



FIRST COMMITTEE
43rd meeting
held on
Friday, 18 November 1988
at 3.30 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 43rd 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 DC2/240, 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.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/43/PV.43
13 December 1988
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 4.20 p.m.

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

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon the **First** Committee will ~~conclude~~ its work on all draft **resolutions** outstanding on disarmament **items**, namely, in **cluster 12**, draft **resolutions A/C.1/43/L. 53** and **A/C.1/43/L. 75**; and in **cluster 11**, draft **resolution A/C.1/43/L.61/Rev. 2**.

I NOW call upon the **Secretary of the Committee**.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) I should like to inform Committee member **a** that the following **countries** have become **sponsors** of the following draft **resolutions**:

A/C.1/43/L.61/Rev.2: Austria

A/C.1/43/L.75: Hungary and Bulgaria

A/C.1/43/L. 53: Samoa

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the representative of Hungary, who wishes to make a statement on the draft resolution in **cluster 12**.

Mr. TOTH (Hungary) **a** In our time the subject of **verification** is assuming a **growing** significance in all fields of arms limitation and disarmament. My delegation is deeply convinced that the elaboration of **disarmament agreements** and the **strengthening of international security** should be based, inter alia, on the viable solution of verification problems. The overall interests of international security call for a continuous review of experience in verification as well as for the facilitation and **promotion** of its application at future **disarmament** talks.

The elaboration of disarmament **measures** presupposes that qualitatively **new restrictive** and verification **measures** should be **harmonized** with the national security and **economic** interests of States. The outlines of new institutional systems of verification are emerging or are being discussed in **connection with**

(Mr. Tobth, Hungary)

nearly all **disarmament** efforts related to the **ban** on weapons of mass **destruction** and the prevention of an **arms race** in **outer space**. That could open up **prospects** for multilateral **co-operation**, which would not only **ensure** that **effective** and reasonable verification applied to **all States but** would also enable countries to launch joint **programmes** of co-operation far beyond the scope of their individual scientific and technological capabilities.

Considering that the question of verification has **come** to be the subject of regular exchanges of views within the framework of the **United Nations as well**, and that a wealth of experience has also been accumulated in other areas, it is desirable to **seek ways** and means of enhancing the role of the **United Nations** and **its specialized** agencies in the promotion of that process.

We welcome the concrete proposals that have **been** put forward with respect to the nature and **scope of the role the** United Nations **could possibly** play in the context of **the** verification of compliance with arms-limitation and **disarmament** agreements. We formally supported **the** proposal of **the Soviet Union** outlined on the eve of **the** forty-second **session of the General Assembly**, and **we are very much in favour of the** proposal in this sphere **by the countries** of the **Six-Nation Initiative** and others.

Hungary itself, in August 1987, at the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, proposed **that** consideration be **given to** establishing a disarmament agency effectively **to co-ordinate** procedures for the international verification of compliance with disarmament agreements, to use available means and methods of monitoring disarmament and military activities **subject to** control and to promote peaceful **co-operation** among **States**.

We **warmly** welcomed the interest expressed **by Member States at** the third special session of **the** General Assembly devoted to disarmament on the subject of

(Mr. Toth, Hungary)

the **role** of the **United Nations** in the field of **verification**. We **stand by** the opinion that the **ideas** and **proposals** put forward in different **forums** on that **score** could be a **useful subject for consideration**. That is why my delegation, as a **co-sponsor**, supports **draft** resolution **A/C.1/43/L.75**, in particular the idea that the **Secretary-General** be requested 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**.

At the same time, we regret the fact that in the **course of** the preparation **of** that draft resolution **an opportunity to take** into account some legitimate **considerations related** to the **reflection of** earlier proposals **has been** missed. We are **of** the opinion that any **step** towards **reeking the** real **ization of ideas concerning** the role of the **United Nations in the field of** verification should be based on a balance **of** opinions and interests and **be** directed towards achieving a real consensus.

