



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 33rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. Roche (Canada)

CONTENTS

- CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS
[51 to 69, 139, 141 and 145] (continued)
- PROGRAMME OF WORK

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.45.

AGENDA ITEMS 51 TO 69, 139, 141 AND 145 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call first on Mr. Sohrab Kheradi, Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform members that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/43/L.38, Cuba; A/C.1/43/L.45, Morocco and Tunisia; A/C.1/43/L.55, Malaysia; A/C.1/43/L.69/Rev.1, New Zealand.

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with our programme, the Committee will proceed to take decisions on the draft resolutions dealing with disarmament agenda items, beginning with the following draft resolutions contained in cluster 1: A/C.1/43/L.3, A/C.1/43/L.8/Rev.1, A/C.1/43/L.34, A/C.1/43/L.44, A/C.1/43/L.60, A/C.1/43/L.63, A/C.1/43/L.69/Rev.1, and the draft resolution contained in document A/43/29.

With respect to the remaining draft resolutions in this cluster, based on my consultations it would appear that some further time will be necessary before we can proceed to take action on them.

Allow me at the outset to remind members of the Committee once again of the procedure that will be followed during the present stage of our work. Before taking decisions on draft resolutions in a particular cluster, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions in any cluster.

(The Chairman)

With regard to the decisions to be taken on each of the clusters, delegations will first have an opportunity to make a statement other than an explanation of vote or explanation of position. Subsequently I shall call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on any one or all of the draft resolutions in a given cluster, that is, before I call for the vote. After all decisions in the cluster have been taken by the Committee I shall then call on those members who wish to explain their position or vote. I urge delegations kindly to make just a consolidated statement if possible on the draft resolutions within a given cluster.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1 I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt): The Middle East is unique in many respects. Situated as it is at the geographical crossroads between the continents of the earth, it has an unparalleled role to play in developing and influencing contemporary civilization. Its contribution has been enriched by its cultural diversity. In the Middle East, the birthplace of Christianity, Judaism and Islam, soul-searching has been synonymous with living. Yet, while it is the land of spiritual callings devoted to peace and tranquillity, the Middle East has also continued to be a battleground of conflicting forces in the region and beyond.

Egypt has long recognized that the turbulent Middle East could not sustain further aggravation, particularly of such ominous dimensions as those associated with nuclear weapons. It was with this in mind that Egypt declared in 1968, when the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was opened for signature, that it would be ready to ratify the Treaty or apply full safeguards to its nuclear facilities. In 1974 Egypt joined Iran in sponsoring, or sponsored independently, a General Assembly resolution calling for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

zone in the Middle East. In 1981 Egypt unilaterally ratified the non-proliferation Treaty, even though the reciprocal measures it had originally called for were not forthcoming.

We are strongly committed to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to nuclear disarmament. We also remain true to our conviction that the Middle East cannot become an arena for a nuclear-arms race and ultimately survive with a stable and prosperous future. Egypt has forewarned, and has done so repeatedly, that it shall not allow a nuclear-arms race in the Middle East where one State becomes superior to others, for that would be a directive for instability.

In order truly to rid the Middle East of any direct or implicit threats related to nuclear weapons, all States of the region have to undertake equal legally binding commitments not to acquire nuclear weapons or to allow their deployment on their territory. It is in this vein that we have called upon Israel to join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to place its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

Egypt has sponsored the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East because that would provide a framework for keeping the region free from nuclear weapons through equal, legally binding commitments by all States of the region. Equal commitments provide equal security, an imperative for stability.

We are gratified that this proposal has been endorsed by the international community without a vote since 1980. This is a consensus of paramount importance, a consensus that must be safeguarded and preserved. This cannot be achieved through stagnation or by resting on our laurels. We should not become infatuated with our own political exhortations. Quite the contrary, the only viable option available to us to prevent the consensus from eroding or losing its luster is to

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

translate our political commitment in this regard into concrete action that would bring our objective closer to reality.

