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CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue the third phase of its work, devoted to consideration of and action upon draft resolutions on disarmament agenda items.

As was decided yesterday, the Committee will take up today clusters 3 and 5. I hope and expect that we shall be able to dispose of cluster 3 this morning and cluster 5 this afternoon.


In accordance with consultations I have held with various delegations, we shall deal with the draft resolutions in cluster 3 in the following way.

Consultations are going on between the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.9 and the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.58. Therefore, we shall take up draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.9 when we take up draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.58, considering the two drafts at the same time.

We shall not consider this morning draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.67 and A/C.1/39/L.72, because the sponsors are still engaged in negotiations on those draft resolutions and in consultations with other delegations about them.

Hence, this morning we shall take up draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.34 to A/C.1/39/L.63, inclusive.

Before we take up individual draft resolutions, I shall call on any representatives who wish to state their positions or to make explanations of vote on individual draft resolutions or on all the draft resolutions in cluster 3 that are before us this morning.

Mr. EMERY (United States of America): My delegation wishes to explain its opposition to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.34/Rev.1.

In the past we have stated our dual concerns over resolutions along these lines: We feared they would hamper the important work being undertaken in specialized agencies and other bodies within the United Nations system by assigning
them additional tasks for which they were unsuited. At the same time, we believed this kind of resolution would not help in promoting progress in the field of disarmament.

Unfortunately, we have seen our fears become reality. Many United Nations agencies have been politicized and have had to neglect their real missions in order to deal with disarmament issues - issues in which they have no experience or competence. And who can say that these developments have had any positive impact on the disarmament field?

My delegation urges others to join us in opposing resolutions such as this, which we all know can have no positive benefits.

Mr. MacPhionnghairr (Ireland): I should like, on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Contribution of the specialized agencies and other organizations and programmes of the United Nations system to the cause of arms limitation and disarmament".
The Ten share the view, which has been endorsed by all the States Members of this Assembly in a wide range of consensus documents, that it is the Department of Disarmament Affairs which exercises the co-ordinating role regarding the pursuit of disarmament activities within the United Nations system, and that it is responsible for liaison with the relevant governmental and non-governmental organizations and other institutes and bodies.

The Ten equally recognise that the Department should also take account fully of the possibilities offered by specialized agencies and other institutions and programmes within the United Nations system with regard to studies and information on disarmament. This approach is in accordance with the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament and, accordingly, its more active role in this field since the drawing up of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

As they have already indicated in the debate under this agenda item, the Ten believe that disarmament activities within the United Nations should contribute positively to present and future negotiations on concrete measures of disarmament. In this connection, they consider that more attention must be given to the question of improving the use to which the available resources are to be put than has heretofore been the case.

The draft resolution contained in A/C.1/39/L.34/Rev.1 proposes that the specialized agencies within the United Nations system should broaden further their contribution to the cause of arms limitation and disarmament. The Ten wish to recall their firm conviction that the specialized agencies, having been established for specific purposes, should uphold the priorities laid down in their respective statutes in order to achieve the goals for which they were established. Given the resource restraints which currently prevail throughout the United Nations system, the Ten fear the type of effort which this draft resolution would see initiated will in practice detract from other, more specific and more pressing, activities which are proper to these specialized agencies and which are of importance to all States but, given the actual distribution of resources, of particular benefit to developing countries.

In particular, the Ten would draw attention to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which, if implemented, would seriously detract from the Secretary-General's ability to pursue his co-ordinating role in the field of disarmament in accordance with the wishes of the vast majority of the delegations.
represented in this Committee. In addition, such a plan would seriously affect the autonomy of the specialized agencies under their respective mandates.

Having established the central role of the Department of Disarmament Affairs, why, the Ten ask, do we now wish to dilute this role and detract from the modalities which are its very strength? It is because they do not wish to see this happen that the Ten, convinced as they are of the central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, cannot support a draft resolution such as that contained in document A/C.1/39/L.34/Rev.1. The draft resolution ignores the already agreed procedures and priorities by which United Nations activity on these questions shall be pursued.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I wish to make a statement in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.58, which deals with the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session.

It has long been a matter of regret for my delegation that we have been unable to support draft resolutions on this topic or on the report of the Conference on Disarmament. In our statement in explanation of vote last year we expressed regret at the sponsors' failure even to attempt to negotiate on the language of these draft resolutions and expressed the hope that, in future, consultations would be held so that more generally acceptable formulations could be found. We note with great regret, however, that once again the sponsors have made no attempt to negotiate on the language of the draft resolution and have used it, not to express a consensus view, but their own highly partisan opinions and to attempt to impose their views on the Conference on Disarmament.

