



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 42th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of the representative of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Record Unit, Secretariat Room DC2, 507 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, and appear in the next issue.

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 to 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The Committee will first take decisions on draft resolutions in cluster 14. Then we shall return to cluster 9.

We shall begin with draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.70/Rev.1, followed by draft resolution L.76/Rev.2. A later version of draft resolution L.60/Rev.1 - L.60/Rev.2 has just been issued, consequently I shall give representatives enough time to study it, and we may return to it tomorrow morning.

I call on representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting on draft resolutions in cluster 14.

Mr. AZAMBUJA (Brazil): My delegation wishes to make some comments on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2. We are in broad agreement with virtually all the measures suggested in it. Brazil has long been an advocate of measures to rationalize our work and to make it more effective and more productive. However, we feel a draft resolution is not altogether the most appropriate vehicle to convey such a measure to ourselves, since we in the First Committee are, after all, those to whom those recommendations are addressed, and that a decision or some other formula would be more appropriate. We believe that by adopting this as a resolution we might find ourselves in the awkward position of ourselves violating what we recommend in paragraph 1 (b), where we say

"Recommendations on procedural matters should be adopted as decisions, not as resolutions".

We therefore feel that a decision would be appropriate. We imagine that it would not require the preambular language, since that is natural in a resolution, but not natural in a decision. We could achieve our purpose without the formalities of a resolution, which we do not consider to be the appropriate way of conveying to ourselves these useful and worth-while suggestions.

Therefore, perhaps it would be acceptable to the sponsors, among which we see a number of countries with which we normally share a wide range of similar concerns and preoccupations, if the draft resolution were transformed into a less solemn and formal document, more flexible and in a modified version, without the preambular language, which would then become unnecessary - a document that you, Sir, could recommend to us as a decision from the Chair.

Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka): I wish to make some brief explanatory comments on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2.

The document's evolution has been - at least to my delegation - somewhat confusing. What has emerged with clarity from the confusion is that the subject of

(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

the rationalization of the First Committee's work is of great interest to all. That is as it should be. The draft resolution covers the manner in which the First Committee is to deal with important disarmament issues. However, we would have preferred to discuss the substance of the draft resolution in a less hurried and less hurried atmosphere. Many suggestions have been submitted to the sponsors, in writing as well as orally. Regrettably, while the sponsors have certainly done much work on the initiative, too much of their time has been devoted to wording and drafting, rather than to a careful discussion of the substance of the recommendations and their implications.

Despite those caveats, my delegation still finds it difficult to accept draft resolution L.76/Rev.2 as it stands. Properly speaking, the Disarmament Commission, which is looking at these matters and the whole question of the role of the United Nations in disarmament issues, is the appropriate place to study these issues rationally and calmly. I also agree with the remarks just made by the representative of Brazil.

My delegation is in complete agreement, however, that the existing machinery for the consideration of disarmament and related international security questions within the framework of the United Nations can and should be reinforced through concrete measures to increase its effectiveness and efficiency. But I find it difficult to give complete and unqualified endorsement to draft resolution L.76/Rev.2 and the positions advocated in it. More time might have helped my delegation to vote in favour. As things stand, however, my delegation is, regrettably, constrained to abstain on the draft resolution. That is in no way to be seen as reluctance by my delegation to accept the avowed purpose of the draft

(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

resolution, which is rationalization of the First Committee's work; nor is it to be taken as meaning that I wish to hamper or delay the process of rationalization. Indeed, our abstention stems precisely from our interest in a careful and well-thought-out process of rationalization of the Committee's work. In the Disarmament Commission the saga will, of course, continue.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We shall now take decisions on the draft resolutions in cluster 14, in which, instead of taking decisions on three draft resolutions, namely, A/C.1/42/L.60/Rev.2, L.70/Rev.1 and L.76/Rev.2, now, we shall deal with two draft resolutions - L.70/Rev.1 and L.76/Rev.2. We begin with draft resolution L.70/Rev.1, on agenda item 66 (m), "Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session".

