



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 42ND MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MULLOY (Ireland)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 34 TO 37, 41, 44, 47 AND 48 (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), 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.1/35/PV.42
25 November 1980

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 34 TO 37, 41, 44, 47 AND 48 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now begin the voting procedure on the draft resolution recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in paragraph 30 of its report (A/35/29). First, I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. SEZAKI (Japan): My delegation fully understands the desire of the States concerned to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. We believe that the establishment of such a zone would contribute substantially to the security of the countries in the region, as well as to the achievement of general and complete disarmament.

As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean ever since it was established, my delegation endorses the idea of convening a Conference on the Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. It is necessary to point out, however, as we have already done on several occasions during the course of discussions in the Ad Hoc Committee, that the full participation of all permanent members of the Security Council as well as all the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean should be ensured, not only in the conference itself, but also in the preparatory work for the convening of the conference.

It should also be noted that during the discussions in the Ad Hoc Committee, some delegations, including my own, expressed their doubt regarding the appropriateness of deciding at this stage to convene the Conference on the Indian Ocean in 1981

(Mr. Sezaki, Japan)

My delegation continues to believe that, in order to ensure the success of the conference, it is absolutely essential that adequate preparations be made prior to its convening. We understand that there remain some discrepancies even in the fundamental issues related to the convening of the conference and we believe that further time and effort is needed before an agreement on these matters can be reached.

With regard to the political and security climate in the area of the Indian Ocean, the Government of Japan is deeply concerned about the recent deterioration of peace and stability in the region, particularly in Afghanistan and in Iran and Iraq, and about the implications for international peace and security. In particular, my delegation notes that the Soviet Union has flagrantly violated that very rule of international law which prohibits the use of force, and that the withdrawal of its troops from Afghanistan, as was called for in resolution ES-6/2 of the General Assembly of 14 January 1980, has not yet been realized.

(Mr. Sezaki, Japan)

Finally, with regard to procedural matters, my delegation would like to reiterate its view that the preparatory work for the convening of the Conference by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean should be conducted on a consensus basis, which is its usual methods of work.

My delegation hopes that these points will be duly taken into consideration when determining the precise date for the Conference.

Having made these remarks, my delegation intends to vote in favour of the draft resolution on the Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, as contained in document A/35/29.

Mr. AKKERMAN (Netherlands): My delegation wishes to make some comments on the draft resolution concerning the "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", contained in document A/35/29, but before doing so we should like to extend our congratulations to Ambassador Balasubramaniam and express our appreciation for the skilful way in which he exercised the chairmanship of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean during the past year. His persistent efforts resulted in the agreed recommendation by the Ad Hoc Committee of this draft resolution.

In this context, I should like to underline again the importance that the principle of consensus constantly be respected in the Ad Hoc Committee. My delegation feels encouraged by the fact that members of the Ad Hoc Committee, keeping this point of departure in mind, have shown the necessary flexibility in participating in the sometimes arduous negotiations leading to this draft.

The work of the Committee has indeed shown, as the text rightly states, that progress towards harmonizing differing approaches has been made, but that a number of fundamental issues remain to be resolved.

I should now like to put on record the Netherlands' views on and interpretations of this draft resolution.

(Mr. Akkerman, Netherlands)

We are not fully satisfied with all its provisions, and we understand that others too would have reservations on the text. By way of introduction, my delegation wishes to recall first of all that a number of important developments have taken place since the adoption of resolution 34/80. In this respect, my delegation regrets to note that, during the last year, profoundly unsettling events have occurred which present a threat to peace and stability in that area. The armed intervention in Afghanistan, a hinterland State of the Indian Ocean, constitutes a clear violation of principles embodied in the United Nations Charter. It has seriously affected the necessary climate of trust and confidence which form the basis for any arrangement in the security field. It is our opinion that the international security climate must of necessity be taken into account when considering the advancement of the idea of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean area.

A development which we welcome is the increase in membership of the Ad Hoc Committee, which has grown by several countries.

My delegation is convinced that the idea of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace merits further elaboration and that a sufficient identity of views has thus far not been achieved. The text of this draft resolution reflects the state of affairs sufficiently clearly, we think. Allow me to state a number of principles to which my delegation is committed in this connexion.

The prevention of an arms race in the region is clearly in the interest of both regional States and other countries. Any set of security arrangements must be arrived at through consensus and has to be based on the principle of undiminished security for all States. No future agreement can prevent States from exercising their right to make appropriate arrangements for individual or collective self-defence in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. Akkerman, Netherlands)

The quest for peace and security cannot be said to be the sole responsibility of the major external Powers. It is essential that the regional States of the area of the Indian Ocean fully contribute thereto. It will be, in the first place, up to them to indicate the kind of relationship which they wish to be constituted among themselves in the security field. In the view of the delegation of the Netherlands, no such arrangements could, however, derogate from the freedom of the high seas, including the freedom of navigation and of overflight, as established by international law.

My delegation cannot support the creation of regionally confined sets of duties and obligations which would be at variance with rules recognized at the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

Proceeding from this, my delegation has the following specific comment to make about the content of the draft resolution before us. We understand the reference to "other recent relevant resolutions" mentioned in the first preambular paragraph as including resolution ES-6/2 on Afghanistan and resolution 35/37, adopted by the General Assembly at its plenary meeting a few days ago. We wish to reiterate the call contained therein for the immediate, total and unconditional withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan. As long as those troops are not withdrawn, it is hard to see how a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region could be realized.

Secondly, the wording of the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs does not adequately reflect, in the opinion of my delegation, the point that the threat to the stability in the area of the Indian Ocean does not originate primarily from the presence of naval forces. In fact, the actual causes of tension are to be found elsewhere.

I have already mentioned Afghanistan, and we are all only too aware of other areas of conflict in the region.

