UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
37th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 15 November 1989
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 37th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) (Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/44/PV.37
21 November 1989
ENGLISH

89-63231 4762V (E)

28 P.

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Fahmy (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 69 AND 151 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee for an announcement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following States have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/44/L.25: Cape Verde and Cyprus; A/C.1/44/L.26/Rev.2: Cyprus and Yugoslavia; A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1: United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN: Today the Committee will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.40/Rev.1 in cluster 5 and on draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.2/Rev.1, A/C.1/44/L.29, A/C.1/44/L.30 and A/C.1/44/L.35 in cluster 16.

As no delegation has asked to make a statement on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.40/Rev.1, the Committee will now proceed to the vote. The draft resolution, which is entitled "Nuclear-arms freeze", has seven sponsors. The text was introduced by the representative of India at the 31st meeting of the Committee, on 8 November 1989.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the names of the sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.40/Rev.1, Nuclear-arms freeze, has the following seven co-sponsors: India, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Romania and Sweden.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.40/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People 8 Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jcmahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: China, Costa Rica, Iceland, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.40/Rev.1 was adopted by by 115 votes to 13, with 4 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon delegations who wish to make statements in explanation of their vote after the voting.

---

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

Mr. GEVERS (Netherlands): The North Atlantic Alliance, to which the Netherlands belongs, relies on a strategy aimed at preventing war. It does so by maintaining a credible deterrent baeed on an adequate mix of conventional and nuclear forces. A nuclear-arm8 freeze goes contrary to this balanced policy, which has succeeded in maintaining peace in Europe since the Second World War. It is in that conviction that the Netherlands voted against draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 40/Rev.1 on a nuclear-arm8 freeze.

We believe the en tire concept of a freeze to be outdated and bypassed by the encouraging development8 in the bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations between the United State8 of America md the Soviet Union. We hope that the sponsors Of the draft resolution will in the future realize that the repetitive introduction of outdated concept8 serves no practical purpose. By ignoring ongoing nego tia tions the draft resolution become8 unrealistic and run8 the risk of simply being irrelevant.

Mr. de LA BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation should like to set forth the reasons for its negative vote on draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 40/Rev.1, Nuclear-arms freeze .

Our objection8 are to the very concept of a nuclear-arm8 freeze, and we have voiced them on many occasions. First, a freeze, by definition, would entail freezing the statue quo in the wor ld and, th us, the imbalances that would be made Permanent, as well a8 a risk to the security of the States concerned. Secondly, a nuclear-arms freeze would confer a tremendous advantage on any State that might then decide to increase its armaments, to the de tr iment of State8 that would have acted to limit their efforts. Thirdly, a nuclear-arm8 freeze would be extremely difficult to verify, and arriving at the necessary condition8 for effective verification md the negotiations leading thereto would be just as lengthy and complex a process as the verification and reduction of conventional armaments.

(Mr. de La Baume, Prance)

Lastly, to the extent that it might redound to the advantage of a given Power, such a freeze would greatly reduce that Power's interest in negotiation8 and thus its will to negotiate seriously to achieve any arms reduction.

Progress in this field would not be fostered by measures or statement8 favouring a nuclear-arms freeze. The route to nuclear-arms reduction is through negotiation8 between the two largest nuclear Powers, and its starting-point must be the definition and establishment of a proper balance.

Mr. CHACON (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish) : My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.40/Rev.1 because We have a basic objection to it. We bel ieve that the wor ld needs to eliminate nuclear weapons completely , not simply to freeze them. By put. ting nuclear weapons on ice, as it. were, we are not resolving the problem of the danger posed by the nuclear weapons that are already stockpiled , weapons that would continue to exist md that could be used at any time. We therefore believe that the draft resolution is counter to the idea of total and complete disarmament..

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan) : I should l ike to expl ain Japan s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.40/Rev.1. I wish to emphasize that over the years Japan has been making consistent efforts in pursuit of nuclear disarmament, with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons from the face of the earth. Japan has been engaged in such endeavours at the United Nations, at the Conference on Disarmament and in various other in terna tional forums.

Japan s active interest in the question of a nuclear-test ban derives from that basic position of Japan. In that connection I should like to state that Japan is pleased with the onqoinq smooth implementation of the Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range *md* Shorter-Range Missiles. Japan also mole-heartedly welcomes the progress being

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

made in the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on the reduction of their strategic nuclear araenala, and also on the verification of nuclear tea ting .