I should like today to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. This draft resolution is a natural consequence and extension of resolution 42/28, which was adopted by the General Assembly last year by consensus. All the preambular and operative paragraphs of resolution 42/28 were intentionally repeated to emphasize that this year's draft was not replacing last year's resolution, but was rather an extension of it, based on the same principles that had been endorsed by consensus.

The only new element is a request directed to the Secretary-General to undertake a study on effective and verifiable measures that would facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. This is the subject of operative paragraphs 8 and 9.

I would, however, like to highlight a few points in this regard.

First, this is a proposal that is motivated by a sincere desire to rid the Middle East of the threat of nuclear weapons. At the same time it is a realistic proposal taking full account of the different elements involved. In requesting this study we are not - I repeat, we are not - attempting to establish the called for zone using the offices of the Secretary-General. We are not establishing modalities for negotiation, nor are we attempting to prejudice any of the often conflicting opinions as to what modalities should be used to establish such a zone. Actually this is quite a modest proposal aimed only at seeking some light on what effective and verifiable measures would facilitate our efforts towards the objective that has been supported by consensus by the international community.

Secondly, every region in the world, as indicated in paragraph 61 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, has characteristics that have to be taken into account in the

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

establishment of such zones. This is why we made specific reference to the phrase "circumstances and characteristics of the region". We would like to underscore the importance of keeping this in mind in undertaking the study called for. What has applied or was practical elsewhere may not be applicable here, and what applies here may not be relevant elsewhere.

Thirdly, the positions and views of the States of the region should be reflected in the study, for we are seeking effective and verifiable measures, measures which would be useful. It is with this in mind that we inserted operative paragraph 9.

Fourthly, a sincere effort was made in formulating this proposal to limit the expenses that would be incurred. It is not coincidental that we have suggested that the study be undertaken by the Secretary-General instead of by the traditional "group of experts". We do not envisage any costs attributed to conference meetings, costs which have traditionally been substantial. Neither was it coincidental that the study is to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session and not at the upcoming one. Thus the costs could be staggered over two years, thus allowing most of the costs to be covered within existing resources.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

I should, however, like to say clearly that we do not envisage all the costs of this study being covered within the resources available at present to the Department of Disarmament Affairs. We have held consultations with the Secretariat and have been advised that a study of this character is obviously different from those which could be undertaken within existing resources. It has been clearly indicated to us that additional expertise would have to be utilized. As is the custom, the Secretariat will provide the members of the Committee with an assessment of the expenditure related to the study. We are confident that the estimate, which will be made available, will indicate that costs have been kept down to only what is ultimately necessary to undertake efficiently a study of such importance. I am confident that this effort will be appreciated, particularly in view of the valuable contribution the study may make towards our goal.

In conclusion, I am compelled to reiterate that we must work with dispatch to translate our declarations endorsing the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East into practical measures for its realization. The proposal in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1 is a step in that direction. In view of the intensive consultations on this draft, and the considerable efforts my delegation has made in accommodating the different points of view - as is clear from comparing the revised draft resolution with the original A/C.1/43/L.11 - we are hopeful that it will receive as much support as last year's resolution did. We therefore ask that this proposal be adopted by the First Committee without a vote.

Mr. MOULTRIE (Bahamas): It will be recalled that yesterday, during my introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.3, I indicated that consultations were being held on operative paragraph 4. I am now pleased to inform the Committee that those consultations have been concluded, and in the interests of consensus the co-sponsors have agreed to amend paragraph 4 by deleting the following words from the end of the paragraph:

(Mr. Moultrie, Bahamas)

"and facilitating the work on the Conference on Disarmament in its negotiations on specific subjects".

The paragraph will then read:

"Recalls the role of the Disarmament Commission as the specialized, deliberative body within the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery that allows for in-depth deliberations on specific disarmament issues, leading to the submission of concrete recommendations on those issues;"

The CHAIRMAN: Does any delegation wish to speak in the presentation of statements on draft resolutions?

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): In connection with the statement just made by the representative of the Bahamas, my delegation, which is one of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.3, wishes to state that this is the first time that it hears of the consultations, and would request postponement of consideration of this draft resolution, at least for some time during this meeting, to give us an opportunity to consult with the representative of the Bahamas.