(Mr. Akkerman, Netherlands)

My delegation abstained on General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI). However, as stated earlier, we are ready to continue to participate in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. It is our feeling that the Committee's efforts should focus, inter alia, on finding an adequate geographical delimitation of the proposed zone of peace, the elaboration of criteria with regard to categories of forces to be covered and the question of adequate verification. References to General Assembly resolution 34/80 B prompt us to recall our abstention on that text. It is our opinion that it would be premature at this stage to commit ourselves to attending a conference on the Indian Ocean in 1981. We are, however, willing to take part in further discussions, some of which will concern fundamental points of substance, on the necessary preparatory work for such a conference. Our decision on whether or not to participate in any conference will be taken at a later stage in the light of the results of the preparatory work and of further developments.

It is on these understandings that we shall join the consensus on the draft resolution contained in document A/35/29.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): In the statement he made just now the representative of the Netherlands fully reflected the views of my delegation on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

Delegates will be aware that it was only with considerable difficulty that the Ad Hoc Committee achieved a consensus on its report. I should like to stress that the agreement of the United Kingdom delegation represents a considerable effort on our part in the direction of compromise; so much so that I feel I should underline the strongly held view of my delegation that there remains much work to be done in the Ad Hoc Committee before we reach the stage at which it would be appropriate to convene a conference on the subject.

There remain many fundamental issues which must be resolved. Earlier this year my delegation, with others, agreed to participate in the work of the Committee, in the hope that progress could be made in the resolution of those difficulties. But, in the light of the security situation in the area it rapidly became apparent to my delegation that the time was not right for a conference on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

Soviet forces continue to occupy Afghanistan and show no sign of withdrawal, despite urgent calls from the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Organization. In the view of my delegation, a conference in these circumstances could well prove to be a mockery.

The Government of the United Kingdom feels that an appropriately defined zone of peace could make a very real contribution to the security interests not just of those littoral and hinterland States of the region but to those of the international community as a whole. However, to hold a conference to consider such a proposal in the shadow of the occupation of Afghanistan could well have the opposite effect to that which we all seek. Instead of promoting agreement, it would probably result in acrimonious exchanges and lead to further divisive hardening of positions. This would not in any way contribute to peace and stability in the area.

My delegation will participate in the first preparatory session, which is planned for February 1981; but, as has been pointed out by the representative of the Netherlands, we feel that the efforts of that Committee should be directed in the first instance to the clarification of the fundamental issues which remain to be resolved. We shall continue to review the situation and would give serious consideration to attending any conference which had broad international support and which seemed likely to foster progress; but I repeat our serious reservations as to the likelihood of such a conference making a positive contribution to world security in the present circumstances.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): My delegation wishes to offer a few brief comments on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, contained in document A/35/29.

At the outset I should like to express our deep appreciation to Ambassador Balasubramaniam of Sri Lanka, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, whose untiring efforts and outstanding diplomatic capability have been responsible for the skilfully balanced report that enjoys a consensus in the First Committee. We are gratified to see that all five permanent members of the Security Council are now actively participating in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, which has been further enriched by the inclusion of five littoral and hinterland States, namely Djibouti, Egypt, Seychelles, Singapore and Sudan, and several other States which have significant maritime interests in the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

We have also noted with satisfaction that the Committee had a wider and more extensive exchange of views on certain fundamental aspects of the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and that those discussions were useful and helpful in harmonizing approaches on the subject.

By far the most difficult task before the Ad Hoc Committee was to formulate recommendations in respect of preparations for the Conference on the Indian Ocean, to be held in 1981, as decided in General Assembly resolution 34/80 B adopted last year. In pursuance of that resolution it has been recommended that the Ad Hoc Committee continue its efforts for the necessary harmonization of views on the fundamental issues related to the convening of the Conference and make every effort in consideration of the political and security climate in the Indian Ocean area to finalize, in accordance with its normal method of work, preparations for the Conference, including the date of its convening.

As a littoral State of the Indian Ocean, Pakistan attaches the utmost importance to progress in our common endeavour with other regional States to ensure the realization of the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. With the enunciation of the idea by the brotherly country of Sri Lanka, Pakistan has actively participated in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. During the last session Pakistan supported resolution 34/80 B and was looking forward to the 1981 Colombo Conference for substantial progress. However, the events of last year, particularly the military intervention in a non-aligned hinterland State of the Indian Ocean, have cast a bleak shadow over the prospects of peace in the entire Indian Ocean region. That action has dangerously aggravated tension in the area, which has always been a focal point of great-Power military contention and rivalry. It is clear that the attainment of positive results at the Colombo Conference will primarily depend on the improvement of the political climate in the region. It is our hope that the circumstances undermining the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace will soon be attenuated and that the Colombo Conference will prove to be an important milestone in the achievement of our common objectives.

At the heart of the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is the concern of the peoples of the region to strengthen peace, stability and security so that they can channel their energy towards economic progress and the elimination of poverty. The security of the region is indivisible and the questions relating to it will have to be treated in a comprehensive manner. A partial approach with a view to strengthening the security of the region will be neither meaningful nor realistic.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

The threat to the security of the States of the Indian Ocean has two aspects: first, the non-regional, and secondly the regional. When we speak of "non-regional threat to security", we have in mind all manifestations of great-Power rivalry and confrontation in the region: foreign military bases and military forces within the region or its vicinity and all doctrines which tend to justify foreign military presence or intervention in the affairs of the States of the region. The massive foreign military intervention in Afghanistan and the recent threats of the use of force against Iran illustrate the nature of this threat.

In the regional context threats to the security of the States of the Indian Ocean primarily arise from resort to use of force, localized arms build-up, military imbalance and policies seeking regional military predominance. It is the firm belief of my delegation that unless these primary sources of threat to the security of the region are removed, the goal of the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace will remain elusive.

The comprehensive perception of the security of the States of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, therefore, not only will require the elimination of the naval bases and other military installations of the great Powers from the Indian Ocean, as conceived in the context of great-Power rivalry, but also must stipulate obligations on the part of the great Powers to cease their policies of military occupation, intervention and interference, pressure and intimidation against the States of the region, to abandon doctrines claiming the right to intervention in the affairs of those States on any pretext, and to remove their armed forces from the territories of the States of the peace zone. The great Powers must further refrain from military build-up and the acquisition of new bases in the peace zone, as well as desist from the deployment of their military forces - ground, air or naval - in the vicinity of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

Similarly, in the regional context, the States within the peace zone should commit themselves to seek peaceful settlement of disputes and not to use force in the conduct of their relations or resort to arms build-up and

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

policies seeking military preponderance, undermining the security of their smaller neighbours.