On the other hand, in the process towards the realization of nuclear disarmament we should not loae sight of the preaent world situation, where a balance of military capability continues to play an important role in maintaining world peace md security. It is for that reason that Japan has serious doubts about the practicability or meaningfulness of the nuclear-arms freeze proposal on which a vote has just been taken. A freeze on nuclear arms would be tantamount to the preservation of a real or perceived nuclear superiority of cne aide over the other unless it is backed up by reliable end well-prepared arrangements for ensuring the balanced reduction of nuclear arms. Otherwise, the freezing of nuclear arms would in no way be a contributing factor to international peace and stability.

The Japanese delegation also wishes to point out that verification, the importance of which is now widely recognized, is regarded as being extremely difficult to apply in the field of a nuclear-arms freeze and that the mere declaration of a nuclear-arms freeze without effective means of verifying it would not he very meaningful.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now take up draft resolutions in cluster 16. I should like to inform the Committee that the Chairman has been requested to postpone a decision on draft resolution L. 2/Rev.1 so that further consultations can take place. It is hoped that thoee consultations will be concluded by tomorrow.

Does any delegation wieh to make a statement at this stage?

Mr. BARNEWITZ (German Democratic Republic): In connection with cluster 16, my delegation would like to submit some ideas on agenda item 63 (j) "Naval armaments and disarmament". There have recently been changes towards reduced military confrontation in Europe, where processes are unfolding that can lead to greater mutual trust, the strengthening *of* stability and security through the establishment of a stable and secure balance *of* conventional armed forces at lower levels. *If* naval forces are left out of the calculus, there is a risk that the disarmament process, which has only just begun, may be put in jeopardy, for it is precisely thore forces - with their enormous potential in conventional and nuclear weapons, their high degree of mobility, and their global range of action - which could be used to circumvent or render ineffective, fully or partially, agreement8 concluded on conventional and nuclear disarmament.

If naval forces are not taken into account there cannot be genuine transparency, openness and predictability in military affairs in the long run, nor *cm the* aapability for surprise attack md large-scale offensive operations be removed. The Foreign Ministers of the Wareaw Treaty Statee, therefore, at their recent meeting at Wareaw, again pronounced themeelves in favour of taking up as soon as possible negotiation6 on the cessation of the naval arms race and on naval disarmament with the par ticipation of all in terested States ad, in par ticular , the major naval Powers. In this regard my delegation considers the beet prospect to be the extens ion of conf idence- *md* security-building measures to the seas ad oceans.

(Mr. Barnewitz, German Democratic Republic)

The German Democratic Republic is in favour of naval confidence- and security-building meaaures that take into account the security interests of all States involved, give due consideration to the specific conditions prevailing in the different regions of the world, ensure aafety of navigation and the peaceful exploration md exploitation of marl time resources, promote in terna tional co-operation, and prepare the ground for the limitation and reduction of naval armamen ta.

Significant preparatory work has already been done, not only through the elaboration md putting into practice of confidence- and security-building measures within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, but also through the work of the United Nations Disarmament Conference, not least through the adoption by consensus of guidelines for confidence-building measures.

To my delega tion the most promising approach seems to be a step-by-step approach which focuses, as a f i ret step, on glasnost - openness - and predictability in naval affairs, so as to create the conditions for moves that are more far-reaching in the field of naval confidence- and security-building and disarmament.

In my delegation's view, the following measures should be considered in this respect: f i r s t , regular exchange of objective information on naval matters and capacities, including data on the number , structure and deployment of naval forces down to the brigade/operational-tactical group level; secondly, periodic discussion and comparison at various forums of political and technico-military aspects of marl time strategies; thirdly, invitation of observers to naval and amphibious exercises and manoeuvres, including briefings at shore headquarters and visits to operational combat md ncn-combatant ships; fourthly, prior notification of major

(Mr. Barnewitz, German Democratic Republic)

movements and manoeuvres of naval forces and the associated air forces, and prior notification of all such activities in proximity to sensitive aecurity areas; fifthly, notification of major marine force tranafers by sea or air, to the territory of another State) and, sixthly, notification by all nuclear-weapon States of the presence or absence of nuclear weapons on board their ships entering Ports of other countries.