For these reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.56 on the report of the Conference on Disarmament. In the voting on draft resolution L.58 we will call for a separate vote on the fifth preambular paragraph and will vote against it, while abstaining on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. MANSFIELD (New Zealand): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.47. New Zealand will abstain in the voting on that draft resolution, not because we disagree with the idea it puts forward, but because we do not think that the General Assembly should comment in this way either on the procedures by which the Conference on Disarmament orders its business or the misuse of those procedures by members of the Conference. Those are
matters for the Conference itself. In our view, there is nothing wrong with the
Conference on Disarmament rule at issue, and a General Assembly resolution is not
the answer.

But the Conference still has an obligation to States which are not members of
it, and to itself, to ensure that the spirit of its rules of procedure are
respected. We agree that any country which believes it can contribute in a
positive way to efforts in the field of disarmament should be welcomed to the
plenary sessions of the Conference. We believe too that any country whose
interests are affected by a matter brought before the Conference should have the
right to address the Conference. That is the practice of the Security Council and
of other organs and bodies within the United Nations system in which not all
Governments are represented. Every Government has a right to be heard, and every
international organization, whether negotiating or deliberative, has a
responsibility to ensure that that right is respected and upheld.

Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands): My delegation wishes to explain why it will
cast a negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55, sponsored by Bulgaria and
others, and entitled "Curbing the naval arms race: limitation and reduction of
naval armaments and extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans".

At its thirty-eighth session the General Assembly adopted resolution 38/188 G,
in which the Secretary-General was requested to carry out, with the assistance of
qualified governmental experts, a comprehensive study on the naval arms race, on
naval forces and naval arms systems, with a view to analysing their possible
implications on a wide spectrum of aspects. The Secretary-General was asked to
submit his final report to the General Assembly at its fortieth session next year.

The study just mentioned is well under way and can be expected to be finalized
in the time-frame desired by the Assembly.

Draft resolution L.55 recommends inviting United Nations Member States to
communicate to the Secretary-General their views on a set of suggestions described
and confined in that draft resolution and sets a deadline that does not allow
Member States to benefit from the contents and conclusions of the ongoing study of
naval experts.
On a purely procedural note, the Netherlands is therefore of the view that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55 would set a bad precedent for the United Nations system. Studies that have been decided by the Assembly would have no practical usefulness if recommendations which encouraged Member States to ignore those studies were to be condoned. On the financial implications, suffice it to say that the consequences of such conduct by the General Assembly were this draft resolution to be approved would clearly be unacceptable to my delegation.

The direction taken by draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55 concerns us to an even greater extent - if that were possible - in so far as the actual scope of the views which Member States would be asked to express to the Secretary-General is so delineated as to prejudice indeed the results of the study considerably.

In our view, the considerations I have mentioned justify in themselves an important revision, if not withdrawal, of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55. We therefore chose to separate these considerations from our further objections of substance to the draft.

While we are in favour, in principle, of negotiations on aspects of naval armaments and their possible use, we believe that the measures indicated in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55 would be incompatible with the existing geographical disparities concerning the major naval Powers and would hence run counter to their legitimate interests in the field of security and commerce.

Moreover, in its preambular part the draft resolution contains partisan notions which cast doubt on the sincerity of the desire of the sponsors to achieve results in the negotiations purportedly sought.

True negotiations, in this as in other fields of arms control and disarmament, should be sought with an open mind and without pre-conditions.

For the reasons I have just explained, my delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55 if it should be pressed to a vote.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): Last year Yugoslavia supported the resolution on the limitation and reduction of naval armaments and extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans. We did so taking into account the basic objective of this initiative, namely, the prevention of an arms race in the seas and oceans. Furthermore, precisely owing to the importance which my country attaches to this issue, my delegation last year sponsored the draft resolution on the elaboration of a United Nations study on the naval arms race.
Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55 requests the Disarmament Commission to consider the question of curbing the naval arms race and to report to the General Assembly at its fortieth session. Such a request, however, seems to be premature. In our view, at this stage we should await the completion of the United Nations study on the naval arms race and only after considering the conclusions and proposals of that study should we decide on the steps to be taken regarding the further elaboration of this significant issue.

My delegation therefore wishes to express its reservations concerning the request in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. However, in spite of those reservations, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution, taking into account the basic intention of the sponsors, which was to draw attention to this issue.