For our future endeavours, the single most important task is to identify comprehensively the principles which relate to the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. In this regard, the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States which took place in July 1979 provides a valuable precedent. In the opinion of my delegation, the forthcoming Colombo Conference will be the most appropriate forum to undertake the task of identifying such principles, particularly principles aimed at the strengthening of the security of each individual State of the peace zone.

Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): The Ethiopian delegation joins the consensus on the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We do so because we are keenly aware of the difficulties that had to be overcome in reaching that consensus. The draft resolution represents compromise on several elements, and hence the consensus achieved in adopting it in the Committee falls far short of a comprehensive agreement.

Ethiopia attaches great importance to the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, as contained in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) of 16 December 1971. That Declaration embodies the hopes and aspirations of the States and peoples of the area for peace and security so as to be able to engage in the pressing task of economic and social reconstruction free from outside interference.

The primary objective of the Declaration is the elimination from the Indian Ocean of all bases, military installations and logistical supply facilities, the removal of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction and any manifestation of great-Power military presence there. This objective is a natural outgrowth of the determination of the States of the region to preserve their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, as well as their conviction that the extension of the arms race, particularly in its nuclear aspect, into the Indian Ocean area runs counter to the efforts aimed at removing tension, promoting peaceful co-operation and strengthening regional and international security.

(Mr. Makonnen, Ethiopia)

The call for the removal of nuclear weapons by the great Powers, contained in the Declaration does not and cannot mean the licensing of the production or the deployment of indigenous nuclear weapons. Indeed, the prevention of nuclear-weapon proliferation through effective legal commitments by all the States in the area is an essential component of the peace-zone concept. The commitment of the littoral and hinterland States to the establishment of a zone of peace in their own area and the repeated call of the United Nations for almost a decade for the elimination of great-Power military presence from the Indian Ocean not only have been systematically ignored but also contrast sharply with the intensification of that military presence.

Most alarmingly, the deteriorating conditions in the Indian Ocean are marked by active nuclear collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa, the expansion of existing bases and the acquisition of new military bases and similar facilities, especially on the territory of a State which, like South Africa, is notorious for conflict-making.

While those military activities in no way assure the attainment of their declared objectives, they have on the contrary resulted only in heightened tension and increased anxieties. Furthermore, they have undermined the prospects for peace and stability in the region and opened new and critical chapters in the defence requirements of the States directly threatened.

We are convinced that action taken in furtherance of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace would be a substantial contribution not only to the enhancement of the right to free and unimpeded use of the zone by vessels of all nations but also to the strengthening of regional peace and international security.

Having said that, my delegation would like now to state its understanding of the consensus on the Indian Ocean draft resolution.

First, we consider the draft resolution as a purely procedural one, and we would have preferred a more precise and concise text similar to the text submitted by the non-aligned countries to the Ad Hoc Committee.

(Mr. Makonnen, Ethiopia)

Secondly, we consider that, without prejudice to the need for adequate preparations, the Indian Ocean Conference to be held in Colombo, Sri Lanka, during 1981, as called for by General Assembly resolution 34/80 B, is reaffirmed.

Thirdly, the preparatory work to be undertaken by the Ad Hoc Committee should, in our view, relate to the consideration of appropriate arrangements for any international agreement that may ultimately be reached for the maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, as provided for in the Declaration in resolution 2832 (XXVI).

Finally, we should like to stress that the continued escalation of the danger posed by the military presence of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean gives greater urgency to the need to take practical steps towards the early achievement of the objectives of the Declaration and to convene the Indian Ocean Conference in 1981. Any attempts to impose preconditions would be tantamount to suggesting that for the conference to be convened the Indian Ocean must first transform itself into a zone of peace. Such an approach, to say the least, would constitute a confusion of aims and means and could not be expected to attract the support of the States of the region.

(Mr. Makonnen, Ethiopia)

We therefore hope that the major maritime users and the permanent members of the Security Council will participate constructively in the preparatory work of the Ad Hoc Committee and facilitate the convening of the Indian Ocean conference as scheduled. Such a positive attitude and participation on the part of all concerned would, we believe, contribute greatly to defusing tension in the region, allaying fears and strengthening confidence.

In conclusion, I should like to express my delegation's gratitude and appreciation to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Ambassador Balasubramaniam of Sri Lanka, whose diplomatic skills and acumen have made this consensus resolution possible.

I wish also to express our gratitude for the valuable assistance given to the Ad Hoc Committee by its Secretary, Mr. Kheradi and the other members of the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed their wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that it is so decided.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions on the decision just taken.

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States of America): The United States decision to join in a consensus in favour of this year's draft resolution on the Indian Ocean marks the first occasion that the United States has been in a position to support a draft resolution on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. My delegation's views on questions relating to this concept have been made clear on many occasions, most recently in this Committee on 19 November. Therefore, I will not now recapitulate them in detail.

Any consensus resolution, however, inevitably contains elements more appealing to some delegations than to others. My delegation was able to support the present draft resolution because we believe it takes into account several concerns of importance to the United States. Though the United States will

(Mr. Floweree, United States)

continue to make every effort to help remove the numerous obstacles which still face the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, we continue to believe that it would be premature to schedule an Indian Ocean conference under present conditions. We have taken this position in part because of continuing substantive differences among the members of the Committee regarding the fundamental principles underlying the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. In addition, the marked deterioration in the security of the region over the past year, caused to some extent by local conflicts but most especially by the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan, has seriously undercut the chances for a successful conference. By asking the Ad Hoc Committee to continue its efforts to harmonize States' views and to consider the political and security climate in the area before dealing with conference preparations, we believe the draft resolution recognizes these two basic realities.

