



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 36th MEETING

Chairmant Mr. ROCHE (Canada)

CONTENTS

- CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA 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 DC2/40, 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 4.33 p.m.

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

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: The opening of this meeting was delayed because of the intensive consultations that were taking place. They have been very successful and consensus has been achieved in some important areas.

This afternoon we shall take action on the following draft resolutions in cluster 1a A/C.1/43/L.57 and A/C.1/43/L.58/Rev.1; and the following in cluster 4; A/C.1/43/L.7 and A/C.1/43/L.47.

Before doing so, I call on any representatives who wish to make a statement or introduce a draft resolution.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): The general debate in the General Assembly and the debate on disarmament items in the First Committee have demonstrated unanimous support for the earliest possible completion of a convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of all chemical weapons and on their destruction.

The negotiations on the convention, which began eight years ago in the Conference on Disarmament - the single multilateral negotiating body - have recently been intensified. That desirable development represents a timely response of the Conference on Disarmament to the growing demand on the part of the world community to impose a total and effective ban on chemical weapons.

As a result of the negotiations, the structure of the convention has been elaborated, as can be seen in the Report of the Conference on Disarmament, document A/43/27. Years of intensive work have led to the definition of wide areas of agreement. At the same time, different approaches to the abolition of outstanding issues and the complexity of some technical aspects of a future convention have properly been reflected.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

The participants in the negotiations, as well as all other States, are aware that the instrument now being drawn up is of an unprecedented character. In fact, we are working on the first multilateral agreement on a comprehensive ban on a whole category of weapons of mass destruction under strict and effective international control. Indeed, there is no example so far of a multilateral disarmament treaty of this magnitude, importance and sensitivity, in which not only specific political and military concerns of States, but also scientific, technological and economic interests, especially those of the civilian chemical industry, are at stake.

Nevertheless, progress can and must be made in the negotiations. On the one hand, this requires the political will of the States involved to finalize the work on the convention and this particular need is one that is almost always referred to. On the other hand, there is not only a need to move to the next step of negotiations in which compromise solutions to outstanding issues would be sought, but there is also an objective possibility of doing so. Such a move would meet halfway the universal demand to speed up negotiations.

Proceeding from those assumptions, the authors and sponsors have been working on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.67, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". I have the honour to introduce it now. In addition to Canada and Poland, the following 29 Member States have sponsored the draft resolution: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Viet Nam.

(Mr. Su jka, Poland)

In the past, members of the Committee have given resolutions on this subject their full support. Last year's consensus was of particular importance, reflecting the successful efforts of the sponsors to reduce the number of draft resolutions in the First Committee relevant to the negotiations on the chemical weapons convention, thus considerably reinforcing a message to the Conference on Disarmament on the urgent need to complete this work. The sponsors trust that the full support for the draft resolution will continue.

(Mr. Su jka, Poland)

The draft text before us is essentially based on last year 's consensus resolution. However, there have been considerable modifications taking account of significant developments which occurred over the past year and during the current General Assembly session in particular. It is not my intention to go into the details of the paragraphs incorporated from resolution 42/37 A; instead, I shall concentrate on the new material. Before I do so, permit me to make one remark of a more general nature.

In the view of the sponsors, consensus on this draft resolution would be a sure indication of the deep concern shared by Member States over the existence of chemical weapons and the growing possibility of their military use. As a reflection of that concern, the draft resolution again urges the Conference on Disarmament to give a high priority to negotiations on the elaboration at the earliest possible date of a convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of all chemical weapons and on their destruction. The reiteration of the call for strict observance of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction is based on the same concern. It is necessary to emphasize again that any violation of either of those two instruments carries grave implications for us all.

As I have already mentioned, new paragraphs have been included in this year's draft resolution. The second and seventh preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 7 and 8 reflect the request of Member States for the convening in Paris, from 7 to 11 January 1989, of a conference of States parties to the 1925 Geneva Protocol and of other interested States, and express the hope that the conference will give new political impetus to the Geneva negotiations on a chemical weapons convention.

