



FIRST COMMITTEE  
45th meeting  
held on  
14 November 1986  
at 10 a.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 45th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

\*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 fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/41/PV.45  
12 December 1986  
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will take decisions on draft resolutions listed in cluster 12 of the informal paper distributed to Committee members, namely those in documents A/C.1/41/L.46/Rev.1, L.51, L.53/Rev.1 and L.69/Rev.1 and the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean (A/41/29).

Before we proceed to take action on draft resolutions, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. van SCHAIK (Netherlands): Allow me to introduce draft resolution L.69/Rev.1 on agenda item 62 (b), on the report of the Conference on Disarmament. The revised text is sponsored by Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and my own country.

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

When my delegation introduced draft resolution L.69 in this Committee on 5 November, we stressed that it was our desire to offer a draft which would present a basis for consensus; the consensus nature of the report of the Conference on Disarmament would thus be duly reflected. In consultations over the past two weeks we have solicited the views of other members of the Committee. It was considered desirable by some of them that the language be improved on some points, so as to enable delegations to adopt the draft resolution by consensus. Let me point out the revisions we devised.

It was explained to us that, in the second preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 2, references to "consideration" of disarmament agreements or items should be avoided. So first we deleted the notion of consideration and revised the second preambular paragraph, which now attributes "a central role" to the Conference on Disarmament "as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum ... in the implementation of the Programme of Action set forth in section III of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly". It is appropriate to recall here that the Programme of Action referred to includes the concept of negotiations on all items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament.

Secondly, in operative paragraph 2, the words "the consideration of all items on its agenda" - that is, the agenda of the Conference - were replaced by "the work on all items on its agenda", as "work" is a generic term which covers all aspects and stages of the activities of the Conference on Disarmament.

Thirdly, a strong desire was conveyed to us to include a reference to the priorities in the disarmament negotiations, as spelled out in paragraph 45 of the Final Document. We have done so in the revised text of operative paragraph 2.

We sincerely believe that we have thus provided the basis for a consensus. The text is not in conflict with any of the other draft resolutions. In efforts to

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

reach consensus, various parties have to make concessions in the search for such language as is acceptable to all. With the new language in A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1, we sincerely hope that we have found the common ground that will permit all delegations to accept the draft resolution.

It follows from what I have just said that it is the desire of its sponsors that draft resolution L.69/Rev.1 be adopted without a vote.

Mr. GRUNDMANN (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic would like, first of all, to thank Ambassador Wijewardane of Sri Lanka, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, for presenting document A/41/29 at the 25th meeting of the First Committee, on 29 October 1986. That document contains the Ad Hoc Committee's report, as well as a consensus draft resolution recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee for adoption by the General Assembly.

Bearing in mind the importance of the task of creating a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, my delegation wishes to explain its position on the draft resolution recommended in paragraph 17 of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean (A/41/29).

The creation of a zone of peace in that large region of our globe is growing ever more urgent since the Indian Ocean is increasingly becoming a zone of military activities. The German Democratic Republic shares the concern of many Member States, expressed in the General Assembly and in this Committee, over the dangers inherent in imperialist plans for increasing militarization of the Indian Ocean region. Particularly dangerous are plans, and even practical steps, to involve the Indian Ocean in efforts aimed at the militarization of outer space. This entails threats to the security and independence of non-aligned littoral and hinterland States, as well as strategic threats to other States.

(Mr. Grundmann, German  
Democratic Republic)

Therefore the German Democratic Republic welcomes all activities undertaken by the countries of the region and by other States aimed at scaling down tensions and creating a climate of stability and security.

In that context, we should like to support the statement contained in the Political Declaration adopted at the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, meeting at Harare, that

"... the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo, Sri Lanka, has been inordinately delayed because of the obstructionist attitude adopted by some States". (A/41/697, p. 93)

At the same time we welcome the readiness of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to reach an agreement with the United States and other major naval Powers on the freezing and substantial reduction of military activities in the Indian Ocean.

In view of the aggravated situation in the Indian Ocean, we consider it more imperative than ever to convene the international conference on the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, for which intensive preparations have been made for years by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Grundmann, German  
Democratic Republic)

In reading the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, it becomes clear that the Committee has done extensive work towards fulfilling its mandate. My delegation holds the view that solid foundations have been laid for convening the Colombo Conference within the agreed time frame, as fixed in resolution 40/153 and reaffirmed in the draft resolution contained in document A/41/29. What is necessary is:

"to complete preparatory work relating to the Conference on the Indian Ocean during 1987 in order to enable the opening of the Conference at Colombo at an early date soon thereafter, but not later than 1988". (A/41/29, para. 17, operative para. 5)

This provides a good orientation for the future work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. Therefore the Delegation of the German Democratic Republic supports the adoption of the present draft resolution contained in paragraph 17 of document A/41/29.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic looks forward to the membership of Zimbabwe, the current Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. We are sure this step will add to the efforts for establishing a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

In conclusion, allow me to express the appreciation of my delegation to Ambassador Wijewardane of Sri Lanka for having once again steered the proceedings of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean with diplomatic skill, patience and wisdom.

Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka): Let me, at the outset, thank the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, Ambassador Wijewardane, for all his efforts to promote consensus in the Ad Hoc Committee in respect of its report and recommendations contained in document A/41/29. It is my hope, as Co-ordinator for

(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

the Group of Non-Aligned States in the Committee, as well as representative of the host country of the proposed Conference on the Indian Ocean, that the report and recommendations will be adopted by consensus in the First Committee.

The proposal for the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean was born of the determination of the peoples in the area to preserve their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and to resolve their political, economic and social problems under conditions of peace and tranquillity. Regrettably, the Indian Ocean area continues to be tense because of developments in the area gravely affecting the independence and territorial integrity of the littoral and hinterland States as well as international peace and security.

The continued military presence of the great Powers gives a special urgency to the need to achieve the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. At the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Harare a few months ago, the Heads of State resolved:

"... to continue their endeavours to ensure that the Conference on the Indian Ocean would be held at Colombo at the earliest possible date, but not later than 1988" and "called for full and active participation in the Conference by all the permanent members of the Security Council and the major maritime users, as well as co-operation by those States with the littoral and hinterland States, which was essential for the success of the Conference."

(A/41/697, pp. 93-94)

In chapter II, the report of the Committee gives a brief outline of its work as the Preparatory Committee for the Conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo. This Conference, which was originally called for seven years ago by consensus resolution 34/80 B to take place in 1981, would constitute an essential step towards the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of

(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

Peace. Its postponement several times is therefore greatly regretted. Its importance has increased rather than diminished.

A renewed effort of co-operation is required during 1987 on the part of all members of the Committee to complete the preparatory work, both procedural and substantive, necessary for the convening of the Conference.

With regard to procedural matters, much work has already been achieved and, when the Conference dates are closer and more exact, many of the remaining unresolved questions - for example, in respect of the rules of procedure and the level of participation - will not prove intractable and can be finalized.

With regard to the substantive aspects of the work, some preliminary, though informal, work has indeed taken place and, given an exertion of political will, this work, too, could be advanced and completed to the extent required for a fruitful and meaningful Conference to take place.

The discussion in the Working Group referred to in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution helped to identify those areas on which further negotiations are required and assisted in cataloging those issues in a more systematic fashion. A number of issues of substance were discussed in the Working Group, including the question of confidence-building measures.

It is hoped that, during 1987, further work on the substantive issues can be completed. It is essential that all the delegations co-operate to reach agreement on a suitable framework in the context of which these issues can be engaged in an open, frank and pragmatic manner. Such a framework could be worked out within the mandate of the Working Group. This is essential if the momentum built up during 1986 in discussing these issues is not to be frittered away in fruitless procedural wrangling. The discussions that took place in the Working Group this year clearly revealed the need for a structured and organized engagement of substantive matters, including elements which might be taken into consideration in the subsequent



(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

preparation of the eventual draft final document of the Colombo Conference.

Operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, which sets out the time frame for the preparatory process and the Conference itself, indicates an understanding that, if the Ad Hoc Committee is unable to complete the necessary preparatory work, serious consideration will need to be given to ways and means of more effectively organizing work in the Ad Hoc Committee to enable it to fulfil its mandate.

My own delegation and the delegations of other non-aligned countries in the Committee will, if the need arises, give careful consideration to the implications of this paragraph, particularly in the context of the current review of the functioning of the United Nations. The understanding of the non-aligned States is clearly that this paragraph neither involves change in nor derogation from the existing mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee which is renewed in operative paragraph 10.