My delegation hopes **that** the undeniable merits of draft **resolution** A/C.1/43/L.75 and **of the ideas** contained in it will generate broad support, paving the way for practical work on their **realization**.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon those representatives that wish to explain their vote before the voting on draft resolutions in cluster 12.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of **America**) : The United States **has** always **been** firmly of the view **that** effective verification arrangements are an essential requirement **if arms limitation** and disarmament are to **be** real, viable instruments for enhancing **security**, international stability and peace. We are therefore gratified that this **view is now shared by** practically **tne** entire international community, including those with **a long record of** oppoeing it.

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

We also welcome the fact that **the subject** of verification **is** now on the **agenda** of the **General** Assembly and that, **under** the **able** and dedicated leadership of **Ambassador Roche** of Canada, the Disarmament Commission **was** able to develop a set of general principles of verification.

The United States greatly appreciates **the** interest in the **subject** of verification shown **by** the **sponsors** of draft resolution **A/C.1/43/L.75**. **At the same** time, we have **great** difficulties with that draft resolution. The position of the United States is that **any** verification arrangements, including **those that** might provide for a United Nations role, **must be** developed and agreed upon by the negotiating parties. **We** do not therefore see how the **Secretary-General** can undertake an in-depth **study** of the role of the United Nations in the field of verification in the abstract, in **the absence of any** parameters **that** specific agreements might provide for **such a** role in **individual cases**.

(Mr. Friederich, United States)

Consequently, we **also do not see** how, in the **circumstances**, the participants in the **study** can provide **specific recommendations** for future action by the **United Nations** in the field of **verification**.

As delegations are aware, the **United States routinely opposes** a programme that would require real **increases in the United Nations budget**. It is clear from the **programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75**, as contained in **document A/C.1/43/L.81**, that this proposed study would **entail considerable additional cost**. Yet there has been no discussion, to our knowledge, of any commensurate budget **cuts in other areas of the United Nations budget**, in order to **compensate for those additional expenditures**.

We regret that, for all of **those reasons**, we are unable to support the adoption **of the draft resolution**.

Mr. DOLEJS (Czechoslovakia): The **Czechoslovak delegation, of course**, welcomes the overall **outcome of the conference between the authors** of draft resolutions **A/C.1/43/L.1 and A/C.1/43/L.2** that led to the **emergence of the single draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75**. **Czechoslovakia strongly supports a strict verification of arms control and disarmament agreements**. We also support and are interested in **taking part in the elaboration of the proposed in-depth study of the role of the United Nations in the field of verification**.

We are of the opinion that in **issues of such a highly sensitive and complex nature** the active **participation of all groups of States is unconditionally required**. In order to be effective, **therefore, any draft resolution addressing verification should express in a politically balanced form the fundamental consensus of all groups of States and, naturally, of the authors of major proposals on the subject**.

(Mr. Dolejs, Czechoslovakia)

Unfortunately , that is not the case with regard to the last preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 75, which appears to us to be clearly unbalanced, thereby leading to doubts as to the draft resolution as a whole, as well as to the degree of flexibility that we can expect in the future.

We regret that it was not possible to reach agreement in that regard, which we believe should have been a relatively simple task. Our delegation, therefore, wants to put on record our reservation on the last preambular paragraph. Regretfully, it is only with that reservation that we can support the draft resolution before us at this session.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we take action on draft resolutions in this cluster, I should like to inform the Committee that, the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.1 and A/C.1/43/L. 2, respectively, do not wish to press these draft resolutions to a vote. Therefore, we shall not take any action on them.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 53. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the United States at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 4 November, and has the following sponsors: Australia, Austria, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United States, Uruguay and Zaire.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly?

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 53 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75. The programme budget implications of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/43/L.81.

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 41st meeting of the First Committee, on 17 November, and has the following sponsors: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Zaire.