Building on these ateps, far- reaching confidence- and security-building measures could then be elaborated which would ensure the safety Of navigation and the Peaceful exploration and exploitation of maritime resources and help progressively to scale down the potential for suprise attack and large-scale offensive operations and also limit and reduce the possibilities for power projection from the aea.

As we see it, in this regard the following are of particular relevance:

First, conclusion of a multilateral agreement on the prevention of incidents on and over the high seas. Intermediate steps could be multilateral agreements to be concluded for specific seas and oceans. The German Democratic Republic therefore would like to suggest that an agreement of that sort be drafted for the Baltic and North Sea region.

Second, elaboration of safety measures for maritime communications.

Third, limitation of the size, number and duration of naval exercises and manoeuvres.

Fourth, prohibition of major naval exercises in zones of intensive shipping and fishing as well as in straits of international significance.

Fifth, adoption of multilateral measures for the prevention of threats to the freedom of shipping.

Sixth, strict observance of existing nuclear-weapon-free zones in Latin America and in the South Pacific.

(Mr. Barnewitz, German Democra tic Republic)

Seventh, creation of a zone of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic, and a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

Eighth, creation of nuclear-weapon-free seas: creation of a nuclear-weapcn-f ree Baltic Sea, as recently proposed by the Soviet Union, could be a good starting-point.

Ninth, limitation of deployment areas for naval units that could be used for surprise attack.

Tenth, mutual withdrawal of specific types of naval armaments from specified regions of seas and oceans - especially from regions where the potential for conflict or crisis is high.

Eleventh, limitation of the number of vessels equipped with tactical nuclear weapons.

A gradual elaboration and realization of such measures could help prepare the ground for negotiations on genuine naval disarmament.

Mr. BOKOV (Bulgaria): The Bulgarian delegation would like to propose a minor change in the wording of the second pr eambular paragraph of draft resolution L. 29, entitled "Conversion of military resources". We have been advised that the word "specificities", used in this draft, does not exist in the English language, and would therefore propose that it be replaced by the word "details".

The CHAIRMAN: The comments of the representative of Bulgaria have been noted.

Since no other delegation wishes to make a statement at this stage, I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. DOLEJS (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian) : In the view of the Czechoslovak delegation the time has come for the question of conversion to become the object of serious multilateral and international discussions, including at the United Nations.

We have already acquired some practical experience in the implementation of measures to reduce our conventional armaments, armed forces and military budgets. These unilateral steps help our national economy directly. Some of the tanks that have been taken out of service will be used as tractors, agricultural machinery and mine-working equipment.

(Mr. Dolejs, Czechoslovakia)

There is already a limitation on o omb industrial aotivitirr for military purposes and their civilian conversion. The potential resources thur freed will be used for wider international co-operation with a view to drvrloping peaceful alternative8 in varioua fields of scientific and technological progress. We consider that the problem of conversion will be vary important in the future in United Nations activities on a global or a regional level. We therefore support draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 29 ad will vote in favour of it.

The CHAIRMAN : The Commi tter shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 29, an orally revised by the representative of Bulgaria.

The draft resolution is entitled Conversion of militaiy resources" and it has two sponsor s. It was introduced by the representa tive of Bulgaria at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 7 November 1989.

I call on the Secretary of the Commi ttee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponrore of draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 29 are Bulgar is and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The CHAIRMAN : I nw put draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 29 to the vote. 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, Burundi, Byeloruraian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republia of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indoneaia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Irelmd, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, bbanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Mymmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippinea, Polmd, Fortugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republio, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Irelmd, United Republic of Tanaan ia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 29, as orally revised, was adopted by 134 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on thoee representatives wishing to explain their vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. MAFAEL (Federal Republic of Germany): I would like to comment upon our vote on draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 29, en titled "Convers ion of military resources".

The conversion of military production capacities is not necessarily part of disarmament agreements. It might be the outcome of such agreements. It can also be unilaterally decided upon by Governments. In countries with free market systems, the flexible civil industry is accustomed to adjusting its production

(Mr. Mafael, Federal Republic of Germany)

under its own rerponribility according to the requirements of the market. Basic or rtruatural national mnverrion programmes do not apply, or are of little use, to those countries. Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.29 therefore mainly addresses the concernr of aountr ies with a State-planned economic system. we would have liked to see that exprerred more olearly in the text of the draft resolution.