More specifically, the United States would like to make clear its interpretation of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution which reads in part:

"Requests the Ad Hoc Committee in pursuance of the decision contained in resolution 34/80 B to convene a Conference on the Indian Ocean during 1981 at Colombo [Sri Lanka], and taking into consideration the exchange of views thereon".

First, the United States interprets the phrase "to convene a Conference on the Indian Ocean during 1981 at Colombo [Sri Lanka]" as a description of the contents of resolution 34/80 B, on which the United States abstained, and not as a call by the present draft resolution to convene such a conference.

Secondly, the United States interprets the phrase "in pursuance of" to mean that the Committee will make every effort to set a date for an Indian Ocean conference but is not specifically bound to do so.

Thirdly, the United States interprets the phrase "and taking into consideration the exchanges of views thereon" to include our view that it would be inappropriate to convene a conference under current conditions.

Fourthly, the United States interprets the phrase "in accordance with its normal methods of work" to mean that the Committee will continue to take its decisions by consensus.

(Mr. Floweree, United States)

With regard to the sixth preambular paragraph, it is our view that not all "military presence of... great Powers... conceived in the context of... confrontation" will necessarily lead to a dangerous situation. As we have said before, we believe that military forces deployed in contravention of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter undermine the intent of a zone of peace, while those deployed in accordance with those purposes and principles do not.

Likewise in our view, the draft resolution's reference in the seventh preambular paragraph to "other foreign military presence" recognizes that threats to regional security do not emanate solely from the presence of the great Powers. In this connexion, the United States interprets the phrase "all other foreign military presence in the area" in the seventh preambular paragraph to include such forces as Cuban troops now deployed in the Indian Ocean region.

Mr. NOLAN (Australia): The Australian delegation, which has supported all Indian Ocean resolutions since 1972, is pleased to see, for the first time in the history of the Ad Hoc Committee, a consensus resolution. Delegations will be aware that considerable negotiations took place between members of the Ad Hoc Committee to achieve this consensus text, and for that reason there are elements on which a number of delegations have difficulties. There are two particular areas of the draft resolution on which the Australian delegation wishes now to make specific comment.

In the seventh preambular paragraph, the Australian delegation interprets the reference to "foreign military presence" as covering the presence of all foreign military forces in the area when in contravention of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

Our understanding of operative paragraph 2 is that while the call for a conference to be convened in 1981 is noted, recognition is given to the fact that a significant number of members of the Ad Hoc Committee have stated the need for certain prerequisites or conditions to be met before finally deciding on a date for the conference.

(Mr. Nolan, Australia)

The Australian delegation has long stressed the necessity for a conference, when convened, to be given every opportunity to succeed. We have been deeply concerned that a conference convened prematurely would fail and thus set back the objectives of the States of the region to achieve a declaration of an internationally accepted and verifiable zone of peace. For this reason, the Australian delegation has during this year stressed the need to ensure that before a conference is held adequate preparations be completed, including the achievement of a significant degree of harmonization of positions on the issues outstanding.

(Mr. Nolan, Australia)

Of course, that can be achieved only if the political climate in the area is conducive to the holding of such a conference. The necessity for those conditions to be met is, in the view of the Australian delegation, clearly set out in operative paragraph 2 (a) to (d) of the draft resolution. It is regrettable that, in view of the deterioration in the political climate in the region since the adoption of resolution 34/80 B, serious grounds have developed for doubting that those conditions will in fact be met. In particular, it is difficult to envisage how a conference could be successfully held when one of the States of the region is forcibly occupied by one of the Powers attending the conference.

It is the task of the Ad Hoc Committee to decide, preferably during its session in February next year, if the conditions have been met and if therefore a conference can in fact be convened in 1981. In doing that, the Ad Hoc Committee will of course continue to operate in accordance with its normal methods of work, that is, by consensus.

Mr. BALASUBRAMANIAM (Sri Lanka): In the 10-year history of the resolution on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, this is the first occasion on which the draft resolution has been passed in this Committee by consensus.

Let me take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to the members of this Committee for adopting the draft resolution without a vote. Let me also thank the several members of the Committee for the kind references made by them to me as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee. In that connexion, I wish to acknowledge that my task as Chairman was facilitated to a great extent by the spirit of co-operation and accommodation displayed by the members of the Ad Hoc Committee and in particular by the assistance given to the Chairman by the group of the friends of the Chairman, who worked for several months to produce the draft resolution which the Committee adopted a little while ago.

The adoption of the draft resolution in document A/35/29 by consensus in this Committee is indeed a development that will encourage the members of the Ad Hoc Committee and be a source of inspiration to them as

(Mr. Balasubramaniam, Sri Lanka)

they prepare for the Conference on the Indian Ocean, scheduled to be held next year in Sri Lanka.

Before I conclude, may I also express my appreciation and thanks to the Secretary of the Ad Hoc Committee, Mr. Kheradi, and to his colleagues in the Secretariat for the unstinted co-operation and assistance that they always extended to me and the other members of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. SARAN (India): Permit me, on behalf of my delegation, to express our gratification at the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. We are glad to note that this draft resolution pertains to the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, which Declaration was contained in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI).

Our own views, particularly in relation to the draft resolution just adopted by consensus, have already been mentioned in the First Committee and it is not my intention to repeat them. However, we note that the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee has not been changed and that it remains as set out in the relevant resolution. We also note that the draft resolution that has just been adopted by consensus also refers to the decision taken last year by resolution 34/80 B to convene a conference in 1981. We assume that conference will be convened, and my delegation is certainly committed to that.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First of all I should like, through you, Sir, to extend to the delegation of Italy our profound condolences on the recent catastrophic earthquake that has taken place in Italy, causing severe material damage and great loss of life.

The position of the Soviet Union on the question of the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is well known. It has been stated repeatedly in this Committee and in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. The Soviet Union has consistently supported the initiative of the littoral States as regards making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. We shall continue to co-operate with all States concerned in ensuring the attainment of that goal,

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

inter alia, at the international Conference on the Indian Ocean scheduled for 1981.

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee and the draft resolution contained therein on the whole are in accordance with those goals, although to our mind their positive thrust might have been strengthened. The main point is that in the present complex international situation efforts to curb the arms race and improve the international political climate should be not slackened but intensified. We supported the draft resolution since we considered its major provisions to be an expression of the desire of the States of the Indian Ocean that such efforts continue.

