



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 35TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

Draft resolutions were introduced by:

Mr. Wegener (Federal Republic of Germany)  
Mr. Lidgard (Sweden)  
Mr. Djeki: (Yugoslavia)

- A/C.1/37/L.33 and L.35  
- A/C.1/37/L.30  
- A/C.1/37/L.27

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

\* 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.1/37/PV.35  
22 November 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now continue its consideration of and action upon draft resolutions under all disarmament items. Before calling on the first speaker for this morning I should like to remind members of the Committee that the deadline for submission of draft resolutions under all disarmament items is 1 p.m. today.

I now call on the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to introduce two draft resolutions.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): I have the honour of introducing, under agenda item 133 (b), draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.35, on confidence-building measures. I am proud to report that the draft has been sponsored by more than 30 delegations - namely, apart from my own, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Mauritania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Zaire.

It is my privilege to express gratitude to the other sponsors joining in this endeavour. As in the case of resolutions of the General Assembly on the theme of confidence-building measures in the past three years, the current draft resolution has found broad support among delegations representing all regional groups. It is therefore the hope of my delegation that the draft resolution can be adopted by consensus. In fact, it has been drafted with that objective in mind. The text at present before the Committee reflects helpful contributions by a number of sponsors and other interested delegations, for which my delegation is also grateful.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

It is indeed desirable that the important subject of confidence-building measures again be a consensus item in the deliberations of this Committee. All delegations in this room now basically agree that confidence among States, and measures to enhance confidence, can play an important role with regard to regional and world-wide stability and can make a major contribution to progress in disarmament. A comprehensive study on confidence-building measures prepared by the Secretary-General with the assistance of a group of qualified governmental experts has contributed substantially to sharpening the concept of confidence-building measures and to introducing it into our discussions as an important tool of our work.

Obviously, while confidence-building measures can play a very significant role in achieving disarmament, they cannot serve as a substitute for concrete disarmament measures. Rather, there is a reciprocal relationship -- as the experts in the comprehensive study also stressed -- between confidence-building measures as such and specific measures to promote disarmament which will mutually enhance one another as they unfold.

The fact that confidence-building measures are widely considered useful and are supported by this Assembly obviates the need for me to place them in a broader philosophical framework at this time. All delegations now possess a good grasp of the concept. My delegation submitted a working paper on confidence-building measures at the second special session on disarmament, summarizing, as it were, the state of the art and making suggestions for further work on the subject. In its statement in the General Assembly on 27 October my delegation had an opportunity to outline the draft resolution that is now before the Committee. Hence it will now be sufficient if I briefly recall the operational thrust of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

In the first place, the draft resolution undertakes to maintain the momentum which has been created by previous resolutions, encouraging States to give emphasis to such confidence-building measures in various ways. Operative paragraph 2 repeats verbatim last year's exhortation to all States to consider the possible introduction of confidence-building measures in their particular regions and to include them in their international transactions in a form well adapted to their regional requirements. That general exhortation found a consensus last year and should not pose a problem to any delegation. The pivotal operational paragraph of the draft resolution is operative paragraph 3, which would entrust the Disarmament Commission with the elaboration of guidelines for the future conduct of States, spelling out appropriate types of confidence-building measures, as well as behavioural yardsticks for the implementation of such measures on a global or regional level.

This important work assignment for the United Nations Disarmament Commission should also be understood as an expression of my delegation's confidence in the capability and role of the Disarmament Commission, which in our expectation is called upon to deal with a limited number of essential points on our disarmament agenda, so that it can make constructive and concrete recommendations to this Assembly. Shortly we will be engaged in a selective process, pin-pointing the subject-matter on which the Commission could make its input felt in a particularly helpful way.