(Mr. Sujka, Roland)

The eighth **preambular** paragraph and operative paragraph 6 **recognize** the importance of the **strengthening** and **enlargement** of confidence-building measures through further international data **exchange** relevant to the drawing up of the convention. It is **worth stressing** that at the current stage of work such exchanges **are essential** to the **effective continuation** of the negotiations.

One further change concerns paragraph 5, which has been moved to the operative part from the **preamble**. Here, Member States, again in full **conformity** with the present needs of our work in Geneva, are strongly urged to contribute to an early agreement on, and universal **adherence**, to, the convention.

The draft resolution before us is the result of very intensive and broad consultation in which many delegations have demonstrated a **spirit** of good will and compromise. In this respect I should like to **express** the heartfelt gratitude of my delegation, particularly to the delegation of Canada, which has co-operated very closely with Poland on this draft resolution. Our two delegations highly appreciate the generous co-operation and valuable assistance offered by the delegations of Australia, Austria, France, the German Democratic Republic and Sweden, as well as by all other delegations that participated in the process of consultations.

It is the belief of the draft resolution's sponsors that the text will continue to enjoy the unanimous support of the First Committee and that, like similar draft resolutions in the past, it will be adopted by consensus. That would **firmly demonstrate** our commitment to the goal of eradicating chemical weapons, and send a vital message to the Conference on Disarmament.

In conclusion, I believe we all agree it is essential for the effectiveness of the Conference - the **single** multilateral disarmament negotiating body - to be demonstrated. It is high time the multilateral dimension of disarmament again proved its value,

MP. BUTLER (Australia): It is my honour to introduce today the draft resolution contained in Document A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1, which will be issued shortly. The draft resolution is entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and to support the conclusion of a chemical weapons convention".

The following Member States have joined Australia in sponsoring this draft: Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United States of America and Zaire.

The text issued on 31 October (A/C.1/43/L.52) has been revised and will be reissued as Document A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1. There have been two changes to the text of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.52, and I should like to bring these to the attention of the First Committee.

The first of the changes occurs in the eleventh preambular paragraph, whose new text reads as follows:

"Bearing in mind the resolutions of the Security Council on chemical weapons adopted during 1988, "

The second change to the text occurs in operative paragraph 8, whose new text reads as follows:

"Decides to include in the provisional agenda of the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly the item entitled 'Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons'."

By way of background, I would recall that one year ago almost to the day Australia introduced document A/C.1/42/L.67/Rev.1, which was subsequently adopted by consensus as resolution 42/37 C.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Those who were here last year will recall that resolution 42/37 C was the product of a protracted and complicated series of negotiations among interested delegations. But the results justified our efforts, and, in resolution 42/37 C, the international community endeavored to express a firm commitment to upholding the authority of the 1929 Geneva Protocol, to support the conclusion of a chemical-weapons convention and to agree on practical measures in pursuit of those ends might be elaborated, primarily by supporting the Secretary-General's role in investigating allegations of the use of chemical weapons, enabling the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of qualified experts, to develop guidelines and procedures for assisting those investigations.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1 is the successor to last year's resolution 42/37 C. It retains the essential elements of resolution 42/37 C. It reflects developments that have taken place since the adoption of that resolution. In it the Secretary-General is requested to continue to carry out promptly investigations in response to reports concerning the possible use of chemical and bacteriological (biological) or toxin weapons. It mandates the Secretary-General, with the assistance of the group of qualified experts provided by interested Member States, to continue his efforts to develop further technical guidelines and procedures available to him for the timely and efficient investigation of such reports.

On the last point, I should like to make it clear that it is the view of the Assembly that operative paragraph 6 does not exclude any State from contributing in any way it deems appropriate to the work of the group of experts. The work they are undertaking is of paramount importance to the international community, and it is important that those who can contribute positively to the process should be enabled to do so and to have their views taken fully into account.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Like its predecessor, draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1 has been the result of detailed consultations with very many delegations. The Australian delegation wishes to express its appreciation for the co-operation extended to it by those delegations, representing, as they did, all groupings within the United Nations. We would also thank them for the constructive approach they all brought to the task of seeking a consensus draft resolution on this subject.