The delegations of the non-aligned States members of the Committee look forward to the membership in the Committee of Zimbabwe, current Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, which has applied for membership.

This year the Ad Hoc Committee was able to complete its work on its report and draft resolution before the opening of the forty-first session of the General Assembly. This is in happy contrast to the situation last year, when the draft resolution on the Indian Ocean was the last to come before the First Committee. What is required now is to translate into action the consensus that has been built up in past years in which all members of the Committee have concurred. As the Foreign Minister of Sri Lanka, Mr. Hameed, stated in respect of the Indian Ocean initiative at this session of the General Assembly:

"The United Nations functions on the basis of consensus, and what is now required is an exercise of greater political will and a sense of commitment to decisions already adopted which will ensure the establishment of a zone of peace." (A/41/PV.12, p. 11)

Mr. RATH (India): We have before us the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, adopted by consensus, along with the consensus recommendation of that Committee for adoption by the General Assembly in document A/41/29. I express my delegation's deep appreciation for the work Ambassador Wijewardane of Sri Lanka has done in his capacity as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee for having brought forth a consensus report and recommendation at the last meeting of the Committee.

India attaches great importance to the early convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean as a necessary step for the implementation of the Declaration adopted in 1971. The draft resolution emphasizes that the Conference on the Indian Ocean and the establishment and maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace requires the full and active participation and co-operation of all the permanent members of the Security Council, the major maritime users and the littoral and hinterland States.

(Mr. Rath, India)

We believe that the Colombo Conference, to be successful, should be attended in a spirit of constructive co-operation by the great Powers and major maritime users, as well as the littoral and hinterland States. Indeed, to be meaningful, the Indian Ocean Conference should have the participation of the great Powers and major maritime users. We therefore urge the concerned States to display the necessary political will and to co-operate actively in the task of establishing a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

We should all work towards the successful convening of the Colombo Conference to complete the preparatory work relating to the Conference on the Indian Ocean during 1987, in order to enable the opening of the Conference at Colombo at an early date soon thereafter, but not later than 1988, so that the objectives of the 1971 Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace can be realized.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): Concerning the recommendation contained in the report A/41/29, my delegation would like to express its appreciation for the sustained efforts of the Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka, Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, in carrying out the mandate of the Ad hoc Committee as defined in the relevant resolutions, despite procrastination and obstructive manoeuvres which as in previous years have impeded the Committee's work and the realization of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, as set forth in resolution 28/32 (XXVI), adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session. These objectives could be summarized as follows: eliminating from the Indian Ocean all bases, military installations, nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and any manifestation of great-Power military presence in the Indian Ocean conceived in the context of great-Power rivalry.

The General Assembly has repeatedly stated these objectives, recently in

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

General Assembly resolution 40/153, in which it expresses the need for their early achievement and calls for the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean in Colombo as a necessary step for the implementation of the Declaration.

It requests the Ad hoc Committee to complete in 1986 preparatory work for the convening of the Conference and to continue its work with rigour and determination in order to enable the opening of the Conference at Colombo at an early date soon thereafter, but not later than 1988.

That was the basis on which we agreed to postpone the Conference, after much procrastination, and here I refer to General Assembly resolution 34/80 B. We hope we shall meet with a positive response so that General Assembly resolution 40/153 can be implemented and the Zone of Peace in the Indian Ocean may be established.

This requires the full and effective participation and co-operation of all the permanent members of the Security Council, the major maritime users and the littoral and hinterland States, in order to avoid the postponement of the convening of the Conference from becoming a tradition in the General Assembly.

It is regrettable to note that, despite the sustained efforts of the non-aligned countries members of the Ad hoc Committee to complete the preparatory work on organizational and procedural matters related to the convening of the Conference - efforts which were supported by all its other members - and despite the work done by the open-ended Working Group set up to facilitate agreement on substantive issues, the Ad Hoc Committee was unable to fulfil its mandate owing to the obstacles created by some Western Countries.

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to say that we have agreed to the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, in the hope that the Conference can be held in Colombo as soon as possible, but not later than 1988. In particular

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

we agree with the statement in the draft resolution that the convening of the Conference is a necessary step for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace adopted in 1971, and with the call for the renewal of genuinely constructive efforts through the exercise of the political will necessary for the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration.

We hope that all countries will show the necessary political will in the Ad Hoc Committee and the Working Group during 1987, so that the Ad Hoc Committee will be able to fulfil its mandate and complete the preparatory work for the convening of the Conference.

In this connection, the achievement of this objective requires the full and effective participation and co-operation of all the permanent members of the Security Council, the major maritime users and the littoral and hinterland States, in view of the fact that the Ad Hoc Committee has now completed so much of the preparatory work for the convening of the Conference.

In conclusion, my delegation welcomes the proposal that Zimbabwe become a member of the Ad hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In view of the importance of the question of establishing a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, the Soviet delegation would like to explain its position before the vote on the draft resolution contained in the report of the Ad hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean (A/41/29).

Each year the task of establishing a zone of peace in this vast and important region assumes increasing urgency, since the Indian Ocean is being transformed intensively into a zone of massive build-up of armaments, and this inevitably undermines the security of littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean itself and of other parts of the world.

(Mr. Timerbaev, USSR)

That region involves something that goes far beyond its own confines in terms of the global arms race, a new spiral of which threatens to extend it to outer space. The critical and difficult situation in the Indian Ocean of course makes it particularly urgent to convene the Conference on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, preparations for which are being undertaken by the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. In order to promote the early convening and success of that Conference, we are ready to work towards an agreement with the United States and other major naval Powers to freeze and substantially reduce all military activities in the Indian Ocean.

We whole-heartedly share the concern expressed by the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries in Harare when they noted that:

"the convening of the Conference had been inordinately delayed because of the obstructionist attitude adopted by some States." (A/41/697, p. 93)

I hear a great noise in this room. It would appear that the representatives are actively discussing the very important Conference we are to hold in Colombo. I hope that this discussion will facilitate the convening of the Conference in 1988, in conformity with the resolution we will be adopting shortly. Once again we wish to emphasize the need for unconditional compliance with the timetable for the holding of the Conference as provided for last year in General Assembly resolution 40/153 and confirmed in the draft resolution before us in document A/41/29.

We have to conclude the preparations for the Conference in Colombo by 1987 in order to ensure the convening of the Conference no later than 1988. Up to now, as we can see from the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, it has done a great deal of work towards discharging the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly, and there is every reason to believe that the solid foundation which has been laid will

(Mr. Timerbaev, USSR)

make it possible, given political will on the part of all members of the Committee, to convene the Conference within the scheduled time.

The Soviet delegation and indeed the majority of members of the Ad Hoc Committee do possess that political will. That has been shown in the profound discussions that have taken place and the productive ideas that have been expressed by many representatives especially in the course of the last session of the Ad Hoc Committee, which was greatly facilitated by the Working Group the Committee set up to consider questions of substance for the purpose of preparing a final document of the Conference.

In the view of the Soviet delegation the draft resolution contained in document A/41/29 correctly assesses the amount of work done and the work still ahead of us. It also indicates that the Ad Hoc Committee must take swift action to discharge its mandate with regard to the Conference in Colombo. Therefore my delegation expresses its support for the adoption of and unswerving compliance with that draft resolution.

Mr. HAGOSS (Ethiopia): My delegation has already the opportunity to pronounce itself on the urgency of convening the international Conference on the Indian Ocean. However, let me refer to some important points articulated in the draft resolution contained in document A/41/29, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

At the outset let me avail myself of this opportunity to thank the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, His Excellency Ambassador Nissanka Wijewardane of Sri Lanka for the able manner in which he has led the work of the Committee. In the same vein I should like to express my delegation's appreciation of the commendable efforts of Ambassador Nihal Rodrigo of Sri Lanka in his capacity as Chairman of the Working Group.

(Mr. Hagoss, Ethiopia)

In our view, the draft resolution before us highlights the precarious and indeed deteriorating condition of security in the Indian Ocean region and the urgency of convening the long-awaited international Conference on the Indian Ocean. That is as it should be.

We are also happy to note that due importance is given to the quintessential question of the participation of the permanent members of the Security Council and other major maritime users at the forthcoming conference.

My delegation maintains that by its very nature the conversion of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace is not a responsibility to be shouldered by the hinterland and littoral States alone. All maritime users of the Indian Ocean, and indeed all those in favour of securing a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, should take an active part in that endeavour.