(The Chairman)

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November. The sponsors are: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Burma, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Mongolia, 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, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, 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, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Japan, Norway, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.70/Rev.1 was adopted by 115 votes to 12, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2, which was introduced by the representative of Cameroon at the 32nd meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1987. It is submitted under agenda item 66: "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session".

The sponsors of the draft resolution are: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Ireland, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, the Netherlands, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Somalia, Togo, Zaire and Zambia.

A recorded vote has been requested on this draft resolution, although the sponsors had expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote, pursuant to the intensive consultations that were held for the purpose.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Ethiopia, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Madagascar, Maldives, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2 was adopted by 103 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their votes following the voting.

Mr. CHOHAN (Pakistan): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2.

We highly appreciate the concerns that motivated the efforts of the sponsors of this draft resolution to facilitate the procedures, organization and work of the First Committee. We are in broad agreement with most of the elements outlined in it. We share the desire of Member States to improve the functioning and efficacy of the United Nations bodies dealing with disarmament work. But we are also concerned at the precipitous haste with which this important subject has been addressed.

(Mr. Chohan, Pakistan)

The United Nations Disarmament Commission is already seized of this matter and has been engaged in a serious and delicate exercise of reviewing the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. We attach great importance to the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission on this subject and have also submitted proposals in that regard. We fully support the efforts of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and feel that we should avoid any hasty or precipitate decision that tends to prejudge or hamper its deliberations.

Mr. MOLANDER (Sweden): I wish to make a brief statement on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.17, on prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, which was adopted yesterday. Sweden voted in favour of that draft resolution because of the priority we have given in the past and still give to the issue of a prohibition of attacks against nuclear installations, to which the draft resolution refers. However, we should not hide the fact that we are critical of several elements contained in draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.17. In the opinion of my Government, resolutions on this issue should promote the possibility of reaching early agreement in the Conference on Disarmament. In that respect, there is certainly still room for improvement in the draft resolution adopted yesterday, as we have already indicated to its sponsor.

Mrs. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation was obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2 for the same reasons put forward by the representatives of Brazil, Sri Lanka and Pakistan. We believe that rationalization is of the highest importance and that it deserves proper and thorough consideration. We think, therefore, that the appropriate forum for that consideration is the Disarmament

(Mrs. Gonzalez y Reynero, Mexico)

Commission. Our abstention does not mean that we oppose rationalization of the work of the First Committee. Quite the contrary: we are prepared to work intensively in the Disarmament Commission for an agreement on that subject.

Mr. MASHHADI-GHAHVEHCHI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation was among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.70/Rev.1. However, the text in its revised form contains an added paragraph, the seventh preambular paragraph, which states that all States have the right to contribute to efforts in the field of disarmament. That is acceptable to us with the understanding that it should not be interpreted as any change in the rules of procedure of any disarmament negotiating body. The rules of procedure should be respected, and should not be discredited.

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2. I begin by thanking the delegation of Cameroon and the other sponsors for their efforts to promote the rationalization of the work of the First Committee. Nevertheless, we feel that in order to be viable and effective a draft resolution of this kind should be the object of consensus in the Committee. That was not the case; it is clear that the draft resolution failed to gain consensus because elements in the text caused several delegations to abstain in the vote.

There are elements that are unquestionably acceptable; I would go further and say that many of the ideas in the draft resolution are being implemented. We believe, however, that the best way of achieving the rationalization of the work of the Committee is through self-control on the part of delegations. In the past we have seen that it is extremely difficult for resolutions not adopted by consensus to lead to the rationalization of the work of Committee.

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

Like other delegations which have already spoken, we feel that, as this question is being considered in the Disarmament Commission, it is that body that should continue to deal with the subject and make recommendations to the General Assembly.

It was for those reasons that my delegation had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2.

