Adult literacy has risen from one third in 1950 to about one half today, and the number of students enrolled in primary schools

(Mr. Cooper, United States)

has more than tripled. Much has been accomplished, but much more needs to be done. The Government and people of the United States are proud of the contributions that our country has made to this historically unprecedented achievement. As President Reagan said recently at Cancun:

"I am puzzled by suspicions that the United States might ignore the developing world. The contribution America has made to development -- and will continue to make -- is enormous.

"We have provided \$57 billion to the developing countries in the last decade -- \$43 billion in development assistance and \$14 billion in contributions to the multilateral development banks. Each year the United States provides more food assistance to the developing nations than all other nations combined. Last year we extended almost twice as much official development assistance as any other nation.

"Even more significant is the United States contribution in trade. Far too little world attention has been given to the importance of trade as a key to development.

"The United States absorbs about one half of all the manufactured goods that non-OPEC developing countries export to the industrialized world, even though our market is only one third of the total industrialized world market. Last year alone, we imported \$60 billion worth of goods from non-OPEC developing countries."

All that shows that these contributions are a natural and inevitable corollary of the values and aspirations of the American people. We have not dedicated ourselves to bringing these aspirations to fruition within the United States only to acquiesce in widespread and degrading poverty abroad. On the contrary, we recognize that continuing American support for rapid social and economic development is both a moral imperative and a political necessity.

(Mr. Cooper, United States)

The nature and scope of American development assistance programmes are manifest. We welcome frank and open discussion of these programmes, as well as future programmes, as our President stated at Cancun. Unfortunately, the Soviet Union chose not to be present at that international gathering in Mexico. Certainly we should not be surprised. Despite its oft-professed sympathy for the plight of the developing nations, the Soviet Union has refused to submit data on its assistance programme or on its military expenditures. What does it have to hide?

I think the extent of the unprecedented Soviet arms build-up should be clear to all present by now. I shall not dwell long on these sad statistics.

However, the corollary of the massive Soviet build-up - an almost total lack of any commitment economically to assist most of the developing world - is just as sad and lamentable. In 1980, for example, the Soviet Union gave little more than one tenth of 1 per cent of its gross national product to economic disbursements to developing nations. Of that aid, about 80 per cent went to its communist allies. Over the entire quarter of a century from 1954 to 1979 the Soviet Union actually disbursed only \$8 billion in economic assistance to the developing countries. During the same period the United States extended approximately \$100 billion in economic assistance. In addition, the Soviet Union has refused to support any assistance efforts of the multilateral development banks chartered under United Nations auspices.

(Mr. Cooper, United States)

In terms of trade, only about 10 to 15 per cent of Soviet exports go to non-Communist developing countries and about half of those exports consist of military sales. In contrast, the United States purchases over 50 per cent of the industrial exports of the developing nations. These same developing countries have trade deficits of almost \$5 billion with the Soviet Union.

But while the Soviet Union has been markedly reluctant to extend economic assistance to the developing nations, it has shown no comparable hesitation in pouring lethal weapons into these regions.

During the past four years, while the Soviet Union disbursed only \$2.3 billion in development assistance, it transferred over \$36 billion in military hardware to the less developed nations of the world. Using the data of internationally recognized centres of disarmament, and they are well known, the Soviet Union out-delivered the United States in all six major categories of conventional weapons, often by ratios approaching 5 to 1.

Unfortunately, during the past decade both the substantial progress that has already been attained and the prospects of future progress have been gravely jeopardized as the developing nations have been forced to divert sorely needed resources in order to strengthen their defence against the possibility of aggression and against real aggression, often by heavily armed Soviet client States. The price of Soviet military assistance is not only monetary, it is human as well. The Soviet Union and its allies have created in the order of 10 million refugees from Indo-China through Afghanistan to the Horn of Africa and across to Cuba and Central America. This toll in human suffering for these poor people in regions spread throughout the developing world is unprecedented and staggering. Sadly, but not unexpectedly, the Soviet Union - the great defender of the world's proletariat - refuses to help with this enormous economic and human tragedy for which it bears responsibility.

(Mr. Cooper, United States)

This striking contrast between the magnitude of Soviet weapons transfers on the one hand and Soviet development assistance on the other speaks volumes about real Soviet attitudes towards disarmament and development. Clearly, the Soviet Union recognizes that its political influence in the developing countries derives in great measure from its role as an arms peddler. Deprive the Soviet Union of that role and you deprive it of any role, for apart from arms the Soviet Union has nothing to offer the developing countries. The irrelevance of the Soviet Union to the economic aspirations of the developing countries is becoming increasingly clear and was once again confirmed by the Soviets' refusal to participate in the recent meeting in Mexico.