Therr is, however, one problem that is common to both systems. They both have an interest in ● nruring that industrial over-aapaoi tier in the *field* of armaments should not be ahannelled into increasing exports of weapons. Therefore, all Governments should watoh the aotivi ties of their industries in that field.

Our support for draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 29 is meant ♦□ ● noourago countr ies in need of conversion programmes to continue their efforts. My country is ready to give every support in that field if requested to do so.

Mr. HOULLEZ (Belgium) (in terpreta tion from French): I am speaking on behalf *of* the Benelux-delegations - the Ne therlands, Luxembourg and Belgium. Those three delegations *voted* in *favour* of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.29. In so doing, they wiahed to welcome and support the will exprerred by some States to convert their military resources to civilian purposes.

We rhould neverthelere not lose sight of the fact that the problem of conversion of military resources f requently affectr States that have a high combined level *of* military expenses and a centralized economy. The delegations in whose name I speak hava always tried to ensure that the level of their military resources should not go beyond that of their real neede in terms of national security. Our three countries wish to see a precise and transparent assessment of the military resources of all States based on an exchange of data and on the modalities of the conversion of military resources as recommended in the draft reoolution.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): The United States hu ukrd to speak in order to ● wplain its abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.29, entitled "Conversion of military resources".

We were unable to support the draft resolution because it. is predicated on the assumption that the States dictate what is produced by industry. In Sta tar with free ● oonomir6, such as the Unitrd States, any oonvrrrion would be by pr ivate industry, whose plans in that regard would be dictated primar fly by market considerations.

We would alro like to note that the trrm military resources" is very broad and proaumably covers armaments . Dimporal or conversion of armaments resul ting from ● rmr-aontrol agreements would, *of* course, be governed by thr terms *of* the applicable agreements.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French) I The delegation of Fr ance voted in favour of drr ft rrrolu tion A/C. 1/44/L. 29 on the convers ion of military resources. Indeed, it welcomes the idea expressed by several States of proceeding to a reduction in their ☐❒❍ ● xponditurea and conver ting their military resources to civilian purposes.

France, however, believes that ef fortr at conver sion should be carried out by the States that have a high level of military ● ☐☐☐■❒❒❒ and a centralized, organized economy. We wish to remind members that we have always tried to maintain our military resources at levels that are strictly compatible with our national security requirements.

Lastly, France recommends that exchanges of information on the modalities for the conversion of military resources recommended in the draft resolution be carried out on the basis *of* a precise and transparent assessment of the military resources of all States in order to buttress the credibility and ● ffectiveness of the exercise.

The CHAIRMAN, Wc rhall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 30, which is entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

I call on the reprsrentative of the Netherlandr for an explanation Of vote before the voting.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Net!.erlands) I I rhould like to explain the position of the Nether lands with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 30.

"Consensus" is the key word applicable to the Conference on Disarmament. In that body, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, views are prerented across the whole spectrum of political articulation. How could the work of this forum be done otherwise than by consensus? It is therefore appropr ia te that the report of the Conference on Disarmament, which contains rather divergent views on all aorta of political issues, should be presented to the General Assembly by all States members of the Conference on Diearmament jointly.

In our view, the consensus reached in the Conference on Disarmament on its annual report should have its echo in the General Assembly, in the same way as the General Assembly deals with the report of the Disarmament Commission - that is to say, through adoption by conseneua. The General Assembly addresses all specific items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament by means of specific reaolutiona pertaining to the subject-matter of the respective items. There is no good reason to deal with the same issues again in the resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament: that reeolution should be of a general and non-con trovers ial nature.

In paet years the delegation of the Netherlands, together with likeminded delega t ions, submitted draft resolution8 along the lines that I have just mentioned. It did so with a view to enabling the General Assembly to endorre the report of the Conference on Disarmament without a vote. However, other delega tions - mainly the ones that are aponeoring draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 30 - followed a

(Mr. Wagenmaker s, Netherlands)

different approach, presenting a clearly controversial text. But it is self-evident that neither the political differenoem manifesting themselves between *Conference* on Disarmament delegations nor the ensuing differences in approach to the organization *of* work in the Conference on Dimarmament can be eliminated by a General Assembly reaolu tion - such is not our world .