Mr. ROWE (Australia): Australia this year voted in favour of the draft resolution on implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session (A/C.1/42/L.70/Rev.1). We did so this year because of what we considered to be substantial improvements in the text over that of last year. However, we still consider that the draft resolution contains some deficiencies which, if they were addressed by the sponsors in a more constructive approach, might lead to broader acceptance of the draft resolution. I should like briefly to mention those deficiencies, as we see them.

The suggestion in the third preambular paragraph that no concrete results have been achieved since the first special session on disarmament ignores, for example, the evolution and entry into force of the South Pacific nuclear-free zone Treaty, the Treaty of Rarotonga, and other areas of progress. The language in the fourth preambular paragraph - "Convinced that international peace and security can be ensured only through general and complete disarmament" - ignores, in our view, the reality that peace and security can be maintained also by the balance of forces, at least until complete disarmament is achieved, and that even in a disarmed world peace and security would require a whole panoply of political conditions and machinery to avoid disputes and solve those disputes which arise. Moreover, that particular language in the fourth preambular paragraph is at variance with the

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

language of paragraph 19 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, which speaks of general and complete disarmament as the ultimate objective of the disarmament process.

Finally, operative paragraph 4 could be interpreted as a call to the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations on all items on its agenda, a proposition we regard as unrealistic.

Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh): Bangladesh abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2. We wish to put on record, however, that our abstention should not be interpreted as meaning that my delegation is of the view that there is no scope for rationalization of work in the First Committee.

Mr. BRACEGIRDLE (New Zealand): New Zealand voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.70/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session". New Zealand was pleased to do so this year in recognition of a number of changes made to this year's draft resolution that have, in our view, improved the text over texts of previous years. In particular, it seems to us that the draft resolution has a more positive and forward-looking tone. In the lead-up to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament next year my delegation particularly welcomes such an approach.

We note at the same time that the text has been amended and a revision was circulated only yesterday. We have some reservations about that. We recall that late amendments were made in the same way to the predecessors of this draft resolution. We hope that it might be possible in future for the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.6 and the sponsors of the current draft resolution to agree on a common text before the introduction of texts in the First Committee. We believe, nevertheless, as noted, that this text overall is an improvement, which we welcome.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): I should like briefly to explain the vote of my delegation in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2, which was adopted a few moments ago. First, my delegation thanks the delegation of Cameroon and the other sponsors of that draft resolution for bringing the very important questions concerning the rationalization of the work of the First Committee to our

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

attention. These questions are very important and they have been discussed and are still being discussed in the Disarmament Commission. My delegation believes that it would probably be better to give the Disarmament Commission time to complete its work on this item, and we expect that only when the Disarmament Commission submits its own recommendation to the United Nations General Assembly will the First Committee be able to act and to assess and judge the results of the Disarmament Commission's proceedings.

For those reasons my delegation abstained in the vote, believing that these issues should be considered further within the United Nations Disarmament Commission during its session next year.

Mr. DJIENA (Cameroon) (interpretation from French): My delegation welcomes the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2, which it introduced in the general debate some two weeks ago. It shows the interest of practically all members of the Committee in enhancing and consolidating the efficiency of the Committee, and that, of course, comes through the rationalization of its work.

My delegation will continue, in the context of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and in all other appropriate forums, to make its modest contribution to this end - it of course being understood that the taking of decisions in the field of disarmament is not the monopoly of any State or group of States, and that the sponsors of A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2 would have considered any draft amendment if it had been submitted in good faith and good time pursuant to the traditional practice of the Committee.

I should like to recall here, on behalf of my delegation, that the ways and means of attaining a given objective are multifaceted, diverse and of equal importance. Nevertheless, the appreciation and assessment of suitability is a highly subjective exercise and, if we recognize the sovereign right of each State

(Mr. Djiena, Cameroon)

to express its views quite freely, then no country or group of States has the monopoly of wisdom or the right to stipulate or give advice on moderation whatever their seniority or experience in a given sector.