The sponsors of the draft resolution expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. However, a recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken,

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, 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, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaïre, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: None

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75 was adopted by 130 votes to 1.

The Chairman: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote on the draft resolution just adopted

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the United Kingdom's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75, concerning verification in all its aspects.

The United Kingdom voted in favour of the draft resolution because we consider that an in-depth study into the various aspects of verification would be useful.

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

However, I should like to make clear that the United Kingdom considers that, in accordance with principle 13 of the Disarmament Commission's draft principles of verification, verification is a matter for States directly concerned and is most effective when it is treaty-specific.

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

Outside organizations may be involved in verification of agreements only at the request of, and with the explicit approval of, all States parties to the agreement concerned. Further, sub-paragraph (a) of the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75 states that agreements should provide for the participation of parties, directly or through United Nations organs, in the verification process. The United Kingdom believes that, provided the requirements of principle 13 are fulfilled, organisations other than the United Nations and States parties might also be involved in verification of disarmament agreements, as appropriate to the specific agreement, for example, organizations set up by the States parties for that purpose.

The study to be established by this draft resolution will clearly be an important one. We look forward to being able to play our part.

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In September 1987 the Soviet Union put forward the idea of establishing, under United Nations auspices, broad international machinery for verification of agreements, in order to lower tension, achieve arms limitation and monitor armed conflicts in various regions.

At the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Soviet Union, together with the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, submitted a document containing proposals that gave concrete form to that idea and the stages for its implementation in practice. We believe that initiative by disarmament countries is in line with the proposal of the Six-Nation Initiative and with those of other countries.

The Soviet delegation regrets that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75, referring in the final preambular paragraph to proposals made by specific countries, did not agree to include a reference to the initiative put

(Mr. Naar kin, USSR)

forward by Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. In our view, that refusal did not partake of the spirit of co-operation that had prevailed at this session.

Nevertheless, taking into account the generally positive tone of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75, the Soviet delegation voted in favour of it. The draft resolution shows that efforts towards joint verification measures with the involvement of the United Nations as a centre for co-ordinating the activities of States to maintain international peace and security are becoming an important trend of our time.

Mr. MORRISON (Canada) : Canada went along with the adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.53, on compliance with agreements on arms limitation and disarmament, because we were convinced by the text, which indicates that compliance is a matter of interest and concern to all Members, that the United Nations could play a role in that regard, and that no distinction is made between the role of the United Nations with respect to bilateral agreements and its role with respect to multilateral agreements, and, further, because according to this draft resolution the General Assembly would ask the Secretary-General to assist States Members of the United Nations in this regard. In other words, there is a role for the United Nations in efforts to encourage strict compliance with agreements. We are encouraged by the adoption of this draft resolution and by the agreement of all delegations with its text.

Mr. BOKOV (Bulgaria) : Bulgaria was among the sponsors of the original draft resolution on verification in all its aspects, document A/C.1/43/L.1: this was an expression of the importance my country attaches to the question of verification. That was underlined in my delegation's contribution to the general debate in this Committee on 26 October 1988.

(Mr. Bokov, Bulgaria)

The **Bulgarian** delegation **decided to** join in sponsoring **draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 75** as well, since **its** text, in **its** substantive **parts, reflects** all the elements **of the original draft** resolution, **A/C. 1/43/L. 1**. When considering **our** position, **however, we hesitated** somewhat on the interpretation **of** the last **preambular** paragraph. Having in mind **the significance** of the issue **and** the importance **of** reaching the broadest possible consensus on **it, we decided to join in** sponsoring draft resolution **A/C.1/43/L.75** on the clear understanding **that** the first **part of** the final preambular **paragraph, which reads:**

“Taking note **of** all proposals **that** have **been put** forward in the field of **verification by Member States**”

includes **also** the proposal introduced by Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union **at the third** special **session** on disarmament, contained in document **A/S-15/AC.1/15**.