There is good reason to fear that the effect of language such am is contained in draft remolutiocn A/C.1/44/L. 30 might, rather, be counterproductive. Therefore the Netherlands tried very hard to come to term8 with the proponent8 *of* the other draft, to accommoda te their view8 • o far as possible, alwaym with the aim of • stablimhing a common draft resolution that the General Assembly could adopt without ♋ vote. Thus the General Assembly would be acting in aaaordanoe with the high rtature □↗ the Conference on Disarmament, which is the mingle multilateral disarmamen ♦ negotiating forum.

Alas, our efforts were to no avail. Consequently, in reaent *yearn,* the general Assembly ha8 adopted two different resolutions cm the report *of* the Conference on Dimarmament. The net ef fact of this undesirable phenomenon - the General Assembly speaking with two voices - is that the consensus to whioh members aspire, and which is so urgently needed for meaningful work in the Conference on Disarmsment , is driven out even further .

We had hoped that, this year, things would be different. We conducted oonsultations, during whioh considerable sympathy was expressed for our approach. We are grateful to thome who sat down with us and discussed these matters, but it became clear that, basically, we would end up in the sams situation am last year - with two resolutions pertaining to one and the same agenda item. Taking into • ♍□□◆■♦ the undesirable net effect of much a modus procedendi, the Netherlands

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

decided that it would not again submit a competing draft. Far be it from us to seek confrontation on matters which, in cur considered view, ● hould be dealt with by procedural means.

We appeal to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C, 1/44/L. 30 to reconsider these things ser lowly, in the beat interests of the Confurenae on Disarmament, and to present us next time with a draft that oan achieve consensus.

For all the reasons I have given, the Nether lndm delegation will vote ● gainmt this draft rrmolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now bke a decision on draft remolution A/C.1/44/L.30, which is entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". This draft remolution has 27 sponsors and wan introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 30th meting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1989.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the namer of the sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft remolution A/C.1/44/L.30 ham the follwing sponsors: Algeria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Imlamio Republic of Iran, Kenya, Madagascar, Malaymia, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tunis ia, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia ad Zaire.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put draft remolution A/C.1/44/L. 30, Report of the Conference on Disarmament ", to the vote .

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, Brasil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorumsian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Cmechoslwakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonemia, Irm (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People sDemocratic Republic, Lebanon, Lemotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakimtan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Imlands, 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, Yugomlavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Fmdrral Republic of, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of great Britain md Northern Ireland, United Staten of America

Abstaining: Canada, Denmark, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japm, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

Draft remolution A/C.1/44/L. 30 was adopted by 119 voter to 7, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I request delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting to do so after we have concluded consideration of the next draft resolution, which is the final one in thin cluster.

(The Chairman) ,

The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.35, enti tled Naval armaments and disarmament . The draft resolution, which was introduced by the representative *of* Sweden at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1989, has 15 sponsors. I call on the Secretary to read out the list *of* sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) I The draft resolution has the following mponsors : Australia, Austr ia, Bulgaria, China, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Iceland, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Yugoslavia and Niger ia.

The CHAIRMAN: *A* recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour : Afghanistan, Albania, *Alger* ia, Angola, Argentina, Australia , Austr la, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bras il, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colomb ia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eth iopia, Fiji, Finland, Fr ance, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hal ti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People sDemocratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malays ia, Maldives , Mali, Mal ta , Maur i tan ia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozamb ique, Myanmar , Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Niger ia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Roman la, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Soc ialist Republic, Union of Soviet Social 1st Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.35 was adopted by 132 votes to 1.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on delegations wishing to explain their vote after the voting on the draft resolution in cluster 16.

Mr. MAFAEL (Federal Republic of Germany): My delega tion would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.30, entitled Report of the Conference on Disarmament". This is a consensus report and is the result of a very difficult exercise. It reflects the common ground that has been achieved on a consider able number of issues, as well as a r anqe of differing views regarding questions of procedure and of substance on several issues. Given its nature as a consensus report, my delegation is of the opini ion that any resolution on it, especially if submitted by States members of the Conference on Disarmament, should offer language that reflects the common ground expressed in the report.