The CHAIRMAN: I am now going to call for statements other than explanations of positions on draft resolutions in cluster 1.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): With regard to the draft resolution on disarmament and development (A/C.1/43/L.8), I should like to say that the United States delegation will not participate in whatever action the First Committee may take on that draft resolution. As is well known, the United States believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that cannot be appropriately considered in terms of interrelationship between the two subjects. Consequently, the United States declined to participate in the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development and has

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

refrained from participating in both the drafting of the text and the subsequent debate in this Committee. For those reasons the United States delegation requests that the final record of today's proceedings reflect the fact that the United States has not participated in the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.8.

At the same time our delegation takes this opportunity to state that the United States Government does not, and will not, consider itself bound or committed in any way by either the declarations in the Final Document of the International Conference or the terms of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.8.

Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka): My delegation takes this opportunity to thank Ambassador Daya Perera, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, for introducing the report of the Ad Hoc Committee (A/43/29). I am speaking in my capacity as co-ordinator for the non-aligned members of the Ad Hoc Committee and as representative of Sri Lanka.

The proposal to declare the Indian Ocean a zone of peace is a disarmament exercise which began as a Sri Lankan initiative, with the support of the non-aligned countries, and which has long since drawn both regional and international attention. Following the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, States of the region held a meeting in 1979 which adopted seven principles of agreement for the implementation of that Declaration. These include the non-use of force, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, the peaceful settlement of disputes and freedom of peaceful navigation.

At the Ministerial Conference of the non-aligned countries, held in Nicosia September this year, the ministers reaffirmed the determination of the non-aligned States to continue their endeavours to attain the objectives embodied in the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, as considered at the Meeting Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean in July 1979, as well as in the subsequent meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. They reiterated

(Mr. Jayasinghe, Sri Lanka)

their conviction that the existence in the Indian Ocean area of any manifestation of Great Power military presence, foreign bases, military installations, logistical supply facilities, nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, conceived in the context of Great Power rivalries, constituted a flagrant violation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The ministers expressed their full support for the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in resolution 2832 (XXVI) in December 1971, and urged its early implementation. They also urged the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean to complete its preparations for the Conference strictly in accordance with its mandate.

(Mr. Jayasinghe, Sri Lanka)

My delegation concurs with the Chairman's reference in his introductory statement to the tone of optimism that existed during the Committee's deliberations. The situation in Afghanistan, the possibility of resolving the conflict between Iran and Iraq and various diplomatic moves concerning the situation in Kampuchea appear to be more promising than ever. The possible resolution of these regional conflicts in the Indian Ocean area is a reflection of the improvement in international relations, and its positive effects in the Indian Ocean region and its adjacent areas would particularly help to consolidate the political will of the international community for the speedy implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean.

The proposal to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean was one of the major disarmament issues considered by the third special session devoted to disarmament, held this year. The Ad Hoc Committee, in a consensus report (A/S-15/5), concluded that concrete action for the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace would be a substantial contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security, as well as the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and peaceful development of the States of the region. My delegation is pleased to report that in the discussions at the third special session devoted to disarmament wide recognition was given to the importance of this proposal and to the urgency of its implementation.

In part II of the Ad Hoc Committee's report there is reference to an invitation extended by the Government of Sri Lanka to hold the second preparatory session of the Committee, in 1988, in Colombo. This invitation was an expression of Sri Lanka's firm commitment to the realization of the objectives of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean and their speedy implementation. As mentioned in

(Mr. Jayasinghe, Sri Lanka)

the report, a large number of delegations considered the holding of the second preparatory session of the Committee in Colombo to be an important step on the road to the third United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean. Regrettably, the Committee was unable to reach a consensus on this proposal. Many delegations, in their statements in the Ad Hoc Committee, as well as in meetings at the current session of the General Assembly, have expressed their regret over the inability of the Committee to reach a consensus on the holding of a session in Colombo, in spite of the overwhelming support the proposal enjoyed in the Committee. It is the hope of my delegation that such procedural matters will be approached in a more realistic and constructive manner in future.