We hope that all concerned will work towards the implementation of the contents of the draft resolution before us. As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, Ethiopia for its part fully supports the draft resolution before us and shall endeavour relentlessly to attain its implementation.

Mr. OKELY (Australia): My country is an Indian Ocean littoral State. We thus have vital and enduring interests in the region and have consistently supported the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region. Australia's participation as a member and Vice-Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for an International Conference to establish the Indian Ocean Region as a Zone of Peace has over the years that the Ad Hoc Committee has been in existence, been both active and, hopefully, constructive.



(Mr. Okely, Australia)

My delegation has maintained strongly that such a Conference must be preceded by thorough preparation if its objective of the establishment of a zone of peace is to be realized. This preparation, in our view, must include a frank and detailed examination of issues of substance, particularly as they relate to regional peace and security issues. The purpose of such an examination should be to achieve harmonization of views that are at present divergent. It is on these issues of substance that the Preparatory Committee should focus its future work.

The Ad Hoc Committee, under the patient and excellent chairmanship of Ambassador Wijewardane of Sri Lanka, pursued with its characteristic vigour its objective of a Conference at the earliest possible date. In preparing their report, however, some members of the Ad Hoc Committee strongly felt that, considering progress over the years there was a need to look closely but constructively at the way the Ad Hoc Committee fulfils its mandate.

Progress has been slow. The continuing existence of an adverse political and security climate in the region has meant simply that the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region must await the amelioration of at least some of the problems that confront us there.

Zones of peace cannot be imposed; nor should they be regarded as a means of solving regional problems. Their establishment should flow from a situation of relative peace, security and stability and serve to reinforce that situation.

My delegation welcomes the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region. We shall join in a consensus on the adoption of that report (A/41/29) which includes a draft resolution.

Australia warmly welcomes and supports the application by Zimbabwe to become a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Okely, Australia)

In conclusion, I wish to express my delegation's satisfaction that the business of negotiating and concluding the Ad Hoc Committee's report this year was done with a degree of uncharacteristic expedition. The guiding hand of our Chairman was invaluable in achieving that result, and my delegation pays tribute to his efforts.

Too often in past years delegations have fallen prey to the maxim that work expands to fill the time available. It was a welcome change this year not to have to go through the tortuous business of attempting to negotiate a consensus draft resolution through the busy period of the General Assembly. We have thus established a most welcome precedent.

Mr. MANSUR (Pakistan): My delegation would like to comment briefly on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, contained in document A/41/29, but before I do so I wish to compliment Ambassador Wijewardane of Sri Lanka on having guided the work of the Ad Hoc Committee most patiently and with great skill and understanding.

Pakistan will join in the consensus on the draft resolution contained in document A/41/29, in the interest of advancing the objective of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. Among the several initiatives undertaken within the United Nations framework for the strengthening of peace and security in our part of the world, the Sri Lankan proposal for the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region is all-encompassing, and the most comprehensive initiative.

The concept of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region was embodied in an embryonic form in the 1971 Declaration. The idea was further developed in the shape of certain principles adopted by the littoral and hinterland States which met in July 1979. Soon thereafter the region was shaken by foreign military intervention in a hinterland State, which cast a bleak shadow on the already troubled political and security climate of the region.

(Mr. Mansur, Pakistan)

Pakistan has expressed its views in detail on a number of previous occasions on the principles and issues relevant to the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region, but I should like briefly to touch upon one issue which we believe is central to the concept of a zone of peace, namely, the security of the littoral and hinterland States.

This issue has two aspects: first, the threat emanating from within the region and, second, the extraregional threats arising from foreign military presence in the region, including the territories of the littoral and hinterland States. Extensive military activity, deployments or build-up in the vicinity of the region also constitutes an extraregional threat to the security of the littoral and hinterland States.

It is our hope that the proposed Colombo Conference on the Indian Ocean, which is to take place not later than 1988, will focus on all these aspects and define appropriate commitments and obligations on the part of both the regional States and the extraregional Powers.

Pakistan is keenly interested in ensuring a successful Conference. For this purpose, intensive work in the preparatory phase cannot be over-emphasized. It is our hope, therefore, that the preparatory sessions next year of the Ad Hoc Committee will fully address all the issues relevant to the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. Less than adequate preparation would only hurt the attainment of the objectives that we all share.

Mr. HADDAWI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The question of the Indian Ocean is one of the most important issues for both the littoral and the hinterland States. It is an issue that was first presented at the Conferences of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Cairo in 1964 and in Lusaka in 1970. Since 1971 the United Nations has been seized of this question

(Mr. Haddawi, Iraq)

through the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean without the achievement of positive results, because of the obstinate obstruction of certain States outside the region.

The ocean and its natural extensions have a certain importance for the Arab region. Certain States have decided to use it as a centre for military build-up, with the presence of nuclear weapons and also nuclear submarines, and this places our area and our people in jeopardy. We demand that the Indian Ocean be turned into a zone of peace and we urge that the Conference be held at the earliest opportunity, since this concerns our security and the security of the entire world.

The Indian Ocean is a major artery for maritime users and for world trade. A handful of nations should not for selfish reasons obstruct the convening of the Conference, thus jeopardizing peace in the area. Iraq supports turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace and considers that the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean provides a basis for urging the countries that are obstructing the convening of the Conference or continuing their military build-ups in the Indian Ocean to cease such activities forthwith, if they are really serious about the attainment of world peace and security.

(Mr. Haddawi, Iraq)

The countries of the Indian Ocean reject the presence of military bases as well as surveillance and military weapons. They call on all international forums to assume their responsibilities, and on those countries to dismantle such bases and remove all such weapons from the Indian Ocean as well as its natural extensions. We hope that the Committee will unanimously accept the report.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to inform the Committee that Burkina Faso has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.53/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes before the voting on the draft resolutions in cluster 12 before us this morning.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): I should like to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1 on the report of the Conference on Disarmament.

Yugoslavia attaches the greatest importance to the work of the Conference on Disarmament. We believe that we are all agreed that, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, the Conference on Disarmament plays an exceptionally important role in the negotiations on questions of disarmament, particularly those to which we accorded priority at the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. We also believe that we all agree that the priority issues of disarmament are those concerning the halting of the nuclear-arms race, nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war - in a word, the survival of mankind.

This is clearly borne out by those parts of the Final Document of the first special session related to the Conference on Disarmament and the priority tasks in disarmament negotiations. Therefore, we believe that the Conference on Disarmament should not be a body that will negotiate on some selective questions of disarmament

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

alone, nor a forum that will only discuss the questions of disarmament. We also believe that it would not be acceptable for groups of questions to be singled out in accordance with the interests of certain members as questions on which the Conference can or cannot negotiate. The Conference should be a body that will necessarily negotiate on all substantial issues of disarmament on its agenda - in other words, all those questions that concern the security of all countries.

We note with regret that such an approach to the Conference on Disarmament and its role is contained in draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1. We appreciate the efforts made by the sponsors to ensure that it meets with the understanding of the members of our Committee. We have considered the revised text attentively and find it to be a slight improvement over the original draft. However, regrettably, the new draft has not removed our reservations with respect to the substance of the draft resolution. In its key operative paragraph 2, the Conference on Disarmament is called upon to continue, during its 1987 session, work on all the items on its agenda. We consider that it is not enough only to call upon the Conference on Disarmament to continue its work. The General Assembly can and should point to the priority issues of disarmament and request the Conference on Disarmament to conduct negotiations on them. We therefore cannot agree with the essence of the request contained in this draft.

Our message to the Conference on Disarmament concerning the need to proceed to negotiations on key issues of disarmament should be put in unequivocal and precise terms. We consider it to be indispensable because of the importance we all attach to the Conference on Disarmament and the role it plays in multilateral negotiations on disarmament. Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1, in our opinion, does not contain such a clear message. For those reasons, my delegation is unfortunately unable to support the draft resolution and will abstain in the vote on it.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): It is necessary for the Australian delegation to explain its vote before the voting on the two draft resolutions submitted with regard to the annual report of the Conference on Disarmament precisely because two draft resolutions have been submitted. The first (A/C.1/41/L.51) has been submitted by the delegation of Yugoslavia on behalf of a number of delegations, and the second (A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1) has been submitted by the representative of the Netherlands also on behalf of a number of delegations.

