



**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 39th MEETING**

Chairman: Mr. ROCHE (Canada)

**CONTENTS**

**CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS**  
[51 to 69, 139, 141 and 145] (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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

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

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will take action on draft resolutions in cluster 8 - draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1, L.59 and L.67; and cluster 13 - draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.16/Rev.1, L.17, L.20/Rev.1 and L.37. If we have time we shall return to cluster 9 and take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.38/Rev.1.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): After lengthy and productive consultations on the text of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.38, a number of revisions have been agreed upon. The revised text has been issued as document A/C.1/43/L.38/Rev.1. I wish in this statement to call attention to the basic changes.

Operative paragraph 1 now reads as follows:

"Reaffirms that effective measures should be undertaken to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction;"

Operative paragraph 3 now reads as follows:

"Calls upon all States, immediately following the recommendation of the Conference on Disarmament, to give favourable consideration to these recommendations;"

Operative paragraph 6 now reads as follows:

"Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-fifth session the item entitled 'Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament'."

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

I wish also to introduce orally a further revision. The second paragraph of the preamble should now read as follows:

"Noting paragraph 77 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly".

The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR hopes that these revisions will make it possible for the draft resolution to enjoy the broadest possible support.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolutions in cluster 8. As members know, there have been intensive consultations on these draft resolutions. I myself have participated in several of these very important consultations, and it is my understanding that the Committee is now in a position to adopt them without a vote.

I call first on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform members of the Committee that the following States have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/43/L.22/Rev.1: Bolivia and Norway

A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1: Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on representatives wishing to make statements on draft resolutions in cluster 8.

Mr. OBEIDAT (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): The Committee is about to take action on draft resolutions relating to chemical disarmament, and the members of the Arab Group, on whose behalf I am speaking, wish to indicate their conviction that stress must be placed on the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, the first devoted to disarmament. That document sets out priorities for disarmament, giving the highest priority to nuclear disarmament and stressing that effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war are the top priorities.

(Mr. Obeidat, Jordan)

As the Final Document emphasizes, real progress in the field of nuclear disarmament could create an atmosphere conducive to progress in other disarmament fields. Emphasis should also be put on agreed priorities for disarmament and on the preparation of a multilateral convention on the effective and complete prohibition of the production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and their destruction, within the framework of disarmament priorities. The Arab Group urges the Conference on Disarmament to intensify negotiations in 1988 with a view to achieving such a convention.

The Arab Group considers that the initiative taken to hold a conference at Paris from 7 to 11 January 1989 of the States parties to the 1925 Geneva Protocol, along with other States, is a constructive and positive step. It hopes that that conference will give further support to the Conference on Disarmament. In that connection the Arab Group would recall the words of the President of France in his address to the General Assembly on 29 September. He stated:

"Of course, the banning of chemical weapons could not be imposed on some if others, including the nuclear Powers, retained a clear field for themselves and did not persevere in their desire for nuclear disarmament." (A/43/PV.10, p. 13)

The Arab Group views as constructive and positive the draft resolutions submitted on this subject. We are seeking to join in the consensus on those draft resolutions and, accordingly, we will also join any consensus that emerges within the Committee that is aimed at achieving progress towards the elimination of chemical weapons as well as of nuclear weapons, both of which aims should be pursued with the same enthusiasm and vitality.

Mr. HOULLEZ (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to state the position of my Government on draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1 and A/C.1/43/L.67. Along with many other delegations from all groups and persuasions, Belgium is a sponsor of those two draft resolutions, which have already been introduced in statements by, respectively, the representative of Australia and the representative of Poland.

My delegation would hope that the broad sponsorship of the draft resolutions, along with the adhesion of the Group of Arab States, could lead to their adoption by consensus. We would view that as a confirmation of the great importance the international community attaches to all aspects of the question of chemical weapons. We would particularly like to voice our hope in the forthcoming high-level conference at Paris and in the completion by the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva at the earliest possible date of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of all chemical weapons and their destruction.

