



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 41st 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 780, 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 4.40 p.m.

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

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

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

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

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French):

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,
Zaire)

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nsengeya,
Zaire)

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

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

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

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

The new draft resolution stresses that the issue of verification of and compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements is a matter of concern to all nations. It recalls that the United Nations is already playing a useful role in the field of verification. Furthermore, it recognizes that the United Nations, in accordance with its role and responsibilities under the Charter, can make a significant contribution in the field of verification, particularly of multilateral agreements. The draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to undertake, with the assistance of a group of qualified governmental experts, an in-depth study of the role of the United Nations in the field of verification which would, inter alia, provide specific recommendations for future action by the United Nations in this context.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75 is being submitted after extensive consultations. It goes without saying that none of the negotiating parties can be fully satisfied with the final result. The text does, however, contain a number of important elements which we believe command broad support in this Committee. It is our hope that this draft resolution will in fact be adopted without a vote.

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

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Morrison, Canada)

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75 represents the culmination of a long period of intensive consultation and negotiations spanning many months. It reflects a compromise and a delicate balance among differing approaches. Although it does not contain all that we would have wished, we consider that it represents a realistic, reasonable and mature approach. It is a draft resolution which, we believe, will advance significantly the consideration of verification in all its aspects.

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

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

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

(Mr. Morrison, Canada)

The draft resolution which has been introduced today represents a further movement in this step-by-step process, an approach which is firmly founded on widespread support. It uses as its foundation the past consensus that has developed on this issue. Moreover, it proposes a further constructive step in this process: a study by a United Nations group of experts. Such a study will allow the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of qualified governmental experts, to bring to bear technical skills in order to assist in the definition of an appropriate and useful role for the United Nations in the field of verification, in the first place of multilateral agreements and, furthermore, of regional and bilateral agreements if the parties thereto so desire. In our view, their work, like that already conducted by the United Nations, should be characterized by realism and by consensus. Any recommendations put forward will be relevant, have an impact and lead to practical results only if they reflect the common views of the members of the group.

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

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

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

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

The agenda of the Conference has on it issues of the highest priority, such as the multilateral ban on chemical weapons, the comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty and the comprehensive programme of disarmament. While favourably assessing the substantial progress made in some of the established ad hoc committees of the Conference, it is also our opinion that more effort should be devoted to solving outstanding issues on a technical as well as on a political level.

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

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

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

(Mr. Insko, Austria)

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

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

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting on the following draft resolutions in cluster 13: A/C.1/43/L.24, L.46, L.50, L.54/Rev.1, L.65 and L.66.

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

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

(Mr. Dambski, German Democratic Republic)

levels conduce to the advancement of the process of arms limitation and disarmament at a faster rate. My delegation therefore shares the view - which has also been expressed in the draft resolutions under consideration - that the Conference must intensify its work. In our view, in addition to an early conclusion of negotiations on a convention banning chemical weapons, priority should be given to overcoming stagnation in the consideration of nuclear issues. There should be no delay in moving on to practical work. At the same time, efforts should be intensified to open further negotiations at the Conference aimed at reaching agreement on effective measures of arms limitation and disarmament. I refer especially to a prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

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

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

(Mr. Dambaki, German Democratic Republic)

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

In the view of my delegation the improved political conditions today provide a favourable environment for bringing the potential of the Conference more fully to bear on the future, in keeping with its role as the single multilateral negotiating forum on global arms-limitation and disarmament issues. With that understanding the German Democratic Republic will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.50 and A/C.1/43/L.66.

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

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

future negotiations. This is necessary precisely because of the importance we attach to the Conference on Disarmament and the role it should play in multilateral negotiations on disarmament.

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

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

In our view a draft resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament must satisfy at least two needs, namely, it must recall the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the unique multilateral framework for negotiating disarmament issues and express an assessment of the work accomplished by the Conference, taking account, if relevant, of the progress made during the past year while calling for a redoubling of efforts in negotiations in the context of the ad hoc committees on priority questions.

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

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

(Mr. Benyamina, Algeria)

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Kokeev, USSR)

As is well known, in accordance with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Geneva Conference is the sole multilateral negotiating body. However, we must note with regret that the potential of the Conference as a negotiating body is by no means being fully utilized. For that reason, we feel it is important for the General Assembly once again authoritatively to support the comprehensive stepping-up of the Geneva forum as one of the most effective means for giving the disarmament process now under way an uninterrupted and continuous character.