The representative of Yugoslavia has just given us an analysis of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1. Without wishing to engage in any particular argument with him, I suggest that a similar analysis could be conducted with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.51. I shall not do that, but I shall make the following point.

The operative section of that draft resolution draws selectively from arguments and proposals made and conclusions then arrived at by consensus in the process of the drawing up of the report of the Conference on Disarmament on its 1986 session. In those circumstances, such an approach is not acceptable to my delegation because it is inevitably distorted. If we were to reproduce in the operative paragraphs of a resolution an objective and correct presentation of what had been concluded for the report of the Conference on Disarmament in 1986, we would in fact have to reproduce the report of the Conference as such. And this is precisely our point. The Conference on Disarmament works by consensus. The report that it adopts at the end of its year's work is a report adopted by consensus. The content of that report reflects completely and adequately the proposals, differences, recommendations, agreements and disagreements which were characteristic of the work of the Conference during the year being reported on, and that is all clearly recorded. But in toto the report is adopted by consensus.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Now, at a time when we are in fact attempting to rationalize the work of this Committee, it makes no sense to my delegation to seek in any way to reopen what has been discussed in Geneva. It makes no sense to do anything regarding this draft resolution other than to act on the basis of consensus, which characterized the adoption of the report by the Conference. This Committee should act on the report by consensus.

In these circumstances, the draft resolution that commends itself to my delegation is self-evident, because we are a sponsor of it: is the one contained in document A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1. In our firm view, that draft resolution provides for the appropriate action by the Assembly on the report of the Conference on Disarmament on its work in 1986. That is why it is written as it is. Because the report of the Conference was a consensus report, this draft resolution has been written in a way that should make possible its adoption by consensus.



(Mr. Butler, Australia)

From what has been said this morning, we have learned that that will not be the case. We deeply regret that, and we hope that the future will see a different situation. For our part, of course, we will vote in favour of that draft resolution, and, of course, consistent with what I have just said, we will abstain on the draft resolution contained in document L.51.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation is a sponsor of one of the two draft resolutions now before the Committee, that in document A/C.1/41/L.51.

As the Committee is aware, Mexico is a member of what is now called the Conference on Disarmament; formerly it has been the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee and the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Since the very beginning of the work of that negotiating body, Mexico has been a member. I therefore speak with a certain knowledge of the facts involved since I have been representing my country in that body for more than 15 years, and I can assure all my colleagues in this Committee that the operative part of draft resolution L.51 accurately reflects the unfortunate situation in the Conference.

We are quite justified, then, in expressing in the first operative paragraph deep concern and disappointment that it has not been possible in the Conference on Disarmament:

"to reach concrete agreements on any disarmament issues to which the United Nations has assigned greatest priority and urgency and which have been under consideration for a number of years;" (A/C.1/41/L.51, para. 1)

The injunction in paragraph 4 is also highly relevant because it has been impossible so far to

"provide the existing ad hoc committees with appropriate negotiating mandates and to establish, as a matter of urgency, the ad hoc committees under item 1 of its agenda, entitled 'Nuclear-test ban'". (para. 4)

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The so-called Group of 21 of the Disarmament Conference some years ago adopted a working paper in which it sought, for the establishment of subsidiary organs, not a voting system but a procedure similar to that used by the Security Council, a so-called consensus system, which would in fact be tantamount to a veto system. But such a system should not be used for the establishment of subsidiary bodies, and in fact so far never has been.

That is why my delegation will certainly vote in favour of draft resolution L.51 and will unfortunately have to abstain on L.69, which does not refer to certain essential factors of the kind to which I have just referred.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): I wish to make a statement in explanation of vote on draft resolution L.51, which deals with the report of the Conference on Disarmament. I want to stress that that report is an agreed report. My delegation regrets that in recent years we have been unable to support draft resolutions on this subject as their language had become more and more unbalanced.

In our explanations of vote to the Committee we have expressed regret at the failure of the co-sponsors to discuss and if possible to agree on language for this resolution with all members of the Conference on Disarmament. We have repeatedly expressed the hope that in the future consultations would take place so that more widely acceptable formulations could be found. We are accordingly particularly disappointed that once again the sponsors have not sought to discuss the language of the draft resolution with a view to arriving at a text which could be adopted by consensus.

My delegation will therefore be unable to support draft resolution L.51, but we very much hope that in the future the sort of consultations that I have indicated will in fact take place.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I, too, wish to say a few words concerning the two draft resolutions: L.51 and L.69.

At least some of the representatives who have preceded me have said that the report of the Disarmament Conference is a consensus document. Well, that is indeed so. But that report reflects divergencies - indeed marked divergencies - among different groups of States regarding the obligations and mandates of the Conference.

Some States members of the Conference, including those of the group to which the Soviet Union belongs, believe that the Conference must give priority to certain items - for example, nuclear disarmament, a nuclear-weapon-test ban and the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and we urge that the Conference in fact start negotiations on them. On the other hand, the group of States that has sponsored L.69/Rev.1, does not feel that the Conference should hold negotiations on these particular issues.

That is the essential difference which is before the Committee. We hope that the General Assembly will be fully aware of these divergencies and take a decision as to whether the Conference on Disarmament should undertake negotiations on nuclear disarmament, a nuclear-test ban, and the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

We must therefore have an answer from the General Assembly to those questions.

Forty Member States participate in the Conference on Disarmament. That is a minority of the 160 States in the Organization. Hence, we want to know what the majority of States think in this regard. Do they think that priority should be given to negotiations on comprehensive nuclear and space disarmament, or do they think that those matters should not be considered by the Conference on Disarmament?

For those reasons, we shall obviously vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.51 and shall abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1.

Mr. van SCHAIK (Netherlands): Like other delegations, my delegation very much regrets that it is not possible to reach a consensus now on a draft resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament.

From what I have heard from some representatives, I understand that they think that the draft resolution that we have submitted in document A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1 reflects the idea that we are against negotiations on various items. I would repeat what I said in introducing the revised text of the draft resolution: It is definitely not the wish of the co-sponsors to refer specifically to the position which has been taken by some members of the Conference on Disarmament. We deliberately included the phrase "the work on all items" in operative paragraph 2 in order to avoid expressing the idea of one group. We deliberately tried to find language that would make it possible to reach a consensus:

The representative of Yugoslavia has said that he recognizes that there has been an improvement in the text, and I appreciate that. I regret, however, that he and some other representatives have said that it would still not be possible for them to join in a consensus on the text.

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

A number of delegations from the group of non-aligned countries and from other groups have indicated to my delegation that perhaps the solution would be to delete operative paragraph 2, since there is some misunderstanding about its wording. They have indicated that if it were deleted they could vote in favour of our draft resolution.

As I have said, we did genuinely try to find consensus language for operative paragraph 2. We would therefore regret it if that paragraph had to be deleted. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that there is not enough time now to try to find other language, I think that the deletion of operative paragraph 2 would perhaps be the solution to this problem, and I therefore propose that. I trust that with that deletion draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1 will be generally acceptable.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the Netherlands has just informed the Committee that the co-sponsors have orally revised draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1 by deleting operative paragraph 2.

Since no other representative wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting on the draft resolutions in cluster 12, we shall begin the voting process.

I put to the vote first draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Iraq at the First Committee's 34th meeting, on 5 November 1986, and it is sponsored by Iraq and Jordan. A recorded vote on it 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, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.46/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 108 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The next draft resolution in cluster 12 is contained in document A/C.1/41/L.51. It is entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Report of the Conference on Disarmament". It was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the First Committee's 34th meeting, on 5 November 1986, and has the following sponsors: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Suçan, Sweden, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zaire. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.51 was adopted by 110 votes to 3, with 18 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution

A/C.1/41/L.53/Rev.1, entitled "Review of the Implementation of the Recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session:

Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session".

It was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 36th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1986, and has the following sponsors: Algeria, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, 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: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Samoa, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.53/Rev.1 was adopted by 112 votes to 13, with 7 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now taken action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1, entitled "Review and implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: report of the Conference on Disarmament". This draft resolution, which has been orally revised with the deletion of operative paragraph 2, was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1986, and has the following sponsors: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iceland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Spain.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, China, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 70 votes to none, with 50 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on the draft resolution in paragraph 17 of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean contained in document A/41/29, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". This draft resolution, which has been recommended for adoption by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1986. Its programme budget implications are contained in document A/C.1/41/L.81. It has been requested that this draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their positions or votes on the draft resolutions that have been before us in cluster 12.