My delegation and those of the other sponsors confidently hope that the question of guidelines on confidence-building measures will be included in that subject-matter by next spring and will form a work area in which the Commission can make a particularly useful imprint. In formulating the guidelines, the members of the Commission will be able to draw upon various recommendations contained in the comprehensive study in working paper A/S-12/AC.1/38 and on the fairly large body of literature on the subject that has already accumulated.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

The Commission will certainly see the need to stipulate, at an appropriate time, its own time-frame for the work it will undertake. While the draft resolution invites the Commission only to give a progress report to the General Assembly after its first substantive session, the conclusion of its work in 1984 and a final report to the subsequent session of the General Assembly could well be envisaged.

Concluding this part of my statement, I would again commend draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.35 for the attention of delegations, in the hope that a consensus can be found when it is put before the First Committee for a decision.

I should like to take the opportunity also to introduce, under agenda item 55 (a) and, as we understand it, also agenda item 139, draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.33, on the subject of radiological weapons. This draft is designed as a follow-up to resolution 36/97 B of 9 December 1981 and is deliberately placed in the tradition of consensus resolutions on this item. As with regard to other items currently under negotiation in the Committee on Disarmament, the First Committee has always thought it wise to give its view on all treaty negotiations currently under way in the Committee on Disarmament and, from the high vantage point of the General Assembly, to instil a new political momentum into the ongoing negotiation processes. This is what the present draft resolution also attempts to do. In its language it takes stock of the present status of negotiations and exhorts the Committee on Disarmament to make haste in finalizing the project. For the first time, questions relating to the peaceful application of nuclear technology and especially the proposed prohibition of military attacks on nuclear facilities, are also mentioned in a draft, in the sense that the Committee on Disarmament should continue its search for solutions to the pending issues in this field.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

The draft resolution is also sponsored by Hungary, Japan and Sweden, delegations to which I am grateful. As can readily be seen from this list of co-sponsors, representing important regional groups, this draft resolution is again worded in language which should enable us to reach consensus. In any event, it is with a future consensus in mind that my delegation, having had the honour of presiding over the negotiating group on radiological weapons during the past working year, has introduced this resolution into our debates.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): On behalf of the delegations of Mexico, Nigeria and Sweden, I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.30, which deals with the implementation of the recommendations included in the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. This report was published on 1 June 1982, and was presented to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament by the present Prime Minister of Sweden, Mr. Olof Palme, Chairman of the Commission, on 23 June at a meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee.

The Commission was set up in September 1980. Its members were invited by the Chairman to serve in a private capacity and not under instructions from their respective Governments. None the less, the Commission included many prominent present and former representatives of Member States of the United Nations. The broad participation from East, West and South was notable.

Against this background it is remarkable that the Commission arrived at a consensus report, including many important proposals, but perhaps above all a concept which seems eminently well designed to guide us in our future disarmament work, namely, the concept of common security. The Commission proposes that a doctrine of common security must replace the present expedient of deterrence through armaments. International peace must rest on a commitment to joint survival rather than a threat of mutual destruction. This is the basic idea of the report, which proposes practical methods of reducing the danger and the immense economic burden both of nuclear ~~and~~ of conventional armaments.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

On nuclear weapons, it proposes ways of curbing the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. It sets out detailed steps for reducing by negotiation their presence in Europe and preventing their wider proliferation.

It advocates a complete ban on chemical weapons and suggests means of stabilizing the balance of conventional forces as between East and West in Europe.

The report suggests measures whereby the military security of third-world nations could be increased, their motives for acquiring armaments reduced and their economic security thus enhanced. It also suggests ways of strengthening the security role of the United Nations in accordance with the original aims of the United Nations.

In the view of my own and many other delegations, these proposals need to be carefully considered within the United Nations system. Some of the ideas contained in the report may be discussed in connection with existing proposals now being dealt with by this Committee and other committees. But many proposals are new. How to act on them should in our view be considered thoroughly. We are convinced that the United Nations Disarmament Commission provides a suitable forum for such deliberations.