We think that the unanimous support of all States of the United Nations community for the Conference on Disarmament could have a positive impact on the Conference on Disarmament and strengthen its role in multilateral disarmament.

During recent years, and again this year, considerable efforts have been made to arrive at consensus language in the draft resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament. I should like especially to thank the delega :ion of the Netherlands for its efforts, which always had our full support. My delegation regrets that despite those efforts we had to vote today on a draft resolution that could not command consensus.

---

* Subsequently the delegation of Djibouti informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. HOULLEZ (Belgium) (interpretation from French) : My delegation regrets the saddening - even dangerous - phenomenon of a vote on a draft resolution (A/AC.1/44/L. 30) concerning the report of the Conference on Disarmament. That means that the draft resolution gives rise to divergent reactions on a text that should be purely procedural and therefore should logically have been adopted by consensus. This can only be prejudicial to the work of the Conference on Disarmament and to its chances of success.

Unfortunately, there seems to be a trend in the First Committee to try to impose, through the weight of votes, positions that ignore the divergences or different approaches in the work of other organs, which function on the basis of the principle of consensus. My delegation's negative vote expresses our disapproval of, and concern about, such a procedure, which certainly will not prevent our continuing to play an active role in the activities of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. REESE (Australia) : Although Australia voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.30, we must express our regret that *again* it was not possible for the sponsors to produce a draft resolution capable of enjoying consensus support. In particular, we should like to thank the Netherlands delegation for its efforts in this regard.

The Conference on Disarmament works by consensus, and its annual report is adopted by consensus. It follows that draft resolutions in the First Committee on the Conference on Disarmament should also be susceptible to consensus.

Australia hopes that next year greater and more concerted efforts can be made to produce a single text capable of being supported by all members of the Committee.

Ms. MASON (Canada): To our considerable regret, Canada was not able to support draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.30, concerning the report of the Conference on Disarmament. Instead, we abstained.

This year's text still contains wording which has precluded the possibility of consensus. We regret that.

We also share the wish of the Netherlands delegation that the sponsors of the draft resolution might in the future carefully consider whether it might not be better and more effective to develop a text on which all of us could agree and which therefore could be adopted by consensus. We, too, thank the Netherlands delegation for its efforts in that regard.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The Mexican delegation, as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.30, of course voted in favour of it, believing that the General Assembly has a right to express its views on the work and functioning of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

We know that consensus confines the Conference on Disarmament to a straitjacket with regard to many items that the General Assembly regards as priority matters. I remind representatives who have insisted on consensus in the First Committee that we have to cross the Atlantic, and when we return consensus does not prevail here at the General Assembly. I also remind them that consensus did not prevail when we in the First Committee approved the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and there was no consensus when we approved here by a vote the Treaty on environmental modification techniques.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): The United States delegation wishes to explain its vote against draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.35, "Naval armaments and disarmament".

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

The requirement for naval armaments and the naval activities of various nations are inherently asymmetrical; they are based on different geographical, political and strategic considerations. Separated by sea from most allies, and bounded on both sides by oceans, the United States relies on maritime activities and freedom of navigation under international law to protect its security and trade interests. The relationships between the various naval forces are so different as to preclude a common basis for negotiations on such forces. That is why the United States voted against that draft resolution.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 30, the French delegation can only deplore the fact that on the report of the Conference on Disarmament, which in our view should have been dealt with in a procedural draft resolution acceptable to all, serious differences should have led finally to a text that does not reflect the views of all delegations.

(Mr. Morel, France)

As some other deleqations have already said, in view of the way in which the report of the Conference on Disarmament was drafted, it would have been preferable for that not to have been so. we therefore regret that efforts made by the delegation of the Netherlands, among others, to achieve a consensus text did not succeed, We pay a tribute to the dalega tion of the Netherlands for its ef forts over the past years, and we hope those sfforte, with the agreement of all delega t ions, will enable us to adopt a consensus deciaicn at our next session.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded cur consideration of the draft resolutiona before us for this meeting.

I call on the representative of Australia, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1, in cluster 15.

Mr. REESE (Australia) : I am pleaeed to introduce today the draft resolution contained in document A/C, l/44/L. 47/Rev.1, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and to oupport the conclusion of a chemical-weapons convention .