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

(Mr. Kokeav, USSR)

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

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.50, as we see it the appeal for a continuation and intensification of the work of the Conference could be formulated in this draft resolution much more energetically. Nevertheless, the Soviet delegation believes it possible to support this draft resolution based on the understanding that operative paragraph 4 not only does not exclude but on the contrary presupposes that there will be a positive continuation and a beginning of negotiations on high priority issues submitted to the Geneva body for consideration.

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

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

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

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

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

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

Mr. SHARMA (India): My delegation has asked to speak to place on record its views on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.50, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". The Committee has been presented with two draft resolutions bearing the same title. There are similarities in the procedural content of the two draft resolutions. Both "consider and take note of the report of the Conference on Disarmament" but there the commonality ends. The differences in the substantive content are large and, as a comparison with resolution 42/42 K shows, they have even increased.

We believe that the Conference on Disarmament has an important role as the single multilateral negotiating body, a role that was defined in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament adopted in 1978. That role must be reaffirmed and strengthened. That is possible only if the Conference on Disarmament intensifies its efforts by undertaking substantive negotiations in keeping with its mandate.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.56 gives emphasis to this aspect because it attaches importance to the work of the Conference on Disarmament. We believe that the General Assembly with its universal membership has the responsibility to urge the Conference on Disarmament to fulfil its designated role. In view of the above, my delegation is constrained to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.50.

Mr. CHOHAN (Pakistan): Pakistan voted last year in favour of resolution 42/42 K on the report of the Conference on Disarmament in the hope that in due course its sponsors would see the merit of the resolution submitted by Mexico, of which Pakistan was a co-sponsor. However, this year's draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.50 is a regression from last year's. It is merely procedural in character, does not in its operative part reaffirm the central role of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating forum in the field

(Mr. Chohan, Pakistan)

of disarmament, as last year's did, and does not permit member States to pronounce themselves on or to assess the work of the Conference on Disarmament. Under the circumstances my delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.50.

Mr. AL-KITTAL (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The delegation of Iraq wishes to state its position on a general question relating to agenda item 67 (b). We believe that it is time that the question of expanding the membership of the Conference on Disarmament should be given greater attention and that the necessary measures should be taken to increase the membership in that international body which alone undertakes international multilateral negotiations on disarmament. Pending such action all impediments to the participation of States non-members desiring to participate in the Conference must be eliminated and such contribution must become the right of all States.

(Mr. Al-Kittal, Iraq)

Such actions are absolutely necessary if the Conference on Disarmament is to become an international forum expressing the widest range of views held by the international community.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 50, my delegation expressed its reservations on a similar draft resolution last year and continues to hold reservations on the current one.

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

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

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, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet 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: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.24 was adopted by 109 votes to 1, with 21

abstentions.

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

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 26th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November, and has the following sponsors: Argentina, Australia, Austria, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and 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, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, 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 Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

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

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

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.50.

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

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

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

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

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

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

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November, and has the following sponsors: Byelorussian SSR, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Poland, Romania, Sri Lanka and Venezuela.

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, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 54/Rev.1 was adopted by 109 votes to 7, with

14 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 65. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee, held on 9 November, and is sponsored by the delegations of Algeria, Bangladesh, Colombia, Cuba, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Morocco, Pakistan, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tunisia, Viet Nam 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, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, 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 Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.65 was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 2

abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.66. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, held on 9 November, and is sponsored by the delegations of Algeria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burma, Cuba, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zaire. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.66 was adopted by 117 votes to 3, with 14

abstentions.

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

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): The United States has asked to speak in order to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46, entitled "Comprehensive United Nations study on nuclear weapons". Our delegation's vote against this draft resolution is consistent with our frequently expressed concern about the proliferation of projects which place additional financial pressure on the already strained budget of the United Nations. We note that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46 is just one of several draft resolutions introduced at this session

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

which request that the Secretary-General undertake new studies and submit reports. We are informed also that, in addition to budgeted conference costs, an additional appropriation of \$192,800 would be required to perform the study requested in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46.

In our view, the proposed comprehensive study on nuclear weapons, which is exceedingly broad in scope and which would duplicate and reiterate information already available in open literature, does not warrant such an expenditure and consequently such a de facto priority in comparison with other critical United Nations activities.