In view of the particular interest my country has always shown in questions having to do with chemical weapons, we will continue to contribute actively to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to apologize for not having done so earlier, but I should like to point out that the delegation of Uruguay would like to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.67.

The CHAIRMAN: The request of the representative of Uruguay will be noted.

The Committee is now prepared to proceed with the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1, the programme budget implications of which are contained in A/C.1/43/L.79. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 36th meeting of the First Committee on 14 November and is sponsored by the following: Australia, Austria, Belgium,

(The Chairman)

Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Ecuador, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Liberia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, Uruguay and Zaire.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objections, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee, who wishes to make an announcement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to make the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.59, "Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction".

By the terms of operative paragraph 4 of that draft resolution the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services as may be required for the implementation of the relevant parts of the Final Declaration of the Second Review Conference on the biological weapons Convention. The wording of operative paragraph 4 is identical to that of operative paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 42/37 B adopted last year. Consequently, it should be reiterated that the Secretary-General considers that if the draft resolution is adopted by the General Assembly, he would be required to render technical services and assistance to States parties to the Convention with a view to enabling them to implement relevant parts of the Final Declaration of the

(Mr. Kheradi)

Review Conference, it being understood that such services and assistance would have no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that all related costs would be met by the States parties to the Convention, in accordance with the rules of procedure adopted by the Second Review Conference.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take up draft resolution

A/C.1/43/L.59. The programme budget implications have just been read out by the Secretary. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Austria at the 27th meeting of the First Committee on 4 November and has the following sponsors: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Mongolia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Zaire.

(The Chairman)

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. There being no objection, I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.59 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.67. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 36th meeting of the First Committee, held on 14 November, and is sponsored by the delegations of Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Kingdom, Viet Nam and Uruguay. The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. There being no objection, I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.67 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to congratulate the whole Committee on the major step forward represented by the manner in which it adopted the draft resolutions in cluster 8. This shows that when time is built into the programme for sufficient consultations, such consultations can indeed be very productive thanks to the very positive and constructive atmosphere created by members throughout the proceedings and enhanced in our deliberations on these draft resolutions.

I call now on delegations wishing to explain their positions on the draft resolutions just adopted.



Mr. MAHALLATI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation wishes to comment on draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1 and L.67, which relate to a disarmament issue of the greatest importance: chemical weapons.

The use of chemical weapons against my country during the past few years is now a very well known fact established by reports produced by United Nations investigating teams. However, no practical measures have been taken by the United Nations, representing the international community, to stop the use of chemical weapons, and no action-oriented decisions have been made to prevent the use of these inhuman weapons proscribed by the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

As we are all well aware, the absence of action by the international community led to a situation in which chemical weapons were used in an intensified and extensive manner, with innocent civilian populations their victims.

The first positive step in the direction of upholding the authority of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 was taken in this Committee last year; this led to the adoption by consensus of resolution 42/37 C. But we regret to say that the resolution, owing to certain technical problems that arose, has not yet been implemented.

Security Council resolution 620 (1988), adopted on 26 August 1988, was another encouraging step towards more responsible action to ban the use of chemical weapons. In that resolution the Security Council for the first time separated the issue of chemical weapons from all other aspects of the imposed war. That view is clearly reflected in Security Council resolution 620 (1988), whose paragraph 4 decides that appropriate measures must be taken should there be any future use of chemical weapons in violation of international law, wherever and by whomever committed.

(Mr. Mahallati, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

During the current session of the First Committee, two draft resolutions pertaining to chemical weapons were submitted. In the view of my delegation, it is a well-established practice in United Nations deliberations that in any draft resolution clear reference should be made to the precedents, and particularly to relevant United Nations documents and resolutions. Unfortunately, this important element is absent from these draft resolutions.

As has been stated, reference to the past record and especially to Security Council resolution 620 (1988) has the utmost importance with respect to chemical weapons. Any negligence in this regard cannot be interpreted as anything other than an attempt to undermine a Security Council resolution. After all, we have to bear in mind that the Charter confers on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and that Member States have agreed to accept and carry out its decisions in accordance with the Charter.