The following Metier States join with Australia in aponsoring the revised draft resolution: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

I would recall that at this time last year Auetralia introduced document A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1, which, I would also recall,, was subsequently adopted by consensus as resolution 43/74 A. That resolution was the product *of* a careful and protracted series of consultations among interested delegations, but the results

(Mr. Reese, Australia)

justified those efforts. In rerolu tion 43/74 A, the in terna tional communi ty expressed its firm commitment to upholding the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol, supported the conclua ion of a chemical-weapons convention , to that end requested the Searatary-General to continue to carry out promptly investigations in response to reports concerning the possible use of chemical and ba cter iological or toxin weapons, and mandated the Secretary-General to develop further, technical guidelines and procedurer for the timely and efficient invea tigation of such reports.

The draft reeolution contained in document A/C.1/44/L. 47/Rev.1 is the successor to resolution 43/74 A in every sense of the word. It retains the essential elements of rerolution 43/74 A, particularly the strong sense of commitment to the 1925 Protocol and to the conclusion of a chemical-weapons convent ion. That, indeed, hae been reinforced with the recognition in the third prcambular paragraph of the outcome of the Paris Conference. The Paris Declaration also provided inspiration *for* the formulations offered in the fifth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 8.

The draft reeolution addresses, but in a more subatantive way, the essential element of last year 's resolution 43/74 A and its predecessor, resolution 42/37 C. I am referring, of course, to the process which began two years ago with the adoption of resolution 42/37 C: the request to the Secretary-General to develop, with the asaietance of *a* group of qualified experts, technical guidelines and procedures for the timely and efficient investigation of reports of possible use of chemical and bacteriological or toxin weapons. That process has affectively been completed with the submission of the Secretary-General's report.

Accordingly draft rerolution A/C. 1/44/L. 47/Rev.1 welcomes the proposals of the group of qualified experts and further oallr upon all States to consider the implementation of the guidelines and procedures.

(Mr. Reese, Australia)

I should also note that in its eighth preambular paragraph draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1 acknowledges that upon the conclusion of a chemical-weapons convention those guidelines and procedures should be adapted in the light of the obligations to be assumed under the convention.

Like its predecessors, draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1 has been the result of long and careful consultations with many interested delegations. This year discussions began within a core group of countries, essentially the sponsors of last year's text. Progressively our consultations extended to all regional groups and interested parties, and the Australian delegation wishes to express its appreciation for the co-operation and assistance extended to it by all delegations. Without exception, all approached the task in a most constructive fashion and all, I believe, with the common objective of achieving a consensus resolution of substance.

The Paris Conference and the more recent Government-Industry Conference against Chemical Weapons, which my Government convened in Canberra in September, have made it clear to my delegation that the international community shares the common objective of ensuring that such weapons are never used again.

The sponsors consider that this draft resolution makes an important contribution to that objective. I therefore commend draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1 to the First Committee for adoption without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The following draft resolutions will be ready for action by the Committee at tomorrow morning's meeting: A/C.1/44/L.63/Rev.1, L.53/Rev.3, L.11, L.50/Rev.1, L.37, L.41/Rev.1, L.46/Rev.1, L.20/Rev.1, L.26/Rev.2, L.56, L.2/Rev.1, L.36 and L.44/Rev.1. It is possible that other consultations will be concluded today and that additional draft resolutions will be brought before the Committee by tomorrow, in strict compliance, of course, with our rules of procedure.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): With a view to facilitating the process of taking action on draft resolutions, the Secretariat is doing everything possible to make available the revised texts of proposals and any papers related to their programme-budget implications as expeditiously as possible. Accordingly, I wish to inform members that arrangements are being made to make available the following documents at the delegations' distribution desk in the first basement, beginning at about 5 p.m., or perhaps a little earlier: A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev.1; A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1; A/C.1/44/L.64/Rev.1, the programme-budget-implications paper for document A/C.1/44/L.63/Rev.1; and possibly A/C.1/44/L.65, the programme-budget-implications paper for draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.53/Rev.3. We shall do our utmost also to make available other documents, and members should inquire at the distribution desk whether any other First Committee documents are available.

The Committee is approaching its deadline for the consideration of disarmament agenda items, and it would be greatly appreciated if revised texts could be submitted by this evening. Otherwise we might have difficulty in having them reproduced in time to comply with the 24-hour rule of the General Assembly's rules of procedure.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.