We wish to be associated with all those speakers who have already asserted the importance of the rationalization exercise for the work of the First Committee. The differences of opinion should not discourage us or make us lose sight of the fact that this is a crucial problem in the context of the objective we are all striving to attain, namely, the better functioning of this Committee in particular and of the Organization in general. That is why, whatever the forum and whatever the views we will continue, as we have done in the past, to make our contribution not only for the rationalization of the work of this Committee but also in the context of other forums entrusted with dealing with disarmament matters.

Finally, we wish to emphasize that States in a committee exercise their sovereignty through decisions taken either by voting or by consensus. Of course, my delegation - as I think all the other sponsors also - would have wished this draft resolution to have been adopted by consensus, but that is not a constituent rule of our Organization. The main thing is the expression of the views of States.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We have thus come to the end of the list of speakers in explanation of their votes after the votes taken on cluster 14.

(The Chairman)

We shall now take decisions on cluster 9 and we shall revert to the draft resolutions that have been held over because of ongoing consultations. These are draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.30 and L.50/Rev.1. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.65 and Corr.1, which is still outstanding, consultations are continuing, as I said before, and we hope that we shall be able to take it up at an early hour tomorrow. I shall now call on representatives who wish to make statements other than explanations of vote.

Mr. RANA (Nepal): My delegation has had extensive informal consultations with other members on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.30 with a view to ensuring its adoption by consensus. During the process, slight modifications were agreed upon in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. The suggested changes are: in line 2, after "the initiatives and other activities" delete "of" and add "mutually agreed upon by" so the line would read "support for the initiatives and other activities mutually agreed upon by the Member States of the Asian region", and, on line 4, after "appropriate", change "reutilization" to "utilization". My delegation hopes that with those minor changes it will be possible for the Committee to adopt the draft resolution without a vote, as was done in the case of similar resolutions establishing regional centres in Africa and Latin America.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I now call on Mr. Akashi, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, who wishes to make a statement.

Mr. AKASHI (Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs): I should like to say a few words with regard to document A/C.1/42/L.84, which is a note by the Secretariat concerning the administrative and financial arrangements relating to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.30.

(Mr. Akashi, Under-Secretary-General,
Disarmament Affairs)

The Department for Disarmament Affairs has undertaken further consideration of the arrangements set out in paragraph 3 of A/C.1/42/L.84 and has come to the conclusion that, because of the nature of the functions envisaged, a member of a United Nations Information Centre, assisted by appropriate local staff, would take charge of the regional centre on an interim basis on the premises of the United Nations Information Centre, with the office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) providing administrative and logistic services. This arrangement has been discussed with UNDP and the Department of Public Information, both of which are agreeable to the provision of the services and to the distribution of functions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.30, which was submitted under agenda item 63, entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly". Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.30, as orally amended by the representative of Nepal, is sub-titled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia". It was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1987. The Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Akashi, has just informed you of the arrangements set forth in the note on the subject, document A/C.1/42/L.84. The sponsor wishes us to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.30 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) We shall now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.50/Rev.1, submitted under agenda item 63, entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the

(The Chairman)

General Assembly". The draft was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 36th meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November 1987, under sub-item (b): "World Disarmament Campaign". The sponsors of this draft resolution are Bangladesh, Byelorussian SSR, Bulgaria, Egypt, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

(The Chairman)

The sponsors of this draft resolution would like it to be adopted without a vote; however, a recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.50/Rev.1 was adopted by 119 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions.

Mr. GRANGER (United States of America): For the explanation of the United States delegation's joining in the consensus on A/C.1/42/L.30, my delegation would refer interested members to our explanation of vote on the other draft resolutions addressing United Nations regional centres, that is A/C.1/42/L.62 and L.72/Rev.1.

(Mr. Granger, United States)

We should like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.50/Rev.1, concerning the World Disarmament Campaign. Ideally, the Campaign would be addressed in a procedural draft resolution that could be adopted by consensus. Unfortunately, the draft resolution in question continues the inclusion of objectionable language of an unrealistic and hyperbolic nature. Moreover, although under the decision taken by the second special session on disarmament, in 1982, the Campaign was to be financed solely from voluntary contributions, one third of the present funding for the Campaign now comes from assessed contributions.