Therefore, as emphasized by many delegations in this Committee, we should show our commitment to banning chemical weapons by standing firmly against any blackmail or intimidation by those who were involved in the crime of using these weapons and who are now trying, by breaking the consensus, to prevent the adoption of effective resolutions.

Most members of this Committee are fortunate enough not to have been confronted by chemical weapons or even to have seen the victims of chemical weapons. Let me share an experience with all representatives: the agony portrayed in the pictures of those little boys and girls who were victims of chemical weapons, which caused great pain and anguish until most of them perished. Let us not forget the horrible effects of these heinous weapons and the danger of their proliferation.

(Mr. Mahallati, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

It is therefore imperative that we stick to principles and not give in to intimidation or abuse in the name of reaching consensus. The deliberations and consultations held in the past few days on the two draft resolutions clearly manifest the fact that certain circles, directly or indirectly involved in the proliferation or use of chemical weapons in the past, are now making efforts to prevent any action by the United Nations.

On the other hand, valuable attempts by a few countries such as Australia, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and Sweden to prepare draft resolutions to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol are praiseworthy.

Now, draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1 and L.67 have been adopted, but it should be noted that the wording of both draft resolutions is even weaker than Security Council resolution 620 (1988).

(Mr. Mahallati, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

In our view the draft resolution ought to have been amended to make a stronger commitment to upholding the Geneva Protocol of 1925. Although we are not satisfied with the final text of these two draft resolutions because of some shortcomings, including the absence of clear reference to past records, which is a procedure followed by the United Nations, and the lack of a logical link between what has already happened and the future, nevertheless we decided not to place an obstacle in the way of consensus. That is why, regrettably, we have to state for the record that we could not participate in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.67.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the United Kingdom's position on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1. We have been happy to join in the consensus on that draft resolution. The United Kingdom gives high priority to the conclusion of a comprehensive, global and effectively verifiable chemical weapons convention. A number of difficult technical problems remain to be solved, especially on the key issue of verification, but the United Kingdom is committed to working actively and positively to reach a conclusion to the negotiations as soon as practicable.

We also strongly support the measures taken by the United Nations to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and we were closely involved in the drafting and adoption of Security Council resolutions 612 (1988) and 620 (1988), which we consider major steps forward.

As regards operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1, I should like to thank the Ambassador of Australia for the explanation he gave in introducing the draft text concerning participation in the group of qualified experts. The United Kingdom looks forward to participating in and contributing to the work of the group.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): Our delegation has joined in support of one of the most important draft resolutions on which this Committee is taking action during its 1988 session, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.67, dealing with the ongoing negotiations on chemical weapons in the Conference on Disarmament and with the forthcoming conference on chemical weapons use under the 1925 Geneva Protocol. I want to reaffirm once again our strong support both for the Conference in Paris and for the Geneva negotiations. We fully expect that the Conference on chemical weapons use will provide an opportunity to reaffirm and thereby to strengthen our common commitment to the prohibitions contained in the Geneva Protocol and other customary rules of international law. In addition, we fully expect that Conference to provide a strong impetus to the ongoing negotiations in Geneva.

In operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.67 the Conference on Disarmament is urged to intensify its negotiations, by such means, inter alia, as increasing the time devoted to them. Our delegation believes that this aspect of paragraph 3 should be placed in proper perspective. In our view, the question is not so much whether a given number of days or hours are set aside for negotiations, as whether the negotiating time is being used productively and efficiently by all members of the Conference on Disarmament. The United States delegation in Geneva has intensified its negotiations and has increased the time it devotes to chemical weapons negotiations. It has been engaged intensively in the multilateral negotiations. It has also engaged in a series of some nine intensive bilateral discussions with the Soviet Union, these talks being designed to complement the multilateral efforts. We encourage other delegations in the Conference on Disarmament that have not yet entered the dialogue across the full range of issues to make the necessary commitment to do so and to intensify their efforts to

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

resolve remaining differences. Perhaps we would then record even more substantive progress in our efforts during 1989.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now completed our action on cluster 8. The Committee will now take up cluster 13. Does any delegation wish to speak on cluster 13?