My delegation **hopes that** on the **basis of** that understanding my country will be **able** to contribute further to the **consideration of** the **issue of** verification at the United Nations **and to contribute to the** proposed study.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded **our action on** draft resolutions in cluster **12**.

We turn now **to** draft **resolutions** in cluster 11.

Mrs. SECRET (France) (interpretation **from** French) : Am we proceed to **take** a decision on draft **resolution A/C.1/43/L. 61/Rev. 2**, I wish to state my delegation's **position**, and in particular to **stress** the spirit in which this text **was submitted** by my country along with **Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Spain** and Sweden.

(Mrs. Secret, France)

I shall begin by recalling that the subject is not a new one: two years ago the General Assembly adopted by a large majority resolution 41/59 E on confidence-building measures and conventional disarmament, immediately after the adoption of the Final Document of the Stockholm Conference, on 16 September 1986. Since then, there have been major progress among the 35 States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), and they have now begun the final phase of the work, at Vienna. That will be followed immediately by continued negotiations on confidence-building measures and a new round of negotiations on conventional stability. We can now say that things have begun to move forward, the General Assembly cannot remain silent in the face of those major developments.

The text of draft resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 61/Rev. 2 is well known: the Committee has witnessed the three stages in its evolution: first as document A/C. 1/43/L. 61, then as L. 61Aev.1 and finally as L. 61/Rev. 2, which is the result of very broad consultation conducted, first and foremost, among countries participating in the CSCE process.

(Mr S. Secret, France)

In describing the effort we have all made, I should like to note that we opted for brevity and balance. In the end, it seemed preferable to adhere to broad trends and not go into the details of practical ways and means, in order not to interfere with the negotiations under way at Vienna as well as to take into account the preferences of countries outside Europe that are not participating in those talks.

In that connection I should like to draw attention to the open-minded spirit demonstrated by all the countries participating, which enabled us to arrive at the text of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.61/Rev.2, and I should like to thank them all.

In short, we feel that that text enables the United Nations to give appropriate approval to the impetus generated by the Vienna meetings. As my delegation noted a month ago in the general debate, this is a historic turning-point. I should like to emphasize that the mandates laid down will make it possible to reduce gradually, but very concretely, the military confrontation that has dominated the history of the European continent for more than 40 years and hence East-West relations as a whole. The movement begun 15 years ago at Helsinki continues to bear fruit. How can we fail to mention, in that connection, that 10 years ago, at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, it was the President of the French Republic who proposed the convening of a disarmament conference in Europe.

At the same time, the draft resolution invites other countries and other regions to take account of those developments. Yet it is not our intention to suggest any transposition of some hard and fast European model. Every country and every region must be the judge of the most appropriate ways and means of reducing military confrontation and increasing confidence. The draft accordingly emphasizes that specific regional conditions are decisive. None the less, the present draft

(Mrs. Secret, France)

resolution, which is concerned with confidence- and security-building measures and conventional disarmament in Europe, has a universal character and is a further step forward in the very fruitful discussions conducted at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

For all of those reasons, we feel that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.61/Rev. 2 should be adopted by the First Committee by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 61/Rev. 2. The draft resolution, introduced by the representative of France, has the following sponsors: Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland and Spain. These sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 61/Rev. 2 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. SHARMA (India): My delegation has asked to speak to explain briefly its position on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 61/Rev. 2, on confidence- and security-building measures and conventional disarmament in Europe, which has just been adopted without a vote. Whereas my delegation has always stressed its belief that nuclear disarmament is the preponderant area in the process of disarmament, it also recognizes the importance of conventional disarmament, which is the subject of the draft resolution, and particularly in Europe, which has by far the greatest concentration of such arms of any region.

Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution is an invitation to other States to take measures to enhance their security. We believe that here the essential minimum conditions are recognition of differing regional conditions and

(Mr. Sharma, India)

characteristics, and of the principle that progress can only be made on the basis of agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned.