The international community shares the common objective of ensuring that chemical weapons are never used, and this is the central purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1: that chemical weapons never be used. We and the other sponsors commend it to the Committee, but, more than that, we urge that the consensus that was forged so delicately and so carefully last year be retained this year. What has changed in the intervening year has been the progress that we heard of a few moments ago by the Ambassador of Poland on negotiations towards a chemical-weapons convention. It is within our grasp; we should grasp it firmly; we should ensure in the meantime that these weapons are never used, and this draft resolution has that single purpose. It deserves no less than the consensus of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now turn its attention to the two draft resolutions in cluster 1, draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.57 and A/C.1/43/L.58/Rev.1.

As no delegation has indicated its wish to explain its vote or its position before the voting, the Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.57, which was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee on 9 November. It has the following sponsors: Bangladesh, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, Romania, Sweden, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, 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, Canada, Cape Verde, 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, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, 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, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, 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, Zaïre, 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.57 was adopted by 125 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now turn to draft resolution

A/C.1/43/L.58/Rev.1. It should be noted that the French text *of the draft* resolution was orally corrected today by the representative of Romania. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 29th meeting of the First Committee on 7 November and has the following sponsors: Bangladesh, Indonesia, Ireland, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Senegal, Sweden and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

(The Chairman)

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

Draft resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 58/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of their vote or their position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): My delegation had hoped to be able to support draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.57 and would have done so had the draft resolution been strictly procedural or had it reflected more closely the report which we highly praise. Our vote is not a reflection on the study itself, in which the United States participated, but rather on the draft resolution. Many of the assertions made in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.57 are not, in our delegation's opinion, justified by a reading of the study itself. Reference in the draft resolution to the "alarming" increase in military expenditure is not factually correct. Page 17 of the report shows the real rate of increase to have been 2.6 per cent for the period 1982 to 1985 compared with 3.2 per cent for the previous three years. We feel that the linkage of increased expenditure to decrease in military expenditure reflected in the draft resolution is not shown by the report.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.57 also mirrors the point, in our view, in asserting that military expenditures create economic problems, while ignoring the fact that arms are the direct result of tensions and problems. For these reasons, my delegation voted against that draft resolution.

At this time I should also like to give an explanation of our position on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.58/Rev.1. Our delegation has joined in the consensus on this draft resolution but we deem it necessary to state our position on the status of the deliberations on the reduction of military budgets in the United Nations Disarmament Commission. During this year's session of the Disarmament Commission much progress was made on this agenda item. Our delegation was pleased to see that discussions clearly indicate that differences are not as great as they once were. Although deliberations have for the most part focused on paragraph 7 of the draft principles, our delegation has consistently pointed out that nothing is agreed until all is agreed and that even when agreement is reached on this paragraph the Working Group will need to review the list of principles in its entirety to ensure that as a whole it reflects the consensus of all States.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands) : My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.57 on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race. In the past the Netherlands has, most of the time, joined the consensus on this agenda item but has done so somewhat reluctantly as we believed that this topic had already been adequately dealt with. We now hold the view that the further inclusion of this item on the agenda as proposed in the draft resolution is not sufficiently justified even though we welcome an updating of the report on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race, to which an expert of my country has also contributed. We are unable to concur with the proposal set forth in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.57 and believe that the required resources could be better used in other areas.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom) : I should like to explain the vote of the United Kingdom on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.58/Rev.1, "Reduction of military budgets". The draft resolution contains a request of the Disarmament Commission to continue and to conclude consideration of the item. We support that request and that is why we have joined in the consensus on the draft resolution.

However, the draft resolution goes beyond a simple procedural call on the Disarmament Commission to conclude work on the subject in question. As drafted, it is open to the interpretation that work on the reduction of military budgets is limited to the finalization of one paragraph of the draft text. In fact, my delegation would like the consultation group to have the opportunity to look over other parts of the draft. We have made this clear at the last two sessions of the Disarmament Commission and we hope that time will be made available for this in 1989.