Insecurity and conflict are the great enemies of development, yet chronic, resource-devouring insecurity and prolonged, enervating conflict prevail throughout much of the developing world today. Our Committee's deliberations will not bring an end to insecurity and conflict in the developing world but, by calling attention to the activities of those who seek to profit from the sufferings of others, we can ensure that these activities will not remain for ever and will not remain cost free.

We believe that there is much in this study on disarmament and development that deserves commendation. We agree with the study's conclusion, for example, that excessive secrecy contributes to the arms race, and about that I have spoken, and with its appeals for fuller reporting of military expenditures.

We must note, however, that we have been disappointed by some aspects of the report, as well as by the resolution. The letter to the Secretary-General transmitting the report, for example, wrongly states that with the exception of specific sections on which reservations were made the report was adopted unanimously. In fact, major parts of the report were adopted by majority vote. For that reason 10 of the Experts were obliged to submit a large number of reservations not included in the letter to the Secretary-General. Moreover, the report does not adequately reflect a consensus. For example, the United States, as well as some other delegations, opposed the idea of an institutional direct link between disarmament and development. We believe other factors, such as legitimate security concerns and the role of international trade, must play a major role in the discussion of disarmament and development questions.

(Mr. Cooper, United States)

Finally, despite the enormous economic and security problems facing us, we cannot and must not despair. As our President said in Cancun, we remain committed, in deed -- and I must emphasize "in deed" -- as in principle, to maintaining this co-operative spirit in which practical solutions can move forward.

The CHAIRMAN. We have thus concluded our action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.21.

(The Chairman)

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30, related to agenda item 56, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament". It has 14 co-sponsors, and was introduced by the representative of Iraq at the 37th meeting of the Committee, on 20 November. The co-sponsors are: Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Sudan, the United Arab Emirates, the Yemen Arab Republic, Chad and Mauritania.

A recorded vote has been requested on the draft resolution. A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, taken together.

I ask the Secretary of the Committee to explain the financial implications of the draft resolution.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The Budget Division has informed us that the expenses involved in producing the publication requested in this draft resolution would be met through the existing resources for the publication programme of the Department of Conference Services.

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the rules of procedure, we shall take a separate vote first on operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian

In favour: Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey,
(continued) Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of
Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United
Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen,
Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal
Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy,
Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of
Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of
America

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Brazil, Burma, Chile,
Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Guatemala, Ivory
Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Nepal, New Zealand, Papua
New Guinea, Paraguay, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Uruguay,
Zaire

Operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30 were
adopted by 82 votes to 17, with 25 abstentions.

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

Mr. HELLER (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): If operative
paragraph 7 had been voted on separately, Mexico would have abstained.

Mrs. DA SILVA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation
voted in favour of operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, but we should like to state
our reservations about the scope of operative paragraph 7. We do not completely
agree with its contents.

Mr. RIERA (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation
voted in favour of the three operative paragraphs on which we have just voted,
but if there had been a separate vote on each of them it would have abstained
on operative paragraph 7.

Mr. DE LA FUENTE (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, but if there had been a separate vote on each paragraph it would have abstained on operative paragraph 7.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30 as a whole.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): This draft resolution is yet another in a series of similar resolutions which date back to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly and which my delegation has been unable to support. The United States believes that the prospects of this draft resolution contributing generally to the goals of arms control and disarmament, and specifically to peace and stability in the Middle East, are no better now than they were when this issue first came up.

The draft resolution is unbalanced, censuring only one country, when the problems in the Middle East are certainly much broader. Targeting one country for comprehensive sanctions is not an appropriate approach to the goal of non-proliferation. On the contrary, it is an ideal illustration of how the goal of non-proliferation should not be approached.

Further, we strenuously oppose the draft resolution's request that the Security Council institute enforcement action against Israel. We oppose any such attempt to engage the Security Council in an unbalanced, politically motivated activity.

My Government is committed to the goals of non-proliferation and is dedicated to working constructively towards this end. We are similarly committed to the achievement of a comprehensive Arab-Israeli peace settlement, based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

In summarizing my explanation of vote, my Government finds the draft resolution before us in document A/C.1/36/L.30 unbalanced, contentious and counter-productive, both to our collective non-proliferation efforts and to the interests of peace and stability in the Middle East.