The first precondition pertains to the overall situation in a given region, and the other to the orientation necessary among States participating in the process. The existing formulation in operative paragraph 3 refers to the former consideration, but not to the latter. It is our belief that such an interpretation is universally acceptable, that it has also found expression in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and that it is indeed the basis of the disarmament dialogue in Europe.

We have joined in the consensus on the draft resolution in the belief that operative paragraph 3 is to be so interpreted, although we would have welcomed a complete formulation that would have made that clear,

Mr. KOTEVSKI (Yugoslavia) : In explaining our vote on the draft resolution just adopted I should like to point out that Yugoslavia, as a non-aligned and European country, is most directly interested in all questions concerning confidence- and security-building measures and conventional disarmament in Europe. We have actively participated in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) process from its very beginning and have sought to make a constructive contribution to the current Vienna CSCE follow-up meeting.

We have therefore carefully studied draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.61/Rev.2. Most of its positions reflect our views on the current state of affairs in the negotiations on confidence- and security-building measures and conventional disarmament in Europe, and we fully support them. My delegation has therefore joined in the consensus on the draft resolution,

However, the draft resolution just adopted sets forth certain positions that are in line with the bloc approach to confidence- and security-building measures

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

and conventional **disarmament** in **Europe**, which we do not fully share. We have pointed out that during informal **negotiations conducted** with the principal **sponsors** of the draft **resolution**, we maintained that the **approach set forth** in the third preambular paragraph on

"security and stability in Europe through the establishment of a stable, secure and verifiable balance of conventional armed forces at lower levels, " should be strengthened by **clear reference to conventional disarmament as the way to increase security and stability in Europe.** In other words, what we need are, **first of all, concrete measures in the field of conventional disarmament** and, in our opinion, that **should have been clearly reflected in the draft resolution.**

(Mr. Kotevirk 1, Yugoslavia)

In our view the Vienna follow-up meeting of the Conference on **Security and Co-operation** in Europe (CSCE) must stress the complementary nature of the efforts within the framework of the CSCE process aimed at both building confidence and security and establishing stability as well as achieving disarmament in Europe in order to lessen military confrontation and enhance security for all.

Mr. NUÑEZ-MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation attaches great importance to resolution A/C.1/43/L.61/Rev.2, which we have just adopted without a vote, given the special nature of the European region.

Regarding operative paragraph 3, which invites all States to adopt appropriate measures, my delegation believes that this should be accomplished taking into account the characteristics of each region and with the participation of all the interested States, as stated at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded action on all the draft resolutions before us.

Before adjourning the meeting and, although our work continues for the next several days on other subjects, beginning with Antarctica on Monday, having concluded our work on disarmament items, I want to say just a word concerning this phase of our work and to express my very deep appreciation to the Committee for the spirit of co-operation it has displayed and, indeed, the progress that we have been able to make.

The world is not saved in a day and I do not think any of us expected that the Committee in its five-week session would turn the world around, but it is evident that we have made a constructive contribution to an improved international atmosphere and relationship.

You will recall that when we started our deliberations many of us noted that the continuing improvement in East-West relations and the alleviation of regional

(The Chairman)

conflicts, **coupled** with the recovery of **confidence** in the **United Nations itself**, was a very good and somewhat new atmosphere that will **allow** the United Nations and its **various** Committees and **organs** to **work** in a positive **way**.

It **is** evident that in this Committee we replaced confrontation with **co-operation** and rhetoric **with** pragmatism. That **does not** mean that we **achieved perfect** agreement for indeed we did **not**, but we made some progress and I believe that the **non-confrontational** and relatively rhetoric-free **atmosphere** that prevailed did **narrow** the differences, and a continuation in that **direction** by **the Committee** will pave the way **for** even **more** result-oriented draft resolutions in the future,

We had more **consensus** draft resolutions this **year** than previously, and on **those** issues where **consensus** eluded **us**, we will **just have** to try a little harder to show greater flexibility. We still have some distance to **go before** we **can** all speak with one **voice** on all the **aspects** of the disarmament agenda, with all their terrible **complexities**, but I believe that there is a **growing** perception of our **commonly** shared **objectives**.