I should like also to express our delegation's reasons for not being able to support draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1, on scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security. We view it as both inappropriate and impractical to single out technological developments for international monitoring. In particular, we have serious reservations about paragraph 1. That paragraph would task the Secretary-General to collect, evaluate and report on information assembled, among other ways, from a network of State agencies gathering information on the military implications of all scientific and technological developments. This would almost certainly be an unending source of international friction. Further, this vague provision provides no insight into the scope of the monitoring effort or the end focus of this effort. Without better definition, our delegation is unable to endorse such action that could intrude on broad areas of science and technology and disrupt normal military research and development.

Also, the United States would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.65, on the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The United States was unable to join in a consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.65 for the following reasons: The seventh preambular

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

paragraph refers to the validity of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The third special session on disarmament prompted a comprehensive exposition of the contrasting views of a large number of States, and the many days of debate and drafting demonstrated quite clearly that there now exists a profound disparity of views on many of the disarmament issues addressed in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament.

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Noetsel, German Democratic Republic)

"Qualitative and quantitative disarmament measures are both important for halting the arms race. Efforts to that end must include negotiations on the limitation and cessation of the qualitative improvement of armaments, especially weapons of mass destruction and the development of new means of warfare so that ultimately scientific and technological achievements may be used solely for peaceful purposes." (S-10/2, para. 39)

We share the views expressed at the third special session devoted to disarmament during the consideration of agenda item 12 that the qualitative development and the growing accumulation of weapons add a further dimension to the arms race, that there is increasing recognition of the fact that qualitative aspects of the arms race remain closely linked to the dynamics of international security, and that new technologies have significant applications in the process of arms limitation and disarmament and its verification. I should like to reaffirm the position of my delegation, as expressed in document A/S-15/26, paragraph 9, that it is necessary to prevent the use of new scientific and technological achievements for creating new types and systems of weapons and that it is imperative to ensure that scientific and technological progress is used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

We consider a renewed effort in the direction shown in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1 as a timely initiative for the following reasons: The use of the most modern technologies in the development of new weapons systems is bound to open new channels for the arms race. Specific new weapons systems are increasingly considered to be destabilizing in their effects, thus endangering stability. Specific qualities of new weapons systems, such as miniaturization or mobility, are bound to make verification more difficult. In addition, it has become obvious that the misuse of new technological achievements for military

(Mr. Noetzel, German Democratic Republic)

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

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

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

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

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

(Ms. Courtney, Australia)

My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1, which we consider to be innovative. Australia supports the central thrust of that draft resolution, namely, that in the light of historical experience it makes good sense to think through systematically and in advance the likely ramifications of the application to military purposes of emerging scientific and technological advances.

Australia does not, however, share the implication of the fourth paragraph of the preamble that scientific and technological developments applied to military purposes must necessarily have a negative impact on the security environment. Indeed, the contrary can occur. Australia therefore considers it important that operative paragraph 1 calls for a process of evaluation and does not prejudge the outcome.

Australia voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.65. We would, however, like to express our concern that operative paragraph 3 remains ambiguous in describing the United Nations as

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

That could imply that there are no other forums within which the States Members of the United Nations can deal with and resolve disarmament issues. Clearly, that is not the case. There are a number of other existing and potential forums which at times might in fact be more appropriate, depending on the particular circumstances of a situation and on its political and regional context. We decided, however, to cast a positive vote because we endorse the call for the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament through multilateral consideration of issues which have a bearing on the security of all Member States and, as appropriate, on the resolution of such issues.

(Ms. Courtney, Australia)

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Varga, Hungary)

entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security", which was introduced by the delegation of India and which my delegation co-sponsored.

The realities of the arms race today and, more specifically, its qualitative aspects and implications, point to the potential danger emanating from the possible military application of the achievements of the ongoing scientific and technological revolution.

The inherent threat of an ever-accelerating growth of nuclear war-fighting capabilities, stemming from the nearly automatic use of scientific and technological advances for military purposes, would suffice to prove the timeliness of evaluating scientific and technological developments with potential military applications.

In addition, the emergence of a new generation of conventional weapons with tremendous devastating force, gradually transforming allegedly defensive postures into preemptive deep strike options, cannot but dangerously erode the basis for future conventional stability requiring balanced armed forces and conventional armaments.

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

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

(Mr. Varga, Hungary)

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Rider, New Zealand)

We therefore have some sympathy with that objective of the resolution. However, the wording of this particular text and the processes it envisages would not be helpful in achieving the ends sought.