Mr. Alencar (Brazil): As a sponsor of draft resolution L.51, my delegation would like to explain its vote regarding draft resolution L.69/Rev.1, on which we abstained.

In our view that draft resolution, even in its amended version, remains flawed because it does not explicitly mention the priority issues of disarmament as agreed upon in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament.

Mr. SERAJZADEH (Islamic Republic of Iran): I wish to make a statement in explanation of my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.46/Rev.1, on which we abstained. My delegation considers that all States should be able to participate in the disarmament process, but this is a matter for the Conference on Disarmament and should be decided in accordance with its rules of procedure.

However, the Conference on Disarmament is a negotiating forum rather than a deliberative body. Therefore, we believe that its rules of procedure should not be interpreted in such a way as to change the nature and aim of the Conference. Our abstention in the vote on the draft resolution is without prejudice to the Conference's established rules of procedure.

Mr. HADDAWI (Iraq): I wish to explain why my delegation introduced draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.46.

Many of us in Geneva do closely follow the deliberations of the Conference on Disarmament with much regret that a small number of members of the Conference make a habit of taking advantage of the rules of procedure to achieve narrow political gains, even if those gains work against the interests and functions of the Conference itself. When we introduced the draft resolution we were hopeful that such members would eventually comply with the democratic spirit of the Charter by demonstrating their utmost restraint and consideration for the principles of universality, and would refrain from persisting in misusing the rules of procedure and distorting the true meaning of consensus in such a way that their votes become drastic vetoes. Such members are obviously motivated by political factors incompatible with their responsibility to the common objective of achieving consensus results in the struggle for disarmament.

We believe that no United Nations Member State should be barred by any Conference on Disarmament member for any reason from contributing its share to the Conference's work, which is not much different from that of any other

(Mr. Haddawi, Iraq)

United Nations body. We also believe that the functions, deliberations and accomplishments of the Conference are to be shared by all United Nations Member States. Its failures may yield serious, perhaps tragic, consequences for all of us. The Conference on Disarmament is not a regional or subregional group, and it is not a restricted club. Membership of the Conference is a matter of concern and interest to the United Nations. As a matter of fact, it was initiated by the common will of all of us. Its mandate, and that of its members, was given by our collective decision.

In the First Committee we have been dealing with the achievements and difficulties of the Conference - in other words, we are building big hopes on that serious and civilized forum. Therefore, let it remain a serious and civilized forum, and may those who are adamant in their intransigence cease to tamper with its noble role and co-operate with the other members to achieve positive results.

Mr. MORELLI (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The Peruvian delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1, as orally revised. We wish to place on record our preference for draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.51, of which Peru is a sponsor, because both in the preamble and the operative part that draft resolution is clear and unequivocal on the mandate of the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral negotiating body and as regards the central role it has to play in disarmament matters, in conformity with the priorities already established.

In any case, the Peruvian delegation believes that one single resolution at this session, as at any session of the General Assembly, would have been the appropriate solution on a matter that is so sensitive and important as compliance with the decisions of the General Assembly at its tenth special session.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): I wish briefly to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.46/Rev.1, on which we abstained. We wish to see all States participating in the disarmament process. However, we consider as a matter of principle that participation in the Conference on Disarmament is a matter for the Conference itself, to be decided in accordance with its rules of procedure.

Mr. TONNE (Nigeria): I wish to explain the positive vote of Nigeria for the amended draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.69. In our view it is purely procedural, the sort of resolution that we believe the Conference on Disarmament should have acted upon as part of its annual report. We regret that it was not possible to undertake adequate consultations with a view to merging that draft resolution with A/C.1/41/L.51, which Nigeria sponsored. As we consider draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.6/Rev.1 to be procedural, we voted for it.

We hope that the spirit of co-operation and flexibility we have tried to foster by our vote, in spite of all our reservations, will prevail in the future deliberations of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

Mrs. BORSIIN-BONNIER (Sweden): I should like to explain the vote of the Swedish delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.46/Rev.1, on which it abstained. The Swedish Government firmly supports the participation of all non-members of the Conference on Disarmament in its work, in accordance with its rules of procedure. However, participation in the Conference's work is to be decided upon by the Conference itself, on the basis of its rules of procedure, and the draft resolution implies that States not members of the Conference have the right to participate, the rules of procedure notwithstanding.

Furthermore, the Conference on Disarmament reports yearly to the General Assembly on all aspects of its work, and my delegation does not believe that a further report by the Secretary-General would add much to the report of the Conference itself.

Mrs. CARRASCO (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): We voted in favour of draft resolutions A/41/L.51 and A/41/L.69/Rev.1 as orally revised, because of the importance we attach to the consideration of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the tenth special session of the General Assembly and we give our support to the participation of all Member States. We regret, however, that the sponsors of both draft resolutions did not find it possible to reach agreement on a single text.

Mr. FYFE (New Zealand): I wish to explain New Zealand's position on the draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.46/Rev.1. New Zealand abstained in the vote on that draft resolution because we do not think that the General Assembly should comment in this way on the procedures by which the Conference on Disarmament orders its business. That is a matter for the Conference itself. Nevertheless, New Zealand considers that the Conference has an obligation both to itself and to those States which are not members of it 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 meetings of the Conference. We believe also that any 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 the right to be heard and every international organization, whether negotiating or deliberative, has a responsibility to ensure that that right is respected and upheld.

My delegation also cannot support the request to the Secretary-General in operative paragraph 3. We do not consider that a report of the kind envisaged in that paragraph would facilitate a solution of this particular problem.

Mr. RENIE (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to give a brief explanation of my delegation's position on draft resolution

A/C.1/41/L.46/Rev.1.

In voting in favour of that text we have signalled our agreement to the general goal of the draft. We believe that all Member States of the United Nations should be allowed to speak in plenary meetings of the Conference on Disarmament. That seems to us to be in keeping with the spirit of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and in general to the right of all States to speak on disarmament issues.

However, the French delegation also wishes to state clearly its reservations with regard to operative paragraph 2. This text may be interpreted as inviting the member States of the Conference on Disarmament to renounce the provisions of the rules of procedure concerning decision-taking, which we could not go along with. It would be preferable, in our view, for the General Assembly to express the wish that the States members of the Conference on Disarmament should reply favourably to requests made by non-member States for the right to speak in plenary meetings of the Conference.

Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine delegation wishes to explain its abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1. We believe that the report of the Conference on Disarmament should be embodied in a consensus resolution, in the same way that it has received from the General Assembly the report from the Disarmament Commission, the content of which also reflects diverging points of views.

The Argentine delegation expresses the hope that at the next session of the General Assembly it will be possible to draw up a consensus draft resolution in which all groups will take part, in order to take note of the report of the Conference on Disarmament.



Mr. GYI (Burma): I wish to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.46/Rev.1, L.69/Rev.1 and L.53. We abstained in the vote on L.46/Rev.1. That does not mean that we support the right of all States which are not members of the Conference on Disarmament to participate in the work of that Conference, but we feel that it is the Conference on Disarmament that should take decisions on matters such as these, in accordance with its rules of procedure.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.69/Rev.1, we have supported it since we believe it is a purely procedural draft resolution and that such support does not diminish our support for the principles and objectives contained in L.51.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): The Israel delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.46/Rev.1 because we are firmly convinced that the Conference on Disarmament should be open to all Members of the United Nations wishing to attend as observers and to make statements expressing their views on the important issues discussed there.

However, we cannot accept the motives of the representative of Iraq in introducing the draft resolution in the Committee, namely, his desire to raise certain matters in the Conference on Disarmament which would be completely inappropriate for that body and an abuse of the purposes of the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus today concluded action on a number of draft resolutions listed in cluster 12, with the exception of draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.54 and L.71/Rev.1.

I would inform the Committee that it is my intention to consider this morning the remaining draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.3 and L.52 in cluster 9 and after that the decision proposed by the Chairman in document A/C.1/41/L.78 and the draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.43/Rev.1 in cluster 2. Consequently, we shall now return to cluster 9, and I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements on the two draft resolutions.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): I should like to say something about the draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.3, especially since some time has elapsed since it was introduced. We are naturally aware of some discussion on the margins of the Committee of the draft resolutions under this item, one of which is L.3, sponsored by my delegation and a number of others.