Mr. BARNEWITZ (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic would like to put forward a few ideas on naval confidence-building measures in connection with agenda item 64 (h) entitled "Naval armaments and disarmament".

The issue of disarmament on the seas and oceans is becoming an integral part of the disarmament process, be it on the regional or the global level. As the process of reducing strategic offensive armaments and the conventional forces in Europe continues and as measures to control the activities of land forces and to increase mutual trust and confidence are broadened and deepened, the problem of limiting and reducing naval armaments and spreading confidence- and security-building measures to independent naval activities comes to the fore.

Naval forces, especially their nuclear components, are increasingly becoming a factor destabilizing the situation in various regions and the world as a whole. In the face of the huge destructive potential of nuclear and conventional weapons concentrated on surface ships and submarines and in view of their operational capabilities, the reliable security of States cannot be guaranteed unless naval armaments are limited and eventually reduced and certain categories of naval activities are restrained.

Current developments, including the course of discussion on naval issues in the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the third special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly and the First Committee, indicate that the

(Mr. Barnewitz, German  
Democratic Republic)

objective of limiting and reducing naval armaments can be practically achieved through a step-by-step approach, beginning with relatively simple measures in respect of which the elements of mutual understanding already exist.

Priority should in this context be given to confidence- and security-building measures and to steps to strengthen guarantees for the safety of shipping. More particularly, the measures to be elaborated should focus on the following: first, measures to guarantee the safety of shipping and the peaceful exploration and exploitation of maritime resources, including the conclusion of multilateral agreements on the prevention of incidents on and over high seas in addition to existing bilateral agreements, the elaboration of safety measures for maritime communications, the prohibition of exercises, manoeuvres and major concentrations of naval forces in international straits and zones of intensive shipping, fisheries and other peaceful maritime activities as well as in the airspace above; the adoption of multilateral measures for the prevention of threats to the freedom of shipping, for instance, the creation in specific instances of United Nations naval forces, and the elaboration of international co-operative measures for the prevention and fighting of piracy; secondly, measures to ensure openness, transparency and predictability in the naval field, including an exchange of objective information and data on naval matters and capacities, prior notification of movements and manoeuvres by naval forces and the associated air forces, invitation of observers to naval exercises and manoeuvres, notification by all nuclear-weapon States of the presence or absence of nuclear weapons on board their ships entering ports of other countries, and discussions on operational patterns of naval forces;

(Mr. Barnewitz, German  
Democratic Republic)

thirdly, measures to limit and reduce naval activities in order gradually to reduce the potential for surprise attack and power projection from the sea, including the establishment of zones of decreased densities of naval forces in sectors of the major international ocean routes, strict observance of the existing nuclear-weapon-free zones in Latin America and the southern Pacific as well as initiation of a process of creating a zone of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic and a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, limitation of areas for deployment of naval forces relevant to surprise attack (fleet strike forces and amphibious forces, for example), mutual withdrawal of specific types of naval armaments from specified regions of the oceans and seas (especially from regions where the potential for conflict or crisis is high), limitation of the number of vessels equipped with tactical nuclear weapons and limitation and reduction of naval activities with potentially destabilizing effects; fourthly, measures to guarantee effective and strict verification, including the elaboration of an integrated verification system that may involve international mechanisms and procedures under United Nations auspices, appropriate forms of on-site challenge inspections and the use of national technical means.

During the 1988 session of the Disarmament Commission and the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, States from all groups urged the elaboration of naval confidence- and security-building measures. It is our firm conviction that the Disarmament Commission is capable of making a useful and constructive contribution to that end, especially in view of the fact that progress has been made in 1988 in the deliberations on naval disarmament as well as on confidence-building measures in general.