Mr. GARCÍA MORTAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55 on the naval arms race, because we believe that the approach of the draft resolution is complementary to the task being carried out by the group of experts and that it will make possible a substantive analysis of the subject by providing material for the group of experts to consider.

We also believe that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55 is an appropriate follow-up to General Assembly resolution 38/188 F.

It is our view that the quantitative and qualitative levels of naval armaments, especially their nuclear aspects, require urgent substantive consideration in a multilateral forum.

The seas and oceans comprise 75 per cent of the earth’s surface. Across the seas and oceans, increasingly there are submarines and other vessels with weapons aboard constantly criss-crossing the seas and oceans. This geographical proliferation of nuclear weapons constitutes a very serious threat to coastal States and to the regions concerned as a whole. It also constitutes a very serious situation affecting the international instruments in force and tends to undermine the principles which should govern the uses of the seas and their natural resources.

In our opinion, the nuclear-arms race calls for urgent substantive treatment in a multilateral forum. In our view, draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55, although it aims only partially towards that objective, has our support.
Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55 on curbing the naval arms race, limitation and reduction of naval armaments and extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans.

We feel that it is very important to examine this extremely important issue and that it is very timely to entrust the matter to the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

We cannot agree with any assertion, in particular by the representative of the Netherlands, that until such time as research on this issue has been completed even discussion in the United Nations Disarmament Commission would be premature. In this connection I should like to indicate that the same excuse was once used to block an examination of such very important issues as nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear warfare, with everything being reduced to the conduct of research.
Hence we support draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55; we feel that discussions in the United Nations Disarmament Commission on this urgent question and a continuation of research are in no way mutually exclusive measures but supplement each other. We call upon other delegations also to support this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to speak at this time, we shall now begin taking action upon the draft resolutions contained in cluster 3.

We shall take up first draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.34/Rev.1. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Czechoslovakia at the 37th meeting, on 14 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, 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: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, China, Denmark, Djibouti, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Jamaica, Liberia, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.34/Rev.1 was adopted by 98 votes to 17, with 16 abstentions.
The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.41.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Cameroon at the 40th meeting, on 15 November, and is sponsored by the following countries:

The sponsors of this draft resolution have requested that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.41 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.47.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Iraq at the 40th meeting, on 15 November.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, 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, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None
Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.47 was adopted by 107 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.53.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Czechoslovakia at the 37th meeting, on 14 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.
A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, 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: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Paraguay, Sweden

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.53 was adopted by 99 votes to 19, with 8 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55.

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 40th meeting, on 15 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Bulgaria, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Poland, the Syrian Arab Republic and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan,
Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Chad, China, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Samoa, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55 was adopted by 68 votes to 20, with 45 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.58.

I call on the representative of Yugoslavia.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): The sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.9 and A/C.1/39/L.58 have conducted, in the course of the past few days, consultations aimed at submitting a single draft resolution which could meet the widest possible support. I have particular pleasure to inform the Committee that the consultations have been successfully concluded.

May I be permitted, therefore, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.58/Rev.1. The revised text contains the following amendments:

In the third preambular paragraph, seventh line, after the words "global military expenditures" the words "are approaching" have been inserted since they reflect more faithfully the assessments as to the total sum of expenditures on armaments.

* Subsequently the delegation of Uruguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.
(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

At the end of the seventh preambular paragraph, the following text was inserted at the end of the paragraph: "and that negotiations on disarmament issues are lagging far behind the rapid technological development in the field of armaments and the relentless growth of military arsenals, particularly nuclear arsenals".

In the eighth preambular paragraph, second line, after the words "a new impetus to negotiations", the words "in good faith" were inserted.

At the end of the same paragraph, the following addition was made "and that States should refrain from any actions which have or may have negative effects on the outcome of disarmament negotiations", which promotes the basic idea contained in the paragraph.

In operative paragraph 1, in the second line, after the words "as well as", the word "continued" followed by a comma was inserted, with the rest of the paragraph remaining as in the previous draft.

Lastly, in operative paragraph 5 - which contains the appeal to the Conference on Disarmament to concentrate its work on the substantive and priority issues on its agenda - in the second line, after the words "to proceed to negotiations on", the words "cessation of the nuclear arms race and" were inserted. In the next line, the word "and" was deleted between the words "disarmament" and "on prevention" and, instead, a comma was inserted. In the same line, after the words "prevention of nuclear war", the following words were inserted "as well as the prevention of an arms race in outer space".