For these reasons, the United States voted against draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.50/Rev.1. At the same time, however, we express the hope that in the future the subject of the World Disarmament Campaign will be treated in a way that will restore consensus within this Committee.

Mr. BESANCENOT (France) (interpretation from French): As in the case of similar draft resolutions in previous years, my delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.50/Rev.1. Indeed, it can only deplore, among other things, the drafting of operative paragraph 4 in which the General Assembly

"Reiterates its regret that most of the States which have the largest military expenditures have not so far made any financial contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign".

My delegation wishes to make it clear that France has made a significant contribution to the activities of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), amounting to over \$2 million since the establishment of the Institute. Thus, France participates in the international community's efforts in the area of scientific research, which is one of the fundamental aspects of the World Disarmament Campaign.

Mr. FISCHER (Federal Republic of Germany): The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.50/Rev.1.

Let me first of all express my satisfaction at the successful merger of the two draft resolutions and, thus, the reduction in the number of draft resolutions. It is the first time that an idea contained in draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2, which was adopted by this Committee a few minutes ago and of which we are a sponsor, has been implemented. We warmly welcome this development.

However, I have to state that another desire which should aid the work of all of us has not been met by the merger: the desire for consensus. Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.50/Rev.1 continues the practice of questioning the principle that contributions to the World Disarmament Campaign should be voluntary. Therefore, as on similar draft resolutions in previous years, my delegation has once again had to abstain. We consider it unfortunate that a draft resolution on a cause as worthy as the World Disarmament Campaign should be burdened with non-consensus language that makes it impossible to adopt it unanimously.

Our abstention, therefore, is not related to our position concerning the World Disarmament Campaign: we have supported the Campaign from the outset, this year with a financial contribution to the Lomé Centre.

The World Disarmament Campaign has achieved some success over the years. Information contained in Campaign publications has generally been balanced and factual. Wide dissemination has been given to that information, including in languages other than the official languages of the United Nations. Important regional conferences have been held. For this we commend the dedicated staff of the Secretariat Department for Disarmament Affairs.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from French): Very briefly the Mongolian delegation would like to express its satisfaction at the approval by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.30, concerning the United Nations regional centre for peace and disarmament in Asia. Mongolia has always been in favour of establishing such a centre, believing that it would be a useful instrument in the service of strengthening peace and security and enhancing understanding and co-operation among the States and peoples of Asia. It pleases me to recall at this time that Mongolia proposed the establishment of a United Nations regional centre for peace and disarmament in Asia at the first regional conference on peace and disarmament, which was held in March this year in Beijing.

Mongolia attaches special importance to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which we consider sets out the main goal of that Centre.

Mr. ROWE (Australia): The Australian delegation was very pleased to join in the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.30, providing for the establishment of a United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia. We welcome the possible contribution of such a Centre towards the serious examination of disarmament issues in Asia.

However, I wish to register the fact that we are concerned that a proliferation of such regional centres could duplicate the work of other organizations and create pressure on the United Nations regular budget at a time of stringency, as well as a drain on the capacity of the World Disarmament Campaign. In the latter respect, we are pleased to note that operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.30 provides that the funding for the Centre will be on the basis of existing United Nations resources and of voluntary contributions that might be forthcoming.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.30, relating to the establishment of a regional disarmament centre in Asia. As in the case of regional disarmament centres for Africa and Latin America, the United Kingdom welcomes the thrust of this draft resolution.

In joining the consensus, we proceeded on the basis that the draft resolution raises no programme-budget implications and that the Regional Centre will be funded entirely by voluntary contributions and from existing resources. In the latter context, we hope that any new activities will be met from redeployed resources, and not from new appropriations.