The sponsors of draft resolution L.3 - Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, Liberia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Rwanda, Spain, Swaziland, Turkey and my own delegation - believe that L.3 is a draft resolution that is relevant, substantive and worth while. In our view, it also covers somewhat different ground from the draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.52, which has been submitted under the same item. I draw attention, for example, to the different titles of the two draft resolutions. As is traditional, draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3 concentrates on the nuclear aspects of the bilateral negotiations.

We believe that there is room for two draft resolutions under this item and we therefore hope that our draft resolution, as others, can be considered on its merits and that it will receive general support.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation believes that the item dealt with by these draft resolutions is an important one, and it is particularly relevant after the conversations held at the summit meeting in Reykjavik.

For this reason, we believe that a draft resolution submitted for consideration to the Committee on this particular item should be drawn up in such a way that its balance and equanimity would offer certain guarantees for reaching unanimity. As far as we are concerned, this is unfortunately not the case with regard to draft resolution L.3. There are paragraphs in that draft resolution, for

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

example, the first preambular paragraph, which recalls a number of resolutions on which several abstentions were entered. One was in fact cast by the delegation of Mexico.

Then there are other paragraphs, for example, the fourth preambular paragraph and the sixth preambular paragraph, which in my view could either have been dropped altogether or could have been given different drafting.

As is well known, one of the parties to the Reykjavik talks has maintained from the outset that all agreements were part of a package and until full agreement had been reached it could not be said that any partial agreement had been reached.

We also feel that operative paragraph 2, for the same reasons I have just adduced, could also perhaps have been left out.

Therefore, if the sponsors of this draft were prepared to omit the first, fourth and sixth preambular paragraphs, and if they were also prepared to drop operative paragraph 2, then my delegation would be very happy to cast its vote in favour.

If this is not the case, and with great regret - because we consider that this is an extremely important item - we would have to abstain.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): We could have wished that the representative of Mexico had approached my delegation earlier with specific suggestions for drafting amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3, because this is a very late stage in our proceedings, just as we are coming to a vote.

However, the sponsors have in any case been closely in touch about this draft resolution and I think that, subject to their views, there are a number of ways in which we could meet the points brought by the Ambassador of Mexico. So let me go through the points that he has raised and see whether we can perhaps meet the issues that he has raised.

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

As regards the first preambular paragraph, recalling previous resolutions, perhaps it would help if we noted the previous resolutions. They are, after all, a fact; they were, after all, adopted. So my suggestion there is simply to say "Noting its resolutions ...", instead of "Recalling".

The fourth preambular paragraph was also referred to by the Ambassador of Mexico. I was not quite clear on this, and indeed, on a number of other points, as to what was the matter with the formulation. It seems to me really factual in the light of all the information we have received about the discussions in Reykjavik. However, if it would help the Ambassador, perhaps we could simplify this fourth preambular paragraph, which does refer to Reykjavik, and we could end it after the word at the beginning of the second line of the English text, "issues".

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

The preambular paragraph would then read:

"Noting also that a large measure of agreement was reached on a number of issues".

I do not see how anyone could quarrel with that. We would then delete the rest of the paragraph.

I believe that the next paragraph to which the representative of Mexico referred was the sixth preambular paragraph. Again, from what the representative of Mexico has said, it is not clear to me what the problem is. I think the reference to the Final Document is factual. I do believe that the two Governments concerned have done a great deal to keep other Member States of the United Nations informed of what was going on. One could almost say that what happened after Reykjavik was transparency or "prozrachnosti". Therefore, unless I hear a better reason, which I should be very glad to hear, we would prefer to maintain this preambular paragraph as it is.

The representative of Mexico also referred to operative paragraph 2, which

"Urges the two Governments to reach early agreements in those areas where common ground already exists".

Again, I am not sure what is the matter with the wording. The two Governments concerned will reach early agreements only where there is common ground; if there is no common ground, ergo there will be no agreements. It is difficult to understand what is the matter. Should we not urge the Governments to reach early agreements?

So, I am a little puzzled, but I have a suggestion to make out of a desire to be as helpful as possible. It might help if in paragraph 2 we followed precisely the language agreed between the two sides in the negotiations at the highest level a year ago in Geneva. I have the text to hand; it is very similar to what is here,

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

but if we followed it exactly maybe that would help. I therefore suggest that we amend paragraph 2 so that it reads: "Urge the two Governments to make" - and this is a direct quotation from the Soviet-United States communiqué of November 1985 - "early progress, in particular in areas where there is common ground".

I hope that with those changes the problems that the representative of Mexico has with the draft resolution will be largely resolved. I certainly share his hope that the draft resolution shall be balanced and be adopted by consensus.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to express its views on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.52 and L.3 before they are voted upon. As I understand it, we have proceeded to the voting on them.

The draft resolutions are about a very important question, the solution to which - this is no exaggeration - will do a great deal to determine the further development and very existence of human civilization.

We believe that draft resolution L.3 in essence does not give an objective picture of the results of the Reykjavik meeting and the status of Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space armaments. It is unbalanced, because it is based on the position of one side. The sponsors of the draft resolution have disregarded the position of the other side, the Soviet side. Therefore, the Soviet delegation will abstain in the voting on that draft resolution. The Soviet Union intends to develop the results of Reykjavik and our proposals at the Geneva talks.

I should like to draw it to the attention of all present that what we are talking about is a draft resolution relating to the Reykjavik meeting as a package for agreement, a package of mutual understanding on the global problems of the day. We regard as extremely negative any departure from the understandings reached

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

and any attempt to undermine or revise them. The Soviet side has repeatedly over a short period stated its readiness to continue working on the basis of what was achieved in Reykjavik in terms of both positions and policies. We are quite embittered by attempts on the American side, including attempts made in the course of recent contacts between the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union and the United States, in Vienna, to retreat to a pre-Reykjavik position and once again to rewrite the results of the meeting of the supreme leaders of our countries.

As the Committee is aware, in Vienna there was a clash of two concepts, two diametrically opposed approaches. The Soviet Union wanted to create a basis for the practical implementation of the understandings achieved in Reykjavik. The United States attempted to establish a position leading to an erosion of what was achieved there. If we really want to remain at the level of Reykjavik, we must preserve what was achieved and work towards practical implementation of the historic agreements.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

This possibility undoubtedly still exists, and draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.52 promotes its realization. We shall vote for it.

The amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3 just introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom in essence do nothing to change our assessment of that draft resolution.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): I had the impression that that explanation of vote was written before my amendments were introduced, and did not really take them into account. The representative of the Soviet Union may be being too hasty and too suspicious in relation to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3. It is the product of the views of a number of States. We would like it to be considered properly. The representative of the Soviet Union said that it was unbalanced, being based on the view of one side. I wish he could be more precise. A great deal of the draft resolution is based on joint communiqués of the two sides. Other elements in it are based on common sense.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on a point of order.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to ask a question. A few minutes ago you said, Mr. Chairman, that we were proceeding to the vote on a number of draft resolutions. Then the representative of Mexico stated his views on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3 and explained the reasons for his vote. He mentioned the amendments that might be introduced. I also expressed my position on draft resolution L.3. Now the representative of Britain is using his right of reply. In that case, I ask for my name to be put down on the list of those wishing to speak in exercise of that right, and we can begin a discussion on the various interpretations of my statement and that of the representative of the United



(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

Kingdom. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, for a ruling on what is happening - explanations of vote or a discussion about the results of Reykjavik? If we are having a discussion on the Reykjavik results, I have a 25-page statement which I am ready to read out, giving our views on Reykjavik.

The CHAIRMAN: Having listened to the point raised by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, I wish to repeat that we are now at the stage of making statements and comments on the two draft resolutions before us listed in cluster 9. I was calling on those representative who had put their names on the list to make statements on the two draft resolutions. Statements in exercise of the right of reply may be made at the end of the morning's meeting. We have only one meeting today, and each delegation has the right to ask to speak in exercise of the right of reply at the end of this morning's meeting.

I must repeat that we are at the stage of making statements and comments, and then we shall come to the next stage in considering the draft resolutions, when I call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or their vote before the voting on the two draft resolutions now before us.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Chairman. That was my understanding, too.

I notice that the representative of the Soviet Union quite frequently interrupts representatives when they are saying things that he finds slightly unwelcome, and I wish also that he -

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the representative of the United Kingdom to stick to this stage of our consideration, that is, statements on substance on the draft resolutions now before us. With that understanding, I call on him to continue his statement.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): I intend to do so, of course, Mr. Chairman.