Finally, I should like to thank the sponsors of both draft resolutions, especially the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, whose readiness and understanding have contributed most directly to the successful outcome of the consultations.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the German Democratic Republic.

Mr. NOETZEL (German Democratic Republic): On 14 November 1984, my delegation introduced draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.9, advising at the same time that talks were going on with the delegation of Yugoslavia in order to merge draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.9 and A/C.1/39/L.58, as was the case last year on the same item.

Today, my delegation also is happy to announce that these talks have been concluded successfully. The result is contained in what will be document A/C.1/39/L.58/Rev.1, as has just been explained by the representative of Yugoslavia, a draft resolution of which the German Democratic Republic is a sponsor.
My delegation would like to take this opportunity to thank the sponsors of the new text for the constructive and fruitful co-operation we have had. In particular we thank the representative of Yugoslavia for his fruitful and effective co-operation.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to express the hope that the results of this effort will find widespread support.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): We have just heard extensive amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.58, which is under consideration. I understand that the amended version of the draft resolution is not yet available in writing. May I ask therefore that voting on it should be postponed until tomorrow when we shall have had an opportunity to study the revised text.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for having revealed my intention in this matter. I should like to ask the sponsors of the new combined draft resolution (A/C.1/39/L.9 and A/C.1/39/L.58) if they would be prepared to take action upon this draft resolution tomorrow morning. May I take it that the Committee agrees with this procedure?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.63, which was introduced by the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic at the 39th meeting of the Committee, on 15 November, and which is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon,
Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.63 was adopted by 111 votes to 1, with 24 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their vote after the vote on the draft resolutions that have been acted upon in cluster 3.

Mr. MacPHIONNBHAIR (Ireland): I should like, on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community, to refer to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.63 entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons".

The Ten have been unable to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.63 because they do not consider that the approach which it proposes can lead to any serious progress in negotiating effective controls on the emergence of new weapons of mass destruction.

The Ten have, over the years, actively supported negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament on the conclusion of multilateral agreements on specific types of such weapons of mass destruction as have been identified. The Ten are, frankly, of the view that there should be a prohibition of the development and production of any new weapons of mass destruction if and when such a weapon can be identified.

* Subsequently the delegation of Egypt advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.
The approach contained in the draft resolution before the Committee does not take account of the difficulty of clearly establishing the precise delimitations of civilian and military research and the growing interaction between them. Like many other States in this Committee, the Ten believe that new weapons of mass destruction and their technologies can only be effectively and permanently prohibited if they are subject to concrete, verifiable controls. The Ten believe that a single blanket prohibition of the type proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.63 would have little concrete effect and would risk undermining progress in research and development without necessarily contributing to the goal which we all share of preventing the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction.

I emphasize again that although the Ten cannot support the approach contained in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.63, they are of the view that there is a need for vigilance with a view to identifying potentially dangerous developments in science and technology, so that effective pre-emptive controls can be concluded.

Mr. EMERY (United States of America): The United States was happy to have a chance to support draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.41 on the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. We hope Member States will use the mechanism proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.41 to make serious and well-considered proposals on how the United Nations might more usefully contribute to disarmament.

Based on statements we have heard in the past few days, I know we not alone in our belief that the passage of numerous and often wordy and contradictory draft resolutions is not the most effective means of using the unique resources of the United Nations.
Indeed, such activities merely cause the First Committee to lose credibility among those who pay any attention to it and cause more and more people to cease paying attention altogether. My delegation hopes that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.41 will begin to move us in the correct direction.

On other matters: The United States abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.47. My delegation could have supported the draft resolution had operative paragraph 1 been deleted or revised to make it clear that States which are not members of the Conference on Disarmament participate in the work of that body based on the Conference's rules of procedure.

The United States also voted "no" on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.58; we also voted "no" in the vote on its fifth preambular paragraph. There are many sentiments in this draft resolution with which my delegation is in full sympathy. We share the deep concern of others about the fact that colonial domination and foreign occupation, even of States Members of the United Nations, continue. Acts of aggression continue. We are also seriously concerned about the fact that negotiations on arms reduction and disarmament, already under way, have been stalled. The United States again appeals for the resumption of those negotiations that have been walked away from.

On the other hand, some language in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.58 can be described only as intensely provocative and insensitive to the views of serious members of this body which are working to uphold the principles of the Charter. Other language, as the authors of the draft resolution know full well, conflicts with the views of various members of the Conference on Disarmament. For these reasons, the United States regretfully felt compelled to oppose that draft resolution.