The adoption by consensus of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee shows the importance attached to strengthening the security of and reducing military tension in the Indian Ocean region, to ensure the right of the peoples living there to a peaceful and calm life and the fulfilment of their desire to focus their efforts and resources on their economic and social development.

The Soviet Union considers it a common goal, which we share with the States of the region, to prevent the development of the arms race and the build-up of tension in the Indian Ocean, the preparation of plans and concepts concerning the creation of "crisis arcs" or "spheres of vital interest" and claims of the "right to interfere" to guarantee those interests, by, among other things, practical steps to station and use the rapid deployment force to that end.

We resolutely advocate the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone from which foreign military bases are eliminated, where no one can threaten the security, independence and sovereignty of the littoral States and where the norms of international law and the provisions of the United Nations Charter will be strictly observed.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

We have repeatedly pointed out that an obstacle to the development of co-operation between the Soviet Union and the littoral States of that region is the unlawful attempt to put on the Soviet Union, on an equal footing with the United States, the responsibility for expanding military activity and increasing tension in the Indian Ocean. In this respect, the Soviet delegation would like to emphasize that the wording "the military presence of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean area, conceived in the context of their confrontation" does not correctly reflect the real situation and weakens the draft resolution. In effect, that wording plays into the hands of those who are indeed trying to establish their own diktat in the Indian Ocean region.

The Soviet Union has no military bases in the Indian Ocean. It is not threatening a single country in the region, whether with a blockade, with the seizure of oil wells or in any other way. We are not concentrating a military and naval armada off the coasts of the countries of the Indian Ocean. It is the United States that is actively engaged in this and is trying to expand and intensify its military preparations in the Indian Ocean, thus constituting a threat to peace, and it is on this that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean should concentrate its attention.

The argument about some kind of equal responsibility only conceals the main point, that is that the open build-up of a military presence in the Indian Ocean which is now being pursued by the United States and the creation and expansion by it of military bases there, particularly on Diego Garcia, are contrary to the will of the peoples of that region and are heightening tension and creating the threat of the outbreak of a military conflict. Guided by the desire to reduce tension in the Indian Ocean region, the Soviet Union expresses its readiness to resume the Soviet-United States talks, which were broken off by Washington, on limiting armaments and reducing military activity in that region.

A certain representative in the First Committee has today tried once again to pervert the facts relating to events taking place in Afghanistan. We resolutely reject such attempts. We have already stated

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

our views on the matter, but it seems that certain delegations have been banking on embroiling the First Committee in a fruitless discussion in order to divert attention from the items under its consideration. We will not accept that.

In regard to the draft resolution concerning the Indian Ocean, the delegation of the Soviet Union notes with satisfaction the reaffirmation of the decision to convene during 1981 in Colombo a conference on the Indian Ocean with the object of creating a zone of peace in that region. The Soviet delegation would like to state once again that the USSR is in favour of the establishment of a zone of peace in that region. We shall co-operate actively with all interested States and take an active part in the efforts of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean to convene an international conference during 1981 and to ensure the achievement of practical results at that conference, so that a zone of peace may be created in that region.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): I merely wish to say that, as was stated a few days ago in this Committee, we wish to dissociate ourselves from the consensus on the draft resolution in document A/35/29.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1. This draft resolution has 10 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 39th meeting of the First Committee, on 21 November 1980. I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. PAC (Poland): Permit me first to associate myself with those representatives who have expressed to the delegation of Italy profound sympathy at the heavy loss of life resulting from the disastrous earthquake that has struck the Naples area.

(Mr. Pac, Poland)

I have asked to speak to express the Polish delegation's strong support for the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1, which concerns paragraph 125 of the Final Document of the tenth special session. We have noted with satisfaction that the revised text has been elaborated in co-operation with a number of non-aligned countries. In the view of my delegation, the appeal that the sponsors of the draft resolution propose should be addressed to the permanent members of the Security Council, as well as to certain other States, to agree to exercise restraint in both the nuclear and the conventional fields and not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments beyond a specific cut-off date deserves the widest support by the First Committee.

(Mr. Pac, Poland)

For one thing, the measures referred to in the first operative paragraph of that draft resolution are important not only for their own intrinsic merits. In the view of my delegation they are significant for their confidence-building potential. Besides, in the words of the Final Document of the tenth special session, an agreement on the limitation of conventional armed forces and armaments would stimulate progress in the nuclear field, objectives which the Polish Government and, I am sure, many other Governments strongly support and advocate.

In our considered view, the implementation of the Final Document in that single respect alone would go a long way towards releasing important human and material resources for development purposes, which is a consideration that cannot be easily dismissed.

For these reasons, my delegation will cast a positive vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. SARAN (India): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1. We had serious reservations about the original text in document A/C.1/35/L.36, but now that the revised text has taken into account some of our major preoccupations we have consequently decided to cast an affirmative vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq,

Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Austria, Burma, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Niger, Paraguay, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1 was adopted by 89 votes to 19, with 23 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The Finnish delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1.

We see its main thrust in operative paragraph 2, which deals with efforts to curb the arms race. With regard to certain of its elements,

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

in particular in the fifth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 1, we would have preferred somewhat different language. It follows from Finland's policy of neutrality that we consider it to be the right of every State to interpret its security needs and undertake security arrangements that it deems appropriate.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to state why we have voted against this draft resolution.

My Government has pointed out time and again that it is ready to support any reasonable measure designed to and capable of easing international tension and leading towards concrete, balanced and verifiable steps in the field of arms limitation and disarmament. Judged by these standards, however, the draft resolution in question fails to fulfil its alleged purpose.

My delegation shares the concern expressed in the second and sixth preambular paragraphs at the deterioration of the international situation and the fact that ongoing negotiations on arms limitation and on disarmament have recently encountered additional difficulties. This is the result of the recent increase in international tension, the reason for which is well known. It is the intervention by military force of a permanent member of the Security Council in a neighbouring country which, just a few days ago, was once more deplored by the General Assembly.