The paragraphs dealing with the attack on Tammuz engage the United Nations again in a matter which has already been handled effectively. Indeed, this matter was handled by the most appropriate body of the United Nations, namely, the Security Council, last June. It was then discussed at length and a consensus agreement was reached. Twice now - twice - at the thirty-sixth session the General Assembly has addressed the same issue in plenary meeting, an issue which does not and did not need to be handled once again by any part of the United Nations, because nothing has happened on the matter in the region itself since the Security Council vote. One just wonders how often the same point can be made in different United Nations resolutions without the entire exercise becoming totally ludicrous.

For those reasons my delegation will vote against the proposed draft resolution.

Mr. PROKOFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the report of the Secretary-General, presented to this session of the General Assembly, on Israeli nuclear armament and in connexion with the draft resolution on this item, the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement.

The evaluation of Israel's nuclear programme, which required tremendous efforts in its execution and also its possibility for creating nuclear weapons, has confirmed the misgivings of world public opinion regarding Israel's nuclear ambitions and the creation in that aggressive, expansionist State of a nuclear capacity suitable for military and political purposes.

In this connexion, we should like to stress that the appearance of nuclear weapons in Israel's hands would be a serious threat to peace and international security not only in the Middle East but throughout the world. Therefore, we fully agree with those parts of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30 which

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

note that Israel must adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and that all its nuclear facilities must be placed under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). We should also like to point to that provision in the draft which calls for States to terminate all nuclear collaboration with Israel. It is not a secret, after all, that it is this sort of collaboration on the part of Western countries - and primarily the United States - that to a large extent has made it possible for Israel to disregard the opinion of the international community.

Finally, the Soviet delegation would like to stress that the existing system of IAEA safeguards is a sound and effective instrument for preserving and strengthening the non-proliferation régime. Israel's bandit-like attack on the Iraqi nuclear centre, although it was an attempt to damage the IAEA safeguards system, cannot in any way be taken as an indication of the inadequacy of that system.

Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): At the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, when the First Committee initially dealt with this question, my delegation abstained on the draft resolution before the Committee, but placed on record its views regarding the need for regional security and the halting of the arms race, particularly in the nuclear field.

At subsequent sessions my delegation voted in favour of the relevant draft. We would wish to reiterate that our support then, as now, for the draft resolution on this item was and is based principally on my delegation's genuine desire to see peace established in the Middle East and, obviously, a halt to the escalation of weapons of all kinds in all regions of the world.

However, I wish to record my delegation's continued reservations on the language contained in several paragraphs of the draft, particularly since we are convinced that such an unbalanced approach can only hinder effective implementation. We trust that future texts on this item will take this view into consideration.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): The Swedish Government has on several occasions strongly condemned the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear installation, most recently in the debate on this matter in the General Assembly a fortnight ago. It constituted a flagrant violation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the rules of international law. No circumstances can justify that act, which cannot but negatively affect the efforts to reach a lasting peace in the Middle East.

My Government does not consider Article 51 of the United Nations Charter to be applicable in the way that has been suggested in this case. This would imply that the concept of legitimate self-defence could be extended almost limitlessly to include all conceivable future dangers subjectively defined. The Swedish Government has also expressed its concern with regard to the possible consequences of the attack on the IAEA safeguards system.

Against that background and bearing in mind Sweden's strong commitment to international efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, it is regrettable that the draft resolution is formulated in such a way that my delegation is unable to support it. In the view of my Government, it contains, inter alia, in operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, formulations that cannot be reconciled with the division of responsibilities envisaged by the Charter, as between the General Assembly and the Security Council. That was the reason why we had to vote against those three paragraphs. For that reason, and because of reservations on other parts of the text, my delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

It is my Government's view that all non-nuclear-weapon States should place all nuclear activities in their countries under IAEA safeguards. We therefore fully agree with what is said in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. For the call for full-scope safeguards to be credible, it should however be addressed to all nations that do not yet admit such safeguards on their territories. The Swedish Government hopes that all those nations which will vote in favour of the draft resolution and which have not yet accepted full-scope safeguards will be willing to comply with the same demands that they are making of Israel.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30 as a whole was adopted by 93 votes to 2, with 32 abstentions.*

* Subsequently, the delegation of the Dominican Republic advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

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

Mr. HARRIM (New Zealand): New Zealand abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30, but we wish to emphasize that we fully support the call made in the draft resolution for Israel to place its nuclear facilities under international safeguards. We also consider, as is implicit in the fourth preambular paragraph, that Israel should adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We have already made clear our view that the Israeli attack on Iraq's nuclear facilities was a grave and unjustifiable breach of international law and a severe setback to the search for peace in the Middle East. We also believe that that raid had adverse effects on the non-proliferation régime and weakened the trust placed in the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards system. All this would have justified a positive vote on the draft resolution were it not in particular for those parts of the text which evoke the wording and action provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter which is properly the responsibility of the Security Council.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation felt constrained to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30, entitled "Israeli Nuclear Armament", since it contains numerous paragraphs which are partly or wholly unacceptable to my Government.