But I should like to make the point that I think the representative of the Soviet Union should use the correct name for my country in the Russian language when he is referring to it.

When I was interrupted - if I am allowed to use that word - I was asking where the draft resolution was unbalanced, especially in view of the amendments that had been made. Had I been given the opportunity, I was going to make a further suggestion, subject to the views of the other sponsors, in an effort to meet the points raised by the representative of the Soviet Union. Perhaps I may do so now. I suggest that to meet his points we add a further bit of agreed language to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3. This would be a new third preambular paragraph. It would be taken from the joint Soviet-United States statement of January 1985, on the following lines:

"Noting that in their joint communiqué of 8 January 1985 the two Governments agreed that the subject of these negotiations was a complex of questions concerning space and nuclear arms, both strategic and intermediate-range, with all these questions considered and resolved in their interrelationship"

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

That is a further direct quotation from a joint United States-Soviet statement. I hope that the Ambassador of the Soviet Union could consider this and other amendments in a positive spirit and see whether the draft resolution with the changes I have suggested is not in fact an even-handed one. I hope, finally, that all fair-minded delegations will look at the text of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3 in that spirit.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, that you refer to my country by its proper name - unlike the representative of the United Kingdom, who persists in calling my country by an inaccurate name. We would remind that representative that the name of my country is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, not the Soviet Union. I hope he will be more accurate in the future.

As to the substance of the amendments, once again this relates to questions that existed before the Reykjavik agreements. We fully accept those questions and use them as our point of departure. But the draft resolution relates to the Reykjavik meeting, and gives a one-sided assessment of it. The best proof of that is that for some reason the representative of the United Kingdom has only just decided to consult with us in the course of this untimely polemic, even though we explained our position on this draft resolution some time ago. The sponsors of the draft resolution - as often happens, by the way - are disregarding us, and do not wish to consult with us.

I reiterate that, as has often been stated by our country's leader, General-Secretary Mikhail S. Gorbachev, Reykjavik created new frontiers in international relations and in Soviet-United States relations. That at least is the way the Soviet Union sees Reykjavik. We cannot and will not support draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform the Committee that, in accordance with my understanding of the situation, and in view of the importance of this question, I personally have been doing my utmost, with the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.3 and L.52, to facilitate a conclusion on merging the two draft resolutions. In the course of these informal consultations I felt - and this was officially stated to me - that despite all the efforts made during informal consultations there was no possibility this year of agreeing on a single draft resolution on this subject. I therefore see no alternative to taking action on the two draft resolutions before us. The hour is very late, and we must take action not only on the draft resolutions in cluster 9, but also, as I have announced, on those in cluster 2. A number of draft resolutions will still remain for consideration and action on Monday, 17 November.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I share the view you have expressed from the very outset: that it would be better to have before us a single draft resolution. It was for that reason that I followed with great interest the informal consultations held by a spokesman for the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.52, which include my delegation. Unfortunately, I have been told that those informal consultations led to the conclusion that it was impossible to merge the two draft resolutions and that action would have to be taken upon them individually. It was with a view to making the maximum effort that my delegation said that with the deletion of the four paragraphs I mentioned from draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3 the draft resolution would be acceptable to us. But that was the minimum and not subject to negotiation. I think you are quite right, Sir, to propose that we now proceed to vote on the two draft resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the representative of the United Kingdom whether he has orally revised draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3 officially.

Mr. EDJS (United Kingdom): I said, when I was introducing the amendments earlier, that I regretted the lack of time to consult with the sponsors, but none of the sponsors have come to me to say that they do not support the amendments we have proposed in an effort to make the draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.3 generally acceptable. If those amendments are acceptable, we should like the Committee to take a decision on the draft resolution, as orally amended by me.

The CHAIRMAN: In that case, I have another question for the representative of the United Kingdom. He has proposed the addition of a new third preambular paragraph. Are we to understand that the third preambular paragraph of the original text should become the fourth, or is the proposed new paragraph intended to replace the original third preambular paragraph?

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): The intention was that it should be an additional paragraph inserted between the existing second and third preambular paragraphs. One small stylistic point concerns me. If we insert the new third preambular paragraph, I think that in what would then become the fourth preambular paragraph the words "at their further meeting" would need to be changed to "at the further meeting".

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation, like the delegation of Mexico, has certain difficulties with this draft resolution. There can be no doubt that the changes just introduced may possibly improve some of the paragraphs with which we had problems. We also believe that a draft resolution on such an important matter as this should afford the possibility of being adopted by consensus.

We have particular problems - and these concern the part of the draft resolution that could in one way or another affect countries like my own - with the sixth preambular paragraph, in which appreciation is expressed to the two Governments concerned for their readiness to keep other States Members of the United Nations duly informed of progress in the negotiations.

My delegation - or, at any rate, my Government - has not received any information with regard to such negotiations. We understand that the countries directly involved in the negotiations have kept their allies duly informed through the respective organizations to which they belong. However, paragraph 114 of the Final Document, to which reference is made in the sixth preambular paragraph, specifically states:

(spoke in English)

"The United Nations should ... be kept duly informed through the General Assembly, or any other appropriate United Nations channel ... of all disarmament efforts outside its aegis without prejudice to the progress of negotiations." (S-10/2, para. 114)

(continued in Spanish)

To my knowledge, in the Conference on Disarmament we have only received the reports or joint communiqués issued following those negotiations, and we consider that such information, along with the public information made available as a result

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

of the negotiations, cannot be said to be the type of information that fully satisfies the provisions of paragraph 114 of the Final Document.

Those are the comments we wished to make with regard to this draft resolution, and for those reasons, my delegation, like the delegation of Mexico, will abstain in the vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting, we shall now begin the voting on the two draft resolutions in cluster 9, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3, "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament" and subtitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations," as orally revised by the representative of the United Kingdom, on behalf of the sponsors. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 22nd meeting of the First Committee, on 27 October 1986, and is sponsored by Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, Liberia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Rwanda, Spain, Swaziland, Turkey and the United Kingdom. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3, as orally revised, was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 66 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.52, "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament," which is subtitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations." The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 38th meeting of the First Committee, on 10 November 1986, and is sponsored by the following delegations: Algeria, Bangladesh, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.



A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, 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: None

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.52 was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

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

Mr. BARTHELEMY (United States of America): The United States appreciates the call contained in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.52 for the United States and the Soviet Union to conduct

"their bilateral negotiations with the greatest resolve with a view to achieving agreements on concrete and effective measures for the halting of the nuclear-arms race, radical reduction of their nuclear arsenals, nuclear disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in outer space".

(Mr. Barthelemy, United States)

As far as the United States is concerned, it has put forward a number of proposals aimed at those objectives, most notably, by President Reagan at his recent meeting with General Secretary Gorbachev in Reykjavik. Regrettably, however, this draft resolution also includes in its preamble references to certain clearly unbalanced documents, as well as to formulations that the United States cannot endorse. For this reason, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution L.52.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): Yugoslavia has on many occasions expressed its position regarding bilateral negotiations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America. We have supported such negotiations since, through them, concrete results on complex issues can be achieved.

We would like again this time to underline that there is no alternative to persistent negotiations in the present nuclear era and that these negotiations must be conducted in the interests of all members of the international community. For all those reasons, we support the basic idea with regard to negotiations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America contained in draft resolution L.3. However, in view of the fact that the draft resolution expresses the position of only one group of countries and that, because of that it was not possible to achieve consensus in the Committee, my delegation abstained in the vote on it.

Mr. de la BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.3, on bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations.

We believe that any progress towards nuclear disarmament necessarily requires a reduction of the arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union. From this standpoint, we think it useful and desirable for bilateral negotiations between the

(Mr. de la Baume, France)

USSR and the United States to continue in Geneva. That is why we give our approval in particular to those provisions in the draft which encourage the countries engaged in negotiations to continue their efforts towards the achievement of effective and verifiable reduction.

However, we regret that, instead of sticking to the essential - that is, the negotiations at present under way - the sponsors of the draft resolution have felt it appropriate to consider that the Reykjavik meeting has made it possible to produce large areas of agreement - I am referring in particular to operative paragraph 4 - and that these results, in the terms used in the fifth preambular paragraph, could be a suitable basis for "building on what has been achieved so far". That is not the judgement of my authorities and, in this regard, I should like to mention what was said by the French Foreign Minister, Mr. Jean-Bernard Raimond, at the opening of the follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Vienna:

"We cannot, of course, deny the importance and impact of the bilateral meeting in Reykjavik on overall East-West relations and on the major areas of disarmament. The judgement that can be made can only be preliminary at this stage. The bilateral negotiating table in Geneva will show what promises are worth. We feel that Reykjavik came very close to bringing the positions closer together, but that would not necessarily mean the strengthening of security in Europe. Negotiation that led to the total removal of United States nuclear weapons from Europe without rectification of the imbalance in conventional and chemical weapons would endanger the security of our continent. A Europe where the level of conventional armaments remained undiminished would not be a safer Europe."