Let me now take a closer look at some specific proposals contained in the draft resolution. The fifth preambular paragraph calls for:

"the dissolution of existing military alliances and ... for refraining from actions conducive to expansion of existing military groupings". This paragraph is directed against options available for States that find it necessary to organize their defence in a common effort together with others, be it in military alliances or other regional organizations. It implies that the mere existence of such alliances is a threat to international peace and security.

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal
Republic of Germany)

This paragraph, however, encounters two objections. First, it is not in line with the United Nations Charter and, secondly, it is not in line with the facts. As for the facts, my country is a member of an alliance that has never been involved in any military conflict. Over the past decades it has, on the contrary, been successful in preserving peace and stability in Europe. It is actively involved in arms control negotiations, inter alia, the Vienna talks on mutual and balanced force reductions.

As for the United Nations Charter which, as a matter of fact, is not even mentioned in the entire text, the draft resolution is in contradiction with Article 51, which guarantees the inherent right of States to self-defence, individually and collectively. That right implies the possibility for States, whether or not organized in regional groups, to make the necessary arrangements for collective defence so that they can exercise their right to act together if and when the need should arise.

Let me refer to the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe signed, among others, by some of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1. It says, in the second paragraph of Section I of the Declaration, that the participating States

(Mr. Pfeiffer, Federal Republic
of Germany)

"also have the right to belong or not to belong to international organizations, to be or not to be a party to bilateral or multilateral treaties including the right to be or not to be a party to treaties of alliances".

The request contained in the fifth preambular paragraph can be seen as an attempt to prevent other States from defending their security collectively and seeking protection against foreign intervention by exercising their right to co-operate with other States in the defensive alliance.

It cannot be in the interest of existing regional organizations, be they in Africa or in Asia or elsewhere, to be excluded from that option. As regards the first operative paragraph of the draft resolution, in particular the proposal calling upon States to exercise restraint both in the nuclear and conventional fields and to resolve not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments, it is obvious that that proposal would be in the interest of a military alliance which, through an intensive arms build-up, has reached superiority in many fields, in particular in the conventional field.

Furthermore, this proposal does not envisage the establishment of a sound and reliable data basis for the assessment of balanced results necessary for the maintenance of mutual security for any verification mechanism, which would be essential in order to give States adequate assurance that reciprocal obligations are actually being observed by all participating States.

That is why the draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1 was not acceptable to my delegation.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): I should like to make the following comments with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1. Adherence to a military alliance is incompatible with Sweden's policy of neutrality. The pursuance of that policy is based on the conviction that it is in the best

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

interest not only of our own national security but also of stability in our region.

Sweden is committed to objectives of peace and disarmament and we shall continue our efforts to contribute to improved international relations based on mutual trust and confidence, which eventually may create a situation in which military alliances are no longer needed.

Unfortunately, that objective seems to be as distant as ever. However, we do not consider it our task to prescribe for other States what security arrangements they should choose for themselves or together with others. We are in sympathy with those parts of the draft resolution which call for restraint in increases of armed forces and armaments. The Swedish Government, however, doubts that sweeping declarations will serve the purpose of promoting practical disarmament agreements. We therefore have felt compelled to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1.

Mr. DABO (Guinea) (interpretation from French): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1, being clearly aware of the fact that operative paragraph 1 concerns only Member States which belong to military alliances.

Mr. KHALACHEV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from Russian): The Bulgarian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1.

Our support of it is based on the fact that it is fully in line with the repeatedly expressed position of my country regarding urgent measures which it is necessary to take bearing in mind the present international situation, which has become more complicated.

Like the overwhelming majority of States in the United Nations, Bulgaria considers that nuclear weapons are the most serious threat to international peace and security. On the basis of that, we are of the view that efforts

(Mr. Khalachev, Bulgaria)

by States should be first and foremost aimed at limiting the nuclear arms race. But we are convinced that the practical solution to other problems will present significant possibilities for making progress in the field of disarmament.

Operative paragraph 1 of this draft resolution suggests such a measure, since it calls upon the States permanent members of the Security Council and the countries which have military agreements with them to exercise restraint both in the nuclear and conventional fields and to resolve not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments, effective from an agreed date, as a first step. The implementation of that measure is aimed at preventing ~~any~~ spiral in the arms race, both in this field and in the field of conventional armaments.

In the present situation, that is of primary importance. However, if that first step is taken - and only political goodwill is necessary for this - it will, in our view, doubtlessly promote the adoption of more substantive measures to cut back armed forces and armaments of the States concerned.

Together with this, we must emphasize that the draft resolution is fully in line with the Programme of Action adopted at the tenth special session devoted to disarmament.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to voice its satisfaction at the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1.

This draft resolution just adopted by the First Committee contains a number of important provisions which refer directly to the question of reducing the danger of war. It contains an appeal to dissolve existing military alliances as a first step in refraining from actions leading to the expansion of existing military groupings. That issue is of great importance in resolving the whole range of disarmament problems, since the expansion of military blocs would subvert the military and strategic balance which has been established in the world and would thus raise an additional barrier to the speedy solution of problems in the field of disarmament and would lead to the active involvement of new countries in the arms race.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Operative paragraph 1, furthermore, contains an appeal to States permanent members of the Security Council and countries which have military agreements with them to agree not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments as a first step towards a subsequent reduction of them. Implementation of that appeal would promote progress in the nuclear disarmament field as well and would create more favourable conditions for resolving problems of economic and social development and other global problems which are confronting mankind.

I should also like to express my conviction that the draft resolution just adopted will make an important contribution towards implementing the decisions taken at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Thus, as a result of the adoption of draft resolutions A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1 and A/C.1/35/L.44, the First Committee has supported the basic ideas put forward by the Soviet Union in its proposal entitled "Certain urgent measures for reducing the danger of war". Moreover, the idea of declaring a moratorium on all nuclear explosions has received broad-based support at this session.