In our view, the findings of the expert group are not reflected in the text in a sufficiently comprehensive and balanced manner.

Furthermore, the draft resolution incorporates a number of ideas that are clearly objectionable. I should like to make particular reference to operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, on which indeed my delegation had to vote "no".

Operative paragraphs 5 and 6 unfortunately do not differentiate between military applications of nuclear energy and peaceful uses. Israel, like the vast majority of States here represented, is a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and, under the statute of that organization, is legitimately pursuing scientific and technological co-operation in that domain. There is no reason why the country should be deprived of scientific exchanges in a great number of research areas, for instance in basic nuclear physics. There is nothing illegal about such exchanges between universities, research institutes and private

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of
Germany)

business or intergovernmental research entities on the basis of appropriate arrangements. Operative paragraph 7 is even more clearly out of place in this draft resolution, both in its procedural aspects, which raise grave doubts as to its compatibility with the United Nations Charter, and - obviously - in its content.

In conclusion I should like to reiterate my Government's view that many of the difficulties apparent in this draft resolution could be solved if Israel would adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and submit its nuclear installations to the IAEA safeguards system under that Treaty. Obviously this holds for other countries in the region as well, to the extent that they have not taken positive action on the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Miss DEVER (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Belgium abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30 as a whole and voted against operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, because the text does not adequately reflect the conclusions of the report on Israeli nuclear armament submitted by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly in document A/36/431.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30 furthermore contains references to a question that has no bearing on the nuclear capability of Israel. That question has already been dealt with under agenda item 130. Belgium has already implemented operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution by condemning the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear facilities and the consequent risk to the credibility of the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): On instructions from my Government my delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution relating to Israeli nuclear armament which was sponsored by a number of Arab countries and others. Pursuant to the same clear-cut instructions, the Egyptian delegation would like to state for the record its position, as follows.

First, the Egyptian position on the substance of the matter is entirely in keeping with the contents of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30. Secondly and on the other hand, we have recently witnessed certain Arab delegations adopting a particular attitude on nuclear matters in the Middle East, an attitude which might well jeopardize the efforts currently under way to put an end to any nuclear armament whatsoever in that part of the world. Thirdly, for

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

that reason the Egyptian delegation will closely follow the situation and at the same time will refrain from voting on this matter one way or the other until we have a clearer picture of the intentions of those delegations I have referred to. Our final position will be determined in the light of those facts.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30. This vote should be interpreted as support for our general objective, which is to preserve the area of the Middle East from the danger of nuclear warfare by keeping it free from such armaments. However, this does not mean that we support the methods advocated in the draft resolution, particularly those outlined in operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, on which we abstained when the separate vote was taken on them. At the same time, our position on the Non-Proliferation Treaty is well known. That is why we entered reservations on what is stated on that subject in the draft resolution.

Mr. ZELADA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): The possibility of a deterioration of the conflict in the Middle East by the importation of nuclear weapons into such a disturbed area is indeed a source of justifiable concern for the international community. It is that concern that prompted the Spanish delegation to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30. We fully subscribe to its main preoccupations. However, we should like to state the following with regard to the fourth preambular paragraph.

As we have already had occasion to state during the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, my delegation wishes to reserve its position with regard to the leeway given to States to choose whether or not they should accede to the non-proliferation Treaty.

As far as the operative part of the draft resolution is concerned, my delegation is particularly disquieted by the manner in which paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 have been drafted. Paragraphs 5 and 7 cause us serious difficulties because they refer to matters on which only the Security Council may decide. Paragraph 6 is, furthermore, contrary to the principle of the freedom enjoyed by all States to utilize nuclear technology for peaceful purposes and to co-operate freely among themselves in this field without any discrimination.

For all these reasons, the Spanish delegation abstained in the separate vote that was taken on paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 but we voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): Ireland abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30 as a whole and voted against operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7. Ireland did not vote in favour of resolution 33/71 A or resolution 34/89, which are recalled in this latest draft resolution. Our position now, as then, is that the question of the application of safeguards to Israel cannot be isolated from other related aspects of the non-proliferation régime in the Middle East.