The CHAIRMAN : The Committee will now take up two draft resolutions in cluster 4, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.7 and A/C.1/43/L.47. I now call on the representative of Zimbabwe who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. FUNUNGWE (Zimbabwe) a My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.47 before the voting. At the outset, I should like to thank the delegation of the United Kingdom for the patience, determination and will that it showed in the last few days as we negotiated a possible merger between this draft resolution and draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.7 submitted by the non-aligned countries on the same subject. Nor could we have expected them or us to do any less. The subject of the two draft resolutions is of pivotal importance for nuclear disarmament. We all felt it would be important to send an unequivocal message from this Committee. We were even more honoured and reminded - it such a reminder was needed - of the extreme importance of our task by your personal intervention, Mr. Chairman, with a view to bridging the points that kept the two sides apart. It is, therefore, with profound regret that we feel compelled to admit that, at least for this year, a consensus has yet again eluded us.

The two draft resolutions have become separated not only by what they include but also by what they exclude. On the resolution itself we note that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.7 has no references to verification, for example. That was because we failed to see as correct the thesis that the most noteworthy aspect of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - was its verification procedures and the example those procedures met for the high standard achievable in this field in the future. We see the INF Treaty as having more and greater aspects of importance than the aspect of verification. We even note that two paragraphs are included in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.47 on the question of verification.

A comparison of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.7 and A/C.1/43/L.47 will also show that there are philosophical differences with regard to the importance to be accorded to nuclear disarmament by the international community. The international community has already stated that the prevention of nuclear war is the most urgent

(Mr. Punungwe, Zimbabwe)

tank of the present day. This assertion has obvious consequences for the priority to be accorded to nuclear disarmament. It is in line with this that the non-aligned countries, in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.7, felt compelled to recall their earlier appeal to the two Super-Powers to take into account in their bilateral negotiations, to take into account not only their own national interests, but also those of the rest of the international community. That emphasis is not adequately reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.47.

In draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.7 we also register our grave concern about the continuing escalation of the arms race, especially in nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.47 does not do that. In draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.7 we state that the alternative in the nuclear age is not between war and peace but between life and death, a point emphasized in various resolutions of the General Assembly and in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament: nuclear war can result only in the annihilation of mankind.

(Mr. Punungwe, Zimbabwe)

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.47 does not make this point. In draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.7 we affirm that bilateral and multilateral negotiations on disarmament • ro complementary; that is not done in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.47.

For these reasons my delegation is compelled to • bmtain in the vote on thr latter.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take • otion on draft rrmolution A/C.1/43/L.7. Thm draft resolution wu introduced by thr representative of Zimbabwe, on behalf of thr States Members of the which are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the thirty-second mootng of the First Committee on 9 November.

A recorded vote h u been requested.

A recorded vote wu taken.

In favour: Afghmnimtan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bmnglmdemh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cap Verde, Contral Afr ican Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovak ia, Democr atio Kampuchea, Democr atio Ymmmn, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonrmia, Iran (Imlamio Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japmn, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People 's Democra tic Republic, Lebanon, Liber ia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nígeria, Norway, 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, Thafland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanmania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.7 was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 47. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland at the 27th meeting of the First Committee on 4 November and has the following sponsors: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Zaïre.

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.47 was adopted by 70 votes to none, with 58 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to make a statement on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. SUTRESNA (Indonesia) : My delegation fully agrees with the thrust of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.47, entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations". During the past few years we have noted with satisfaction the progress being made in the bilateral negotiations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We firmly believe that these negotiations should be encouraged, and we have done so by co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.7. Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.47, however, my delegation abstained because that draft resolution not only fails to mention the complementary nature of bilateral and multilateral negotiations but is not as specific as draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.7 in pointing out the priority issues.

Mr. HU Xiaodi (China) (interpretation from Chinese) : The Chinese delegation endorses the thrust of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.47 and therefore voted in favour of it.

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

(Mr. Hu Xiaodi, China)

The *fourth* paragraph of the preamble refers to the question of verification. China has always maintained that effective verification measures are important and indispensable in any disarmament agreement. Different disarmament agreements can have different verification procedures and methods, This should depend totally on the purposes, scope and nature of an agreement. We do not believe that the verification articles of any specific agreement can set a precedent for other agreements.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the Committee's consideration of Cluster 4 for this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.