Bearing this in mind, the delegation of the USSR considers it possible no longer to insist on a vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.1 since its basic provisions have already been reflected in other decisions taken by the First Committee at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. KOR BUN HENG (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French):

My delegation did not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1. This does not in any way mean that we are not interested in the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons, because we are indeed victims of the war of aggression waged with these sophisticated conventional weapons and we ardently hope that other peoples of the world will not have to go through the same tragic experiences as the victim people of Kampuchea is suffering now.

Our reasons for not participating in the vote are the following. First, my delegation stated its position yesterday regarding new military alliances camouflaged under so-called treaties of friendship and co-operation, as is the case with the "Vietnamese Indo-Chinese Federation". Secondly, everyone knows that Viet Nam invaded Kampuchea and is now maintaining there an army of 250,000 men - about one Vietnamese soldier for every 20 inhabitants of Kampuchea, including children.

At the present time, Viet Nam is continuing to reinforce its troops in Kampuchea to cover their losses. Moreover, it has more than 50,000 soldiers in Laos. It can continue to occupy Kampuchea thanks to massive aid from the great expansionist Power whose representative has spoke a few minutes ago about draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.1.

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

Vietnamese military forces in Kampuchea and Laos have also perpetrated acts of aggression against Thailand and are continuing to pose an ever-increasing threat to the peoples of the region, thus increasing the danger that the war will spread throughout South-East Asia and the world. Moreover, Viet Nam is obstinately refusing to implement United Nations resolutions 34/22 and 35/6 and continues to ride rough-shod over the United Nations Charter.

They are now pushing their cynicism and arrogance to the lengths of becoming a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1. It is not by being a sponsor of this draft resolution that Viet Nam will escape world-wide condemnation and the demand of the international community that it withdraw all its troops from Kampuchea. Instead of trying to hide its crimes by perfidiously joining the sponsors of that draft resolution, Viet Nam would have done better to abandon its policy of aggression and expansion, thus making it possible to restore peace and security to South-East Asia and provide better living conditions for the Vietnamese people themselves.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.34, on the declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the thirty-sixth meeting of the First Committee on 20 November 1980. I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their votes before a decision is taken.

Mr. PROKOFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union on the whole supports draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.34 and the document called "Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade" contained in the annex to that draft resolution.

As members know, that document is the result of complex and meticulous negotiations at the last session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and then at this session of the General Assembly on questions on which we were unable to agree during the meetings of the Commission. The document drawn up as a result of that is a highly satisfactory compromise, which adequately reflects the viewpoints of States.

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

In this respect, the Soviet delegation wishes to express its satisfaction that the document reflects the tasks in the disarmament field as set out in the letter sent by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations regarding the proclamation of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. I am referring to document A/35/175.

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

I should also like to note that, notwithstanding the international situation, which has become increasingly complicated recently, it was possible, because of the mutually acceptable evaluation of the present status of international relations, to achieve agreement on a document on the declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade which on the one hand is sufficiently balanced and on the other hand provides a serious warning to imperialist and hegemonistic forces, which are pursuing a policy of the use of force or threat of the use of force against the sovereignty, national independence and territorial integrity of States and of intensifying the arms race in order to attain military supremacy.

My delegation also considers it necessary to mention that paragraph 14 (g) contains a reference to paragraph 57 of the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in which the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons was examined within the context of the prohibition of the use of force in international relations. This approach, we feel, is the only correct one, and it is from that standpoint that the Soviet Union has examined the content of paragraph 14 (g).

In conclusion, I should like to express our conviction that the declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade and the adoption of a corresponding General Assembly declaration by consensus will encourage States to make increased efforts in the disarmament field. The Soviet Union, as is well known, has consistently acted in the belief that in the present complicated international situation it is highly important that the efforts of all peace-loving States to strengthen peace, eliminate the threat of war and adopt practical measures to curb the arms race and achieve disarmament are not slackened but intensified.

The Soviet Union's position of principle remains unchanged. The Soviet Union is prepared, through agreements with other States, to limit, curb and ban any type of weapon, without of course threatening the security of any party, on the basis of complete reciprocity among the States possessing those weapons.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation, of course, supports the draft declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade and welcomes the spirit of co-operation that has enabled us during this session to settle some of the outstanding items that were not settled at the spring session of the Disarmament Commission.

The purpose of this statement is to draw the attention of our Committee to the errors contained in the French text of document A/C.1/35/L.34. My delegation has noted with surprise and displeasure that, of the four passages revised in the course of the consultations presided over by Ambassador Venkateswaran, three have been incorrectly reproduced in the French text. Such is the case in the second sentence of paragraph 12, from which the phrase "là où cela est possible" has been omitted. Similarly, in paragraph 14, beginning with the words "Les autres mesures prioritaires", the phrase "aussi rapidement que possible" has been omitted. Also in paragraph 14, subparagraph (g) should begin with the words "Mesures visant à assurer" and not "Moyens d'assurer"; and at the end of the sentence the word "thereby" should have been translated as "de cette manière" or "ainsi".

In addition, in the course of the consultations to which I have just referred, I said that it was necessary to bring our document up to date as regards decisions which have been adopted since the session of the Disarmament Commission at which this draft declaration was prepared. I suggested in particular that we bring it up to date and draw conclusions from new facts, first as regards paragraph 13 (c), which begins:

"Conclusion of an agreement by the United Nations Conference on

Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons ..."

The United Nations Conference referred to has taken place and has completed its work. The text exists, although of course, it has not been signed or taken effect. What we desire and what we consider as a priority measure in this paragraph is not the conclusion of an agreement by the United Nations Conference, which has met and achieved its purpose. We said we wanted that text brought up to date by saying, for example:

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

"The signing and ratification of the agreement negotiated by the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons ..."

In addition, I called attention to the need to bring up to date paragraph 21 of that draft declaration, headed "Studies", which reads in part:

"... studies pursued under the auspices of the United Nations, in particular by the proposed United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research within the framework of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research could bring a useful contribution ..."

I pointed out to the Secretariat that this text should be brought up to date and that the word "proposed" should be deleted and replaced by words indicating that the Institute has been established, for we know that it has been established within the framework of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and has begun to function.