The draft resolution which we submitted yesterday has, in brief, the following structure. In the preambular part the resolution refers to the alarming state of the arms race and the risks it causes to the survival of mankind. The central role of the United Nations in furthering common security and the cause of disarmament is underlined. It is stated that the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues has made an important contribution to the discussion and deliberation on disarmament and security issues and that its recommendations and proposals should be further considered within the United Nations system. Moreover, it is noted that the recommendations in the report of the Commission were addressed to Governments and to the United Nations and its organs.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

In operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution the Secretary-General is requested to submit the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues to the United Nations Disarmament Commission. My delegation and many others consider it important that specific tasks of this kind be given to the Disarmament Commission by the General Assembly and that new initiatives be duly considered by the Commission.

Operative paragraph 2 requests the Disarmament Commission to consider those recommendations and proposals in the report that relate to disarmament and arms limitation and to suggest, in a report to the General Assembly, how best to ensure an effective follow-up thereof, within the United Nations system or otherwise.

According to the third and last operative paragraph, the General Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-eighth session an item entitled "The Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues: report of the Disarmament Commission".

In view of the broad composition of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, which included prominent political leaders and officials from East, West and South, and the need to consider new and constructive initiatives, it is the hope of the sponsors of this draft resolution that it will be generally accepted. It is an attempt to build on a new and constructive approach to disarmament issues, namely, the fact that there is no other security but our common security and that international peace must rest on a commitment to joint survival rather than on a threat of mutual destruction.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): On behalf of the following group of sponsors - Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Venezuela, Zaire and Yugoslavia - I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.27, concerning the report of the Committee on Disarmament.



(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

This year again we witness an obvious exacerbation of the situation regarding negotiations at all levels in the sphere of disarmament. Perennial negotiations on the part of some nuclear-weapon States on some significant issues of disarmament that were interrupted earlier have not been resumed this year. Negotiations between the two major nuclear Powers on strategic nuclear weapons as well as on medium-range nuclear weapons have not yielded the hoped-for results. Negotiations between the two blocs on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe have been at a standstill for years. Regrettably, the situation regarding multilateral negotiations conducted within the framework of the Committee on Disarmament is no less grave.

At the first special session on disarmament the international community entrusted the Committee, as the single multilateral negotiating body in the sphere of disarmament, with particularly important and responsible tasks. The Committee had the task of negotiating on all major issues of disarmament and of contributing with concrete results to the attainment of the goals that were unanimously adopted regarding the halting of the arms race and the launching of the process of genuine disarmament, in particular, nuclear disarmament. Precisely for that reason the work of the Committee on Disarmament is the focal-point of attention.

The report submitted by the Committee on Disarmament to the General Assembly gives cause for grave concern. It confirms that the Committee, again this year, has been unable, despite the intensified activity and endeavours of a number of its members, to contribute to the successful outcome of negotiations or to achieve concrete results on any substantive issue on its agenda. That also includes the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, a draft of which was to be submitted for consideration and adoption by the second special session on disarmament.

Another fact emerging from the annual report of the Committee on Disarmament is cause for the greatest concern. The Programme of Action of the first special session on disarmament placed the issue of nuclear disarmament as the first priority in negotiations on disarmament. That was done

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

because of the assessment that nuclear weapons posed the greatest danger to mankind and that it was essential to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects in order to prevent the threat of war. The programme of action unequivocally stated that negotiations on nuclear disarmament were to be urgently undertaken and emphasized that nuclear-weapon States had primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament and that those among them possessing the most important nuclear arsenals bore a special responsibility.

The report of the Committee on Disarmament again shows that the Committee was unable to undertake negotiations on issues concerning the halting of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. We must note with concern that a small number of members of the Committee, among them some nuclear-weapon States, continue to oppose any substantial negotiations on those issues in the Committee. They continue to oppose the setting up of an ad hoc working group for negotiations on nuclear disarmament, thus preventing the Committee from fulfilling one of its most important negotiating tasks.

The sponsors of this draft resolution consider as completely unacceptable the view that negotiations on substantial issues, such as the halting of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, should not be conducted in the Committee on Disarmament. Those issues deal with the further development, and even the survival, of the entire international community. The sponsors deeply believe that the Committee on Disarmament is duty-bound to contribute fully to the solution of such issues and that those that are preventing it from doing so bear a very great responsibility.