Mr. LAMAZIERE (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1 on scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security bearing in mind some principles that inform our general position on matters of disarmament and taking into account the high priority that must be given to the qualitative aspects of the arms race. With specific regard to the scientific and technological components of the draft resolution, I want to stress my delegation's firm conviction that any attempt to monitor the military application of new scientific and technological developments must not contribute to converting the structural imbalance created by the technological superiority of some countries into a permanent feature of the world scene.

In that connection, I want to recall resolution 3 (IX) on new and emerging areas of science and technology for development adopted unanimously by the Intergovernmental Committee for Science and Technology for Development at its ninth session and endorsed in General Assembly resolution 42/192. That resolution emphasizes the need for all countries, and especially the developing countries, to acquire and strengthen their capabilities to develop, assess, harness, adopt and transfer science and technology. For that reason we want to underline that any exercise whose objective is to follow future scientific and technological developments must not constitute a base to hinder effective and efficient transfer of technology, particularly more advanced technology, especially to the developing countries for their absorption in those countries in order to promote their optimal utilization.

(Mr. Lamaziere, Brazil)

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

Mr. van SCHAIK (Netherlands): My delegation wishes to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.66, A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1 and A/C.1/43/L.46.

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

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.50 on the same subject were motivated by the desire to achieve consensus. We regret that this time consensus has not been achieved on our text and we regret also that we did not succeed in our endeavours to reach a compromise with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.66.

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

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

these points we could not explain our point or take their points into consideration. Indeed, we did identify common ground for pursuing the type of negotiations that are common in other areas leading to an agreed text. Nor did it appear possible to find language in a separate text that would have reflected the common recognition, in purely procedural terms, of the recent report of the Conference on Disarmament and would have contained a request to the Conference on Disarmament to report again next year under the usual item on the agenda of the First Committee. We are however pleased to note that in the intensive discussions we had with the Yugoslav delegation, which introduced draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.66 - discussions which my delegation appreciated - the Yugoslav delegation stated that it was inspired by the same desire to reach consensus on the subject and we hope that next year, when there will be more time available, deliberations between interested countries will indeed lead to the consensus we are seeking. Consensus is and remains in our view essential - essential because it would be an echo of the consensus reached in Geneva by the 40 members of the Conference on Disarmament, and essential because only consensus would do justice to the stature of the Conference on Disarmament, the sole multilateral negotiating body on global disarmament questions.

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

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

shape and up to date. The application of technological developments for military purposes can be important for our security as it can be for many other countries.

Finally, my delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46, which calls for a comprehensive update of the study on nuclear weapons. Although we listened carefully to the arguments advanced, we believe that the developments that have taken place in the area of nuclear arms since the publication of the Secretary-General's report in 1980 do not sufficiently warrant an update as requested in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46. We are of the opinion that for the six proposals submitted to the First Committee for United Nations studies on disarmament-related issues, priorities should be established in view of the limited resources available. We do not believe that the proposal contained in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46 deserves priority status as compared with some of the other studies, which will cover new ground.

Mr. von STULPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to explain my delegation's negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1. My delegation fully agrees with the authors of this draft resolution that the qualitative aspect of developments and trends relevant to the disarmament process are increasingly a matter for international attention and concern. While technology as such is neutral, and while scientific and technological progress should not be impeded, it is recognized that the qualitative development and growing accumulation of weapons in many parts of the world add a further dimension to the arms race. But it is equally recognized that qualitative aspects of the arms race remain closely linked to the dynamics of international security.

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

(Mr. von Stülpnagel,
Federal Republic of Germany)

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

More specifically, applications of new technologies can contribute positively to the arms control and disarmament process by facilitating effective and economical verification of agreements. Thus, my delegation cannot share the thesis that the arms race is determined by the technology. It falls within the province of political decisions whether to implement certain technologies or to renounce their implementation partially or totally.

The significance for international security of new and emerging technologies derives not from the nature of the technologies themselves but from the purposes to which they are applied. My delegation regrets that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1 does not take these criteria into account and does not reflect the complex nature of the matter. My delegation very much hopes that the Secretary-General, in discharging his responsibilities under this draft resolution, will take these concerns fully into account.

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

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

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

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

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

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46, the purpose of which is to call for an updated version of the "Comprehensive study on nuclear weapons" originally completed in 1980. We did so because we feel that the request is premature, and that, for two reasons. First, the basic technical facts about nuclear weapons, which were well summarized in the original report, have not been changed by subsequent technical developments. Secondly, the ongoing bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, if brought to a successful conclusion, could well have a dramatic effect on nuclear arsenals. It does not seem appropriate to launch a new study in the middle of those negotiations.

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

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

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

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.