(Mr. de la Baume, France)

For those reasons, after Reykjavik we think that, while inviting and encouraging the two parties to continue the necessary negotiations, we must observe a certain caution in order not to prejudge the results - which are still hypothetical - that could be achieved, refrain from any premature manifestation of satisfaction, and insist that account be taken of the need for a balance of conventional forces at reduced levels.

Since these various elements have not been sufficiently taken into account in the draft resolution we have just adopted, it therefore seemed to me desirable to recall them and to make them quite clear.

Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation abstained in the vote on L.3 because, as the representative of Venezuela has pointed out, the sixth preambular paragraph is understood to mean that States should be kept duly informed, but the fact is that this is not what happened in the case of this hypothesis, as we have been seeking in the General Assembly.

Furthermore, a number of paragraphs were the subject of controversy falling outside our purview.

Therefore, without appearing to agree or disagree with what is being discussed here, my delegation abstained in the vote on L.3 and voted in favour of draft resolution L.52, which better reflects its point of view.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to document A/C.1/41/L.78, containing a draft decision proposed by the Chairman on agenda item 65, International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, the programme-budget implications of which are contained in document A/C.1/41/L.80.

For obvious reasons, members of the Committee will not find this draft decision in any cluster. The document is listed in cluster 0, the Chairman's cluster.

(The Chairman)

I am pleased to inform the Committee that, as a result of my informal consultations with the members of the Bureau of the Preparatory Committee and other interested delegations, a draft decision can be submitted which, I hope, will meet with the Committee's approval and be adopted without a vote.

The consultations on this question were permeated by a spirit of constructive co-operation in order to maintain the consensus reached on convening the Conference in 1987. The final stage of the preparatory process should be used to ensure optimum success for the Conference.

I should like to express my gratitude to all representatives who participated in the informal consultations for their faithful co-operation. I was personally impressed by their businesslike approach to the question.

(The Chairman)

I sincerely hope that the Committee will accept the sponsor's request that it adopt the draft decision in document A/C.1/41/L.78 without a vote.

First, I call on representatives who wish to make statements or comments.

Mr. BARTHELEMY (United States of America): The United States delegation requests that the record of today's proceedings show that the United States did not participate in the Committee's action on the draft decision regarding the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

My delegation also takes this opportunity to state that the United States will not participate in the Conference or in preparatory activities for it.

Finally, my Government wishes to state that it questions the procedural method by which this matter has been dealt with in the First Committee.

Mr. TEJA (India): The subject of the relationship between disarmament and development has been discussed within the aegis of the United Nations ever since the signing of the Charter.

More recently, the mandating of a study on this subject at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament saw the commencement of a new phase in the efforts of the United Nations in this area. The study, completed in 1981, showed that the arms race and development were in a competitive relationship. It suggested that the world could either continue to pursue the arms race or move towards more stable, balanced socio-economic development within a more sustainable international economic and political order, but it could not do both. Its main conclusion was that an effective relationship between disarmament and development could be established.

Such a perspective was given a positive thrust forward by the initiative taken by the French President, Mr. Mitterrand, at the fortieth session of the General Assembly, for the convening of a conference on this subject. The non-aligned

(Mr. Teja, India)

countries have been overwhelmingly in favour of such a conference and consider it most timely and appropriate.

My delegation is gratified to note that the General Assembly and the Preparatory Committee for the Conference have during the past two years been able to take decisions and make recommendations on the various issues relating to the Conference without dissent and by consensus. My delegation also notes with satisfaction that all the documents which were required to be prepared for the Conference have been completed and made available to Member States and to others concerned.

The report of the panel of eminent personalities convened by the Secretary-General of the Conference in accordance with paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 40/155 has been unanimously adopted as a joint declaration as an input for the Conference. We note that an agreement was reached by consensus at the third session of the Preparatory Committee on the elements for inclusion in the final document to be adopted by the Conference. These are contained in the annexes to the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference in document A/41/51.

It is also a matter of satisfaction that in June 1986 some 300 non-governmental organizations from different corners of the world expressed their wish to be invited to the Conference.

The draft decision on holding the Conference in New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987 and the convening of one more session of the Preparatory Committee proposed by you, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the recommendations of the Bureau of the Preparatory Committee and your consultations with the delegation of France, is fully acceptable to my delegation.

(Mr. Teja, India)

India and, I am sure, all other non-aligned countries whole-heartedly support the convening of this important and long-awaited Conference next year. We are confident that all the members of this Committee will support your proposal contained in document L.78, which I dare say bears the stamp of your well-known diplomatic skill.

My delegation would also like to appeal that, given the importance of the Conference and the historic opportunity it will provide to conduct deliberations and come to agreed conclusions at a high political level on one of the most significant issues of our time, participation in the Conference will be at the ministerial level. We also hope that a number of Heads of State or Government will also find time come to the Conference to be able to provide direction and guidance to its deliberations.

The success of the Conference will depend not only on the level of participation but the quality of the participation of Governments. We are sure Governments are already conscious of that and will do all that is required to make the Conference a success.

World-wide interest has been generated in the Conference due to the global character of its subject. The relationship between disarmament and development touches all nations and peoples.

The Conference will provide an opportunity to analyse in a constructive and positive spirit the full social and economic implications of the escalating arms expenditure, not to apportion blame for engaging in such an expenditure. We believe that the tardy process of recovery from the world economic recession and many structural imbalances created in world trading systems and national economies of both the developed and the developing countries are due to the staggering dimensions of world military expenditure.



(Mr. Teja, India)

We would strive to derive conclusions in the Conference which would be of common interest to all nations. Our objective is not to raise unnecessary controversy but to attempt to find a forward-looking consensus in a most constructive atmosphere.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand the Committee is now in a position to adopt the draft decision in document A/C.1/41/L.78 Without a vote. If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

The draft decision was adopted.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation is happy that a consensus has finally been obtained on the draft decision concerning the organization of a Conference on Disarmament and Development. We should like to express our gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, in particular for all the work you have done in this regard and also to delegations for their assistance in arriving at a consensus, which has prevailed since the very beginning of work on the Conference.

The Conference will be an important event, and a difficult one. My country attaches great importance to the preparations for and the success of that undertaking. For that reason we should now like to announce that we shall address to the Secretary-General of the Conference a substantive contribution that will be announced at the next meeting of the Preparatory Committee, and we should like to suggest that other Member States do likewise so that their contributions can be taken into consideration by the Preparatory Committee so as to ensure the best possible preparations for the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we can now proceed to consider draft resolution L.43/Rev.1, listed in cluster 2. Does any delegation wish to make a statement or to comment on that draft? It appears not. Does any delegation wish to speak in explanation of its position before we take a decision? I see none.

(The Chairman)

We shall therefore begin taking action on the draft resolution before us contained in document A/C.1/41/L.43/Rev.1, entitled "General and Complete Disarmament", subtitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the United States of America yesterday in the First Committee and has the following sponsors: Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain and the United States.

The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution 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.1/41/L.43/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to thank members once again for their co-operation at this morning's meeting.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: We shall have two meetings on Monday, when we shall take up remaining draft resolutions in cluster 6: A/C.1/41/L.27, L.44 and L.50; in cluster 8, A/C.1/41/L.20; in cluster 12, A/C.1/41/L.54 and L.71/Rev.1; and the draft resolutions listed in cluster 13.

I would remind members that, in accordance with the Committee's programme of work and timetable, on Tuesday, 18 November, the Committee will embark on the general debate, consideration of and action upon agenda item 66, namely, "Question of Antarctica". In order effectively and efficiently to use the time and

(The Chairman)

facilities set aside for consideration of that item, I urge delegations kindly to inscribe their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible. I would also ask those delegations wishing to submit draft resolutions on the item to make every effort to meet the deadline for their submission, which is 12 noon on Tuesday, 18 November 1986.

Before adjourning the meeting, I wish every success to those delegations that will still be involved in informal consultations this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.