Positive developments included the ability of the Working Group of the Committee to undertake further consideration of 20 substantive issues and principles relating to the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, contained in the informal paper (A/AC.159/L.85) submitted by me in my capacity as Chairman of the Working Group. The Working Group agreed that those 20 substantive issues and principles constituted a good basis for further elaboration. Those issues and principles are listed in my statement, but I shall not read them out and take up the precious time of the Committee.

My delegation is confident that the Working Group is in a position to complete this aspect of the preparatory work in time for the convening of the Colombo Conference in 1990.

My delegation also welcomes the proposals to up-date the views on the topics contained in document A/AC.159/L.55 and Add.1 to 5, with the objective of facilitating future work on substantive issues. This exercise will provide a fresh opportunity for delegations to make known their thinking on the developments in international relations and in the Indian Ocean region that will assist the future work of the Committee.

(Mr. Jayasinghe, Sri Lanka)

The Ad Hoc Committee also decided to have a meeting in commemoration of the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, which was held in 1979. This commemorative meeting, inter alia, will undoubtedly bring the increasing relevance of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and the importance of its implementation to the attention of the international community. The outcome of the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean in 1979 was an important step towards the implementation of the Declaration. It is further significant that all members of the Ad Hoc Committee agreed by consensus to the holding of this commemorative meeting. This agreement is an indication of our collective concern to pursue our efforts to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

My delegation participated actively in facilitating a consensus on the text of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 19 of the Ad Hoc Committee's report now before us. In the preambular section of the draft resolution the General Assembly reaffirms some of the important elements which are considered fundamental to the implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean. In the operative part, it takes note with satisfaction of the progress made by the Working Group of the Ad Hoc Committee during the year, and urges the Ad Hoc Committee to intensify its discussions on substantive issues and principles, including those identified by the Chairman of the Working Group, with the aim of elaborating on elements that might be taken into consideration during the subsequent preparation of a draft final document of the Conference on the Indian Ocean.

In operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution the Ad Hoc Committee is requested to complete the remaining preparatory work to enable the convening of the Colombo Conference on the Indian Ocean in 1990. The holding of the Colombo Conference has been a consensus decision of the General Assembly for several years. The time has come for the membership to abide by this decision and work

(Mr. Jayasinghe, Sri Lanka)

resolutely towards the holding of the Conference in 1990. Failure to do so will be a repeated contravention of the decision of the General Assembly. My delegation urges that all parties concerned make a genuine effort towards this end.

As mentioned in the statement of the Sri Lanka delegation at the last session of the Ad Hoc Committee, what is lacking is not competence on our part to complete our preparatory work but the political will of some of the members of the Ad Hoc Committee. Developments on the international, political and security scene have given us sufficient hope and encouragement that disarmament efforts in various fields can be pursued with fewer controversies and better co-operation. It is the wish of my delegation and of the non-aligned members of the Ad Hoc Committee that the positive co-operation already witnessed, particularly the greater co-operation between the super-Powers, will facilitate positive steps towards the implementation of this important disarmament measure, which would contribute to regional and international peace and security.

Mr. CHOHAN (Pakistan): The delegation of Pakistan would like to avail itself of this opportunity to thank Ambassador Daya Perera of Sri Lanka, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, for presenting the Ad Hoc Committee's report (A/43/29) on its two sessions in 1988, which contains the consensus draft resolution recommended by that Committee for adoption by the General Assembly. Pakistan joins in the consensus on that draft resolution, in the interest of advancing the objectives of the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region, despite the fact that the draft resolution falls far short of expectations.

As in the past, we shall continue to support the early convening of the proposed Colombo Conference on the Indian Ocean because we believe that it would prove to be a step in the right direction.

(Mr. Chohan, Pakistan)

Several initiatives have been undertaken within the United Nations framework to strengthen the peace and security of our area. Among them, Sri Lanka's proposal for the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region is the most comprehensive and all-encompassing. Its intrinsic value is not diminished by the fact that the political realities of, and developments in, the region have excluded its realization in the near future.

The