The sponsors attach great importance to the Committee on Disarmament. In elaborating the draft, the sponsors were motivated, as on other occasions, by the desire to support the Committee and to enable it to become an effective and reliable international negotiating body on disarmament issues.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

The preambular part of the draft, inter alia, affirms that the establishment of ad hoc working groups offers the best available machinery for the conduct of multilateral negotiations on items on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament and contributes to the strengthening of the negotiating role of that Committee. In addition, it notes that the Committee on Disarmament has set up an ad hoc working group under item 1 of its agenda entitled "Nuclear test ban", and expresses regret that, despite the expressed wish of the great majority of members of the Committee on Disarmament, the establishment of an ad hoc working group to undertake multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament was once again prevented during the 1982 session of the Committee. The draft expresses deep concern and disappointment that the Committee on Disarmament has not thus far been able to reach concrete agreements on disarmament issues, particularly on those to which the United Nations has assigned the greatest priority and urgency. It expresses the conviction that the Committee on Disarmament, as the single multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, should play the central role in substantive negotiations on priority questions of disarmament and on the implementation of the Programme of Action adopted at the first special session on disarmament. Finally, it stresses that negotiations on specific disarmament issues conducted outside the Committee on Disarmament should in no way serve as a pretext for preventing the conduct of multilateral negotiations on such questions in the Committee.

In the operative part of the draft resolution, the Committee is urged to continue or undertake, during its 1983 session, substantive negotiations on the priority questions on its agenda and to provide the existing ad hoc working groups with appropriate negotiating mandates and to establish, as a matter of urgency, an ad hoc working group on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament.

Operative paragraph 2 requests the Committee on Disarmament to intensify its work, to make the utmost effort to achieve concrete results in the shortest possible period of time and to prepare draft international agreements on the specific priority issues of disarmament on its agenda, above all on a treaty on a nuclear-weapon-test ban and on the complete and effective prohibition of all chemical weapons and on their destruction.

Operative paragraph 3 requests the Committee on Disarmament to continue as from the beginning of its session in 1983, in accordance with the Concluding Document of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, its intensive work on the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, and to submit the revised draft of such a programme to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session.

Operative paragraph 4 invites the members of the Committee on Disarmament involved in separate negotiations on specific priority questions of disarmament to intensify their efforts to achieve a positive conclusion of those negotiations without further delay and to submit to the Committee a full report on their separate negotiations and the results achieved in order to contribute most directly to the negotiations.

Finally, in operative paragraphs 5 and 6, the Committee on Disarmament is requested to submit a report on its work to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session and it is decided to include in the provisional agenda of the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly the item entitled "Report of the Committee on Disarmament".

I should like, in conclusion, to express the conviction of the sponsors that the proposed draft resolution will meet the broad support of the members of the First Committee and of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

## ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform representatives that it is the intention of the Chair to suggest that the Committee should take decisions on draft resolutions in the following order.

On Monday, 22 November, the Committee would take decisions on the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/37/L.9, L.12, L.16, L.20, L.23, L.24, L.25, L.32, L.33 and L.35.

On Tuesday, 23 November, the Committee would take decisions on the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/37/L.3/Rev.1, L.4/Rev.1, L.6, L.10, L.13, L.14, L.17 and L.21.

On Wednesday, 24 November, the Committee would take decisions on the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/37/L.2, L.15, L.18, L.19, L.22 and L.27.

On Friday, 26 November, the Committee would take decisions on the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/37/L.7, L.8 and L.26.

There will of course be further additions of draft resolutions to those I have just mentioned on the respective dates and they will be announced by the Chair as we go along.

I have been informed by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean that the Committee is in the process of finalizing its report to the General Assembly. He has expressed the wish to have a few days more for the conclusion of its work. I suggest extending the period for the submission of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean until 26 November. I am told that this is in accordance with tradition in this Committee. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean has become notorious for submitting its report late. I therefore have no alternative but to suggest extending the period until 26 November. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee so decides.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.