We cannot support the inconsistency of the call on Israel to submit its nuclear facilities to safeguards with the call for an end to all forms of co-operation with Israel in the nuclear field, for we support the right of all nations in the Middle East and elsewhere to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

Ireland has already made clear its position on the Israeli attack on the Iraqi reactor and fully supported Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which condemned that attack. However, we have reservations about the references to the Security Council's role made in the operative part of the present draft resolution.

Mr. SANGARET (Ivory Coast) (interpretation from French): The delegation of the Ivory Coast fully subscribes to most of the ideas contained in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30. In particular, my country has pronounced itself in other forums against the bombing by Israel of Iraqi nuclear facilities. Nevertheless, we consider that, as regards nuclear disarmament, there should be a balanced approach within a regional or world-wide framework. For that reason, my delegation abstained.

Mr. TAVARES NUNES (Portugal) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Portugal condemns acts that create a threat to international peace and security. Therefore my Government and public opinion in my country have condemned the Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations, and our authorities publicly announced this at the time. Furthermore, my delegation has repeatedly declared its support for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We reaffirm our support for the creation of such zones. Therefore my Government views with concern any acts that might endanger the establishment of nuclear-free zones. The acquisition of the capability of manufacturing nuclear weapons is among such acts.

However, my delegation felt obliged to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30 because we have reservations about the wording of several paragraphs, and in particular we deem it excessive to have a general condemnation of any co-operation with Israel. In the opinion of my delegation, co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should not be the subject of condemnation. ~~With that in mind, my delegation voted against operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7.~~

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded action of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.30. We have thus acted upon 11 draft resolutions today, and there remain 16 more for tomorrow.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): I wish to announce the introduction of an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1, introduced today. My delegation has listened with interest to the introduction of that draft resolution. We note that the sponsor of that revised text has made efforts to take into account the difficulties of several delegations with the previous version of his draft resolution. The Committee will recall that our concern, which was shared by the majority of the non-aligned countries, has been to ensure that the task of the United Nations Disarmament Commission will not be detracted from when it meets in 1982. The Disarmament Commission must, in our view, be allowed to complete its deliberations on the guidelines for the expert study on conventional weapons. The results of that work should not be prejudged by the General Assembly.

In order to ensure that those concerns are reflected in the resolution to be adopted and so that it may have the widest possible support, my delegation undertook to consult interested delegations. We are glad to note that there is widespread support for the following amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1, which I will now introduce. My delegation has already handed it to the Secretariat for distribution in written form. This very simple amendment consists of an insertion into operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. It consists of inserting the words "if necessary" between the words "and" and "the deliberations", so that the amendment to paragraph 3 would read as follows:

(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

"Agrees that the expert group should pursue its work after the above-mentioned session of the Disarmament Commission taking into consideration such conclusions as the Commission may submit to it, and, if necessary, the deliberations at the 1981 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, in particular reflected in paragraph 21 and Annex III of the report of that session".

The Brazilian delegation is confident that this amendment will be acceptable to the Committee.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation can support the amendment just proposed by the delegation of Brazil.

In our view this sovereign Assembly is perfectly authorized once more to entrust to the United Nations Disarmament Commission the task of making input into the definition of the mandate of the expert group on all aspects of conventional disarmament, the Commission not having entirely succeeded in its assignment during its 1981 session.

I am confident that under this mandate the Commission will do a good job during its 1982 session and make a constructive input into the work expert group that we are about to establish. As soon as the United Nations Disarmament Commission's work has had good results, which will surely take into account its 1981 work, that former work will be superseded and the experts will have every interest in organizing their work along the lines of the Commission's 1982 recommendation.

However, it is certainly not unwise for seasoned delegates also to hedge against the possibility that the United Nations Disarmament Commission will experience difficulties in arriving at an agreed input into the experts' work. In that eventuality, the amendment will in our view guarantee that the experts will, for lack of more up-to-date guidance, be able to fall back on the results of the work done at the previous session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, specifically the excellent comprehensive working papers prepared under the chairmanship of Ambassador Hepburn of the Bahamas.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal
Republic of Germany)

There is not the slightest intention on the part of my delegation to encroach upon the jurisdiction of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, but in case the Commission does not function as we would wish during its forthcoming substantive session we must make sure that under no circumstances will the expert group find itself without a mandate. Such an unwelcome situation is, in our view, the situation to which the amendment's words, "if necessary", refer, and it is the one in which the 1981 papers of the United Nations Disarmament Commission would take on their full significance.

It is in this spirit that my delegation endorses the amendment proposed by the delegation of Brazil.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.