Mr. AL-MOHAMED (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.53 because of its conviction that the principle set forth in that text is a very important one. But that position of principle should in no wise be taken to imply our approval of some paragraphs contained in the draft resolution or has any connection with the cold war between the great Powers.

My country's position to remain apart from the cold war, in addition to the imbalance of some paragraphs of draft resolution L.55, led us to abstain.
Mr. SUTOWARDOYO (Indonesia): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.55. Members will recall that, last year, two resolutions were adopted on the subject of the naval arms race. In one of them, resolution 38/188 G, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, with the assistance of qualified governmental experts, to carry out a comprehensive study on naval forces and naval arms systems and invited all Governments to submit to the Secretary-General their views on the content of such a study. It further requested the Secretary-General to submit the final report to the General Assembly at its fortieth session.

The Group of Experts has met twice this year, and will complete its work next year in time for the submission of its report by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly at its fortieth session.

In its operative paragraph 5, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.55 requests the Disarmament Commission to consider the question of the modalities for holding the negotiations, with the participation of the major naval Powers, the nuclear-weapon States in particular, and other interested States, on the limitation of naval activities, the limitation and reduction of naval armaments and the extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans.

My delegation believes that these are matters which fall within the purview of the study being carried out by the Group of Experts. We are of the view that their consideration by the Disarmament Commission should be deferred until the Secretary-General's report on the study has been submitted to the General Assembly.

For the reason I have stated, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.55.

Mr. ALESSI (Italy): I should like to explain the vote of the Italian delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.47 entitled "Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session". The Italian Government has consistently supported proposals aimed at promoting greater participation by non-member States in the work of the Conference of Disarmament and of its subsidiary bodies. Although we share the intentions expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.47, we regret that we had to abstain. We did so because we deem that the Conference on Disarmament, as an independent body, should not be given directions on organizational and procedural matters.
Mr. BUTLER (Australia): Australia abstained in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.63 entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons". We did this not because we do not strongly support preventive measures of arms control. In fact, the opposite is true. We consider, for example, that the Environmental Modification Convention and the radiological weapons negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament are two valuable instances of such measures. We cannot support, however, blanket or unspecific calls for banning new weapons of mass destruction. These weapons are not identifiable and the ban is therefore completely unverifiable. If such weapons were identifiable, if we all knew clearly what was at issue, we might all be in a different situation. Under these circumstances, a general convention on this subject would be meaningless and could have the added negative effect of banning positive peaceful scientific and technological development by blurring the distinction between research conducted for military purposes and that conducted for non-military purposes.

Mr. BKEUS (Sweden): I wish to explain the vote of Sweden on three draft resolutions. The first is draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.34/Rev.1. The Swedish Government is of the view that the cause of disarmament should be taken into consideration in international co-operation; Sweden, therefore, looks with favour upon concrete, case-by-case initiatives in the specialized agencies and in other organizations and programmes of the United Nations system.
Such initiatives, however, must in our view bear in mind paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which states that the Committee on Disarmament is a single multilateral disarmament negotiating body.

Examples of important cases in this respect are the studies of the United Nations Environment Programme on the effects of nuclear war on the environment, and the report of the World Health Organization on the effect of nuclear war on health and health services.

Sweden, however, has reservations with regard to a recommendation to the specialized agencies and other organizations and programmes of the United Nations system of such a general character as that contained in the draft resolution upon which we have just voted. Unqualified recommendations to international organizations to broaden their activities to political issues, no matter how important these issues may be, would open those organizations, including the specialized agencies, to insecurity and the potential politicization of their normal operations. A development in this direction could seriously disturb and hamper the support for as well as the work in those agencies.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.47, the Swedish delegation abstained in the vote for the following reason. This draft resolution implies that one international body, the General Assembly, can comment on the rules of procedure of another international body, and that gives us some cause for apprehension. I wish, however, to underline that the Swedish Government firmly supports the rights of all non-members of the Conference on Disarmament to participate in its work, as envisaged in its rules of procedure.

Finally, I wish to explain Sweden's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.63. Sweden is deeply convinced of the importance of preventing, at an early stage, the use of scientific and technological achievements for the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. My Government therefore supports steps to ensure that new major scientific discoveries are used for peaceful and not for destructive purposes.