The adoption of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures by consensus offers new possibilities for the work of the Disarmament



(Mr. Barnewitz, German  
Democratic Republic)

Commission concerning confidence- and security-building measures. The drafting and adoption of such measures may pave the way for negotiations on limitations and substantial reductions of naval armaments.

The ultimate goal of the negotiations should be to bring about a situation in which the military strength, armaments and organizational structure of States' naval forces would be limited to the level of requirements for self-defence and the protection of their friends and allies, but be insufficient for the conduct of offensive operations. In order to achieve such a situation, all opportunities for global, regional and bilateral approaches should be used.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukrainian SSR) (interpretation from Russian): Our delegation has taken the floor on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.20 - Cameroon, Czechoslovakia and the Ukraine - to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to changes that were made in the text of the draft resolution, as a result of which it has been reissued as document A/C.1/43/L.20/Rev.1.

The draft resolution is submitted under agenda item 64(g) and deals with the implementation of General Assembly resolutions in the field of disarmament. After consultations with the delegations involved, and taking account of their positions, the sponsors, guided by a spirit of co-operation and in order to ensure greater support, decided to delete operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.20. There has therefore been a change in the numeration of the remaining operative paragraphs of the draft resolution.

Thanks to those changes, the draft resolution was brought as much closer as was possible to the text adopted on the question at the last session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 20/Rev.1 express the hope that it will meet with the support of as many delegations as possible.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any delegation wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting on resolutions in cluster 13, namely, A/C.1/43/L.16/Rev.1, A/C.1/43/L.17, A/C.1/43/L. 20/Rev.1 and A/C.1/43/L.37? If not, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.16/Rev.1.

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Czechoslovakia at the 35th meeting of the First Committee on 14 November.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted by 116 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.17.

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Czechoslovakia at the 35th meeting of the First Committee on 14 November and has the following sponsors: Cuba, Czechoslovakia and the USSR.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote.

May I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly?

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.17 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 20/Rev.1.

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee on 9 November and has the following sponsors: Cameroon, Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian SSR.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), 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, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted by 106 votes to 2, with 24 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn next to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.37. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, held on 7 November, and is sponsored by the delegations of Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, China, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, Iceland, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: None

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 37 was adopted by 134 votes to 1.

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

Mr. HU Xiaodi (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 20/Rev.1. By that draft resolution the General Assembly would state that it deemed it important that all Member States make every effort to facilitate the consistent implementation of General Assembly resolutions. In our view, that is of great significance.

(Mr. Hu Xiaodi, China)

It must, however, be observed that over the years numerous resolutions on disarmament have been adopted by the United Nations. States have their own positions on those resolutions, and on some questions there is a wide gap between the positions of different States: major differences can exist. The fact that China voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.20/Rev.1 does not mean we have changed our position with respect to some resolutions on disarmament.

Ms. COURTNEY (Australia): Australia abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.20/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolutions in the field of disarmament". We abstained last year on a similar draft resolution and our position has remained unchanged. We do not see value in a draft resolution calling for the implementation of a whole class of resolutions when that could well mean that States are asked to implement resolutions they might have voted against.

Nor do we see any good purpose being served by an annual report from the Secretary-General, as proposed in the draft resolution, especially when in many resolutions themselves the Secretary-General is called upon to report to the General Assembly at a subsequent session.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded action on those draft resolutions in cluster 13 that were ready for action today.

Tomorrow, the Committee will take up draft resolutions in cluster 4 - draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.26/Rev.1; cluster 6 - draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.31 A and L.31 B; cluster 9 - draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.38/Rev.1, L.62/Rev.2 and L.72; cluster 10 - draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.70; cluster 11 - draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.19/Rev.2 and L.61/Rev.2; and cluster 13 - draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.24, L.46, L.50, L.54/Rev.1, L.65 and L.66.

(The Chairman)

On Friday, we shall take up draft resolutions in cluster 10 - draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L. 22/Rev.1 and L. 35; cluster 12; and cluster 15.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.