These are the comments that my delegation wished to make on the text of this draft resolution.

(Mr. de la Gorce, France)

May we take this opportunity to say that great care should be taken in the drafting of texts in the official languages of the United Nations. In the case of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.21, which we voted on last week, the discrepancies between the English, French and Spanish texts were so great and concerned matters of substance to such an extent that they could very well have influenced our vote. Before we could vote on the text we had to check with the sponsors to determine which language version was the correct one. Therefore we must unfortunately take exception to the way in which some of these texts are translated and revised. We urge the Secretariat and the representatives of the Secretary-General to take greater care in the presentation and revision of documents.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to express my appreciation to the representative of France for his statement. The comments he has made in relation to the discrepancies between the French text and other texts with those of the original have been noted by the technical services of the Secretariat and will be acted upon.

However, the representative of France did advert to two points of somewhat more substance, namely the reference in paragraph 13 (c) to the words "Conclusion of an agreement ..." and, if I have understood him correctly, he is proposing that the word "Conclusion" should be amended to read "Signature and ratification of an agreement ...".

Secondly, in relation to paragraph 21, in the second sentence he has proposed that in the phrase "... in particular by the proposed United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research ...", the word "proposed" should be deleted.

I should like to put these changes to the Committee. Might I invite any comments on them?

Mr. PROKOFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If the word "proposed" is deleted, then the Soviet delegation would like the words "established in accordance with General Assembly resolution 34/83 M" to be inserted. That amendment relates to paragraph 21 of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.34.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The suggestion just made by the representative of the Soviet Union is, I think, quite appropriate and we support it.

As regards paragraph 13 (c) and the suggestion I made to replace "Conclusion of an agreement by the United Nations Conference...." by the words "signature and ratification" not of "an agreement" but of "the agreement negotiated by the United Nations Conference...". I think that would be an accurate reflection of the situation resulting from the adoption of the text by the Conference.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): I should merely like to confirm, as a member of the working group that worked on this particular document, that the amendments suggested by the representatives of France and the Soviet Union were indeed the understanding of the other members of the working group when we finalized this document.

The CHAIRMAN: I should now like to propose that in relation to paragraph 13 (c) the amendment suggested by the representative of France should be adopted. I shall read it once again, with the final amendment which he himself has suggested: "Signature and ratification of the agreement by the United Nations Conference ...".

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The language that you have just proposed suggests that the signature and ratification of the agreement should be effected by the United Nations Conference. I suggested that we say "Signature and ratification of the agreement concluded by ..." or, if you prefer, "negotiated by the United Nations Conference...". If we say "Signature and ratification of the agreement by the United Nations Conference..." it sounds very much as if it is the United Nations Conference that is supposed to do the signing and ratifying, which is not at all what we have in mind.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to thank the French representative for bringing this additional dimension to my attention. I think that in the circumstances we could put forward this formulation: "Signature and ratification of the agreement concluded by the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions..."

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States): I think that we are back with the same kind of problem that we were discussing a moment ago on the question of conclusion. An agreement which is negotiated by a United Nations body is not yet concluded and therefore it would seem to us that the better phrasing would be to say "... the agreement that was negotiated by the United Nations Conference ...".

The CHAIRMAN: I am grateful to the representative of the United States for this suggestion. Unless there is further objection I therefore suggest that we word the phrase in paragraph 13 (c) as follows: "Signature and ratification of the agreement negotiated by the United Nations Conference ...". If I hear no objection I shall conclude it is the wish of the Committee so to adopt that wording.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: With reference to the amendments to paragraph 21, the proposals of the representative of France, as amended by the representative of the Soviet Union in a manner acceptable to the delegation of France, are: to delete the word "proposed" before the words "United Nations Institute" and to add "established by resolution 34/83 M" after "United Nations Institute for Training and Research".

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that those changes are acceptable to the Committee.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to restate that, in relation to the amendments to the French text suggested by the representative of France, the Secretary of the First Committee has informed me that he will refer the issue to the technical language services so that the necessary changes can be made in the French text.

I propose that, as I understand has been agreed, we now adopt draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.34, as amended, by consensus. If I hear no objection, I shall take that that is the wish of the Committee.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.34, as amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to explain their positions in connexion with the decision just taken.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Albania would like to state certain views and to make known its position on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.34.

It is common practice in the United Nations to declare decades devoted to various important subjects. In principle we have no objection to that, but we would like the proclamation of those decades to be founded on certain real possibilities and to see them end in concrete results. This has not been true in the field of disarmament. The first Disarmament Decade proved to be a decade of unprecedented armaments, and it was marked by the greatest arms race in the history of mankind, notwithstanding the meetings and discussions on

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

disarmament which took place throughout the entire period and the enormous quantity of documents adopted.

The declaration of the 1980s as the second Disarmament Decade contains some just proposals designed to meet legitimate concerns founded on praiseworthy desires and understandable goals. But in certain respects, and in some of its aspects, it also contains assessments which give rise to reservations and lend themselves to various interpretations, and moreover certain formulations that could even create illusions. Reality shows us that disarmament in the social and political conditions of today's world remains a very distant goal.

All of that leads us to believe that the declaration of another disarmament decade would yield an experience no better than that of the first. That is why the Albanian delegation dissociates itself from the consensus.

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States of America): My delegation was pleased to join in the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.34. However, I think that we all recognize that the declaration of the 1980s as the second Disarmament Decade sets some very ambitious goals, and I should like to recall some of the points that my delegation has made about how we can best carry out this mandate.

The comprehensive measures of arms control and disarmament envisaged in the declaration will require hard and patient negotiations on specific issues in the Committee on Disarmament and especially among the States directly concerned. As we have often pointed out, the United States believes we must bear in mind that adequate and effective measures of verification remain essential to meaningful arms control and disarmament. We share the desire for rapid progress in many of the areas cited in the declaration, but we do not believe effective arms control negotiations can be conducted against artificial and unrealistic deadlines.

I would also note that the declaration refers specifically to the ratification of SALT II. My Government's position on this subject was put before the Committee yesterday in connexion with the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.45.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.