I should also like to explain the United Kingdom's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.50/Rev.1, concerning the World Disarmament Campaign. The United Kingdom

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

is, of course, a supporter of the World Disarmament Campaign. However, my delegation was unable to support this draft resolution for the following reasons, inter alia:

We are unable to support the view in operative paragraph 4, under which the Assembly would express regret that some States have not contributed financially to the World Disarmament Campaign. This Campaign is funded from the regular United Nations budget, of which the United Kingdom pays just under 5 per cent. Part of this contribution is used to fund United Nations services in support of the World Disarmament Campaign. In the financial years 1986 and 1987, the United Kingdom has contributed about \$75,000 to the total World Disarmament Campaign budget. My Government also devotes a substantial sum of money to disarmament information activities of its own which are consistent with the aims of the Campaign.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The representative of Nepal asked to be allowed to speak after the completion of all the statements in explanation of vote. I now call on him.

Mr. RANA (Nepal): I have asked to speak merely to express my delegation's deep appreciation and gratitude to all the members of the Committee for their unanimous endorsement of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.30, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia", which my delegation had the privilege of introducing the other day.

Needless to say, Nepal feels greatly honoured that, pursuant to the draft resolution just adopted, the Centre will be located in our capital, Katmandu.

We are convinced that the establishment of such a centre in Asia, like that of similar centres in Africa and Latin America, will help generate greater awareness of various aspects of disarmament. The Asian Centre will also contribute towards co-ordinating the endeavours of Asian countries to ensure peace and disarmament.

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

My delegation believes also that the establishment of such a United Nations Centre in Asia, along with the earlier decisions on setting up centres in Africa and Latin America, is in keeping with the relevant recommendation of the second special session on disarmament, which reflects the collective determination of Member States to take every possible measure to facilitate the process and programme of peace and disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I should like to remind members of the Committee of the draft resolutions on which decisions still must be taken.

In cluster 13, we must still take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.16, A/C.1/42/L.61 and A/C.1/42/L.69. From the consultations that have been taking place on this cluster, it appears that the Committee could take action immediately tomorrow morning on the draft resolutions contained in it.

In cluster 9, action must still be taken on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.65 and Corr.1. The consultations that are under way indicate that the Committee will not be able to deal with this draft resolution tomorrow. The consultations will continue.

In cluster 11, we must still take action on two draft resolutions: A/C.1/42/L.54 and A/C.1/42/L.66. We hope that the delegations holding consultations will be able to report to us tomorrow morning, so that we may see whether the two draft resolutions can be put to the Committee for action.

In cluster 14, one draft resolution is pending: A/C.1/42/L.60/Rev.2. We think that it may be possible to submit this draft resolution to the Committee tomorrow for action.

In three other clusters, no action has been taken on any of the draft resolutions. I am referring to clusters 6, 15 and 16.

(The Chairman)

We must remember that, under the timetable that we agreed to at the beginning of our work, we have only two working days, Friday and Monday, to conclude our consideration of the disarmament agenda items - items 48 to 69, inclusive. I would therefore request delegations which are holding consultations to be good enough to complete them as quickly as possible so that tomorrow we can take action on the draft resolutions remaining in clusters 4, 9, 11 and 13 and then possibly deal with the draft resolutions in clusters 6 and 15. We shall see if we can take up cluster 16 also. Everything depends on the spirit of co-operation shown by members of the Committee.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): In accordance with the programme of work on which we agreed, the Committee will begin its consideration of agenda item 70, "The question of Antarctica", on Tuesday, 17 November 1987.

In order that we may make the most rational use of our time, I propose that the list of speakers on agenda item 70 be closed on Monday, 16 November 1987, at 6 p.m. sharp.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I would request delegations wishing to speak on agenda item 70 to inscribe their names on the list of speakers by 6 p.m. on Monday, 16 November 1987.

I would also recall that under our agreed programme of work the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions under agenda item 70 is Tuesday, 17 November 1987, at noon. I appeal to delegations to meet that time limit so that we may adhere to the programme of work on which we agreed. That falls within the context of the rationalization of our work, which all delegations have supported.

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.