With regard to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.63, I wish to recall the doubts that Sweden has expressed on earlier occasions concerning the idea of a general prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction. The Swedish delegation therefore had to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution. My delegation notes with satisfaction, however, that the draft resolution also
requests the Conference on Disarmament to draft possible agreements on particular
types of such weapons. Sweden will continue to support all efforts to reach
agreements on the prohibition of specific types of new weapons of mass destruction,
in order to find practical solutions in regard to the disarmament aspects of
scientific and technological advances in the military field.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to
explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.41, which was
accepted a few moments ago without a vote.

This draft resolution relates to the review of the role of the United Nations
in the field of disarmament. This is a very serious and important subject, and the
review in question should be carried out in the best possible conditions. For that
reason, my delegation has some doubts about the effectiveness of the procedure
outlined in the draft resolution. In operative paragraph 3 the Disarmament
Commission is requested to carry out a comprehensive review of the role of the
United Nations in the field of disarmament. We all know that the Disarmament
Commission has a very heavy agenda, and in other draft resolutions, still to be
adopted, the General Assembly will be giving other tasks to it. It therefore seems
to us that it will hardly be possible for the Disarmament Commission to carry out
an in-depth review of so vast and complex a subject as the role of the United
Nations in the field of disarmament.

What I have said applies also to a discussion of this matter by the General
Assembly at its fortieth session. We believe that this subject is vast, complex
and very important and that it might be better to entrust an in-depth review of it
to the third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, which will
probably take place in 1987.

My delegation did not, however, oppose the adoption of this draft resolution
without a vote, because we share the intention of the sponsors and we agree that
there is a need to maintain a United Nations role in the field of disarmament and
to keep that role under constant review.

Finally, I wish to say a few words on the penultimate paragraph of the
preamble to the draft resolution. We do not agree with what appears to be the
implication of this paragraph - namely, that the United Nations has some kind of
responsibility for the lack of success of the disarmament efforts in recent years
and for the relative stalemate in the work on that subject. It is our opinion that
it would have been difficult for the United Nations to do more for the cause of
disarmament, and that the lack of success of the efforts in this field cannot in any way be attributed, even partially, to a lack of initiatives by the United Nations.

Mr. Zharkov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics supported draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.34/Rev.1, the purpose of which is to broaden the activities of the specialized agencies and other organizations and programmes of the United Nations system in respect to disarmament. We emphasize that, in our opinion, the activities of the specialized agencies should not be limited to research but should include also the formulation of concrete recommendations with respect to the arms race, arms limitation and disarmament. The implementation of such recommendations would have a directly favourable impact on the sphere of activities of those agencies. We base our position on the premise of this draft resolution that the appropriate specialized agencies would examine the question of its particular activities in this area, and that such an examination would take place also during meetings of their executive bodies.
Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like to explain briefly the votes of my delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.47 and L.65.

My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution L.47. Although we wish to see all States participating in the disarmament process, we consider that participation in the Conference on Disarmament is a matter for the Conference, to be decided in accordance with its rules of procedure, and not for the General Assembly.

My delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution L.65, but I should like to make two comments on it. First, my delegation is of the opinion that the review envisaged in draft resolution L.65 is already provided for in General Assembly resolution 35/46 of 3 December 1980, which adopted the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. We do not, therefore, consider that this draft resolution is necessary.

On the substance of draft resolution L.65, we doubt the utility of the reference to multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament in the seventh preambular paragraph. My Government believes that under present circumstances the best hope for progress in the nuclear field is through bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.47. We should like to indicate our agreement with the general objectives of that draft resolution. We feel, however, that all States Members of the United Nations should be allowed to speak in plenary meetings of the Conference on Disarmament. That seems to us to be in conformity with the spirit of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and, more generally, in accordance with the right of every State to express its views on questions relating to disarmament.

However, the delegation of France would like expressly to indicate its reservations with respect to the formulation employed in operative paragraph 2, which could be interpreted as an invitation to States members of the Conference on Disarmament to ignore the provisions of the Conference's rules of procedure relating to decision-making or decision-taking in that body, which we would find
 unacceptable. In our view it would have been preferable for the General Assembly
to have confined itself to expressing the hope that States members of the
Conference on Disarmament should respond favourably to requests submitted by
non-member States with regard to their participation in plenary meetings of the
Conference.

Mr. SERAJZADEH (Islamic Republic of Iran): Unfortunately my delegation
was not present during the voting on the draft resolutions in cluster 2.

My delegation intended to vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.17,
L.31, L.35, L.39 and L.56, and we would be grateful to have this reflected in the
records.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.