As Chairman I felt that we were moving forward and that we had **made** progress. We had several **high moments** in the **course** of our **work** and I **should** perhaps note that we reversed a trend **that** had **been** developing for **submitting ever-increasing** numbers of draft resolutions. **Two** years ago 77 draft proposals were **submitted**, **last** year there were 79 and this year, even with the addition of **three new items** on the agenda, we had 75.

We adopted a total of 65 draft resolutions and two draft decisions. A reflection of the spirit in our Committee this year is that we **had** 27 draft proposals adopted without a vote, compared to 25 last **year**, not a great difference, **but nevertheless** a difference in the right direction.

(The Chairman)

Progress was also made in the area of merger. Here, you may recall, I said when we introduced the programme and built more consultation time into it so that there would be time for the consultations that are necessary, we did achieve something very concrete. We developed merger in at least five important areas, namely, verification, arm transfers, objective information on military matters, a nuclear arms freeze and outer space. I believe that everyone recognizes that those are critical areas and for us to have been able, through the process of goodwill, political desire and consultations, to produce merged draft resolutions in those areas, is a distinct accomplishment for the Committee and I congratulate all those who were involved.

(The Chairman)

I believe, Mr. Under-Secretary-General, that we have given your department more work. We know that the Department for Disarmament Affairs is now going to be charged with a number of studies, which creates a major challenge to you **and** your associates. For there will now be studies on arms transfers, on nuclear weapons and on verification; there is an ongoing study **on** chemical weapons and **two** mini-studies under the aegis of the Department, one on a dcnuclearized zone in the Middle East and the other on scientific and technical aspects of **the arms** race.

Those additional tasks that we have entrusted to ~~the~~ Secretariat of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, which is, as we know, one of the smallest **units** in the entire Secretariat, testify to the confidence that members repose in the Secretariat and in the Department.

It certainly pleases **me** that we were able to make a concrete expression of our appreciation of the Department through the letter **that** was sent on behalf of the First Committee to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee, in which we said **that** the resources devoted to the Department for Disarmament Affairs must be commensurate with the mandate we are entrusting to it.

I hope that the trends that have developed - trends towards a better atmosphere; a move towards greater pragmatism in the Committee; a clear-cut desire for more mergers; the achievement of greater consensus - though we still have a long way to **go**; a focussing on important subjects for study; the manner in which we have taken on new and important subjects and highlighted them here; the question of dumping radioactive materials in Africa being given study for the first time - a new agenda item on which I believe we need to **r flect** more **deeply**; the treatment that was given the preparation for the review conference on the non-proliferation Treaty to be held in 1990; the consensus **on** the critical area of chemical weapons; the draft resolutions adopted by consensus by the Committee, all of this has been a

(The Chair man)

manifestation *of the Committee's concern* for **approaching** important subjects in a positive and forward-looking way.

Probably, no subject has **caught** our imagination as much as the draft **resolution on arms transfers**. That is another difficult and delicate subject that **was** part of the mergers that took place, and I believe it is a reflection of our concern **that** the question of **arm** transfers be given a new, global visibility on the **way to the development of a better** system for registering and **reducing** such transfers.

I conclude on the note **of** clear optimism which I brought to the Committee, following the **world-wide consultations** I conducted during the summer. I brought a note **of** hope, I sensed that there was a kind of rebuilding stemming from the third **special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament**, which had a less-than-happy ending. That sense of rebuilding persisted during the past several weeks.

As I say farewell **to** those **who** are leaving and "see you **Monday**" to those who are staying, I wish everyone well. I believe that **the Committee, this year**, has every reason **to** feel a certain sense of satisfaction in its contribution **to** building **a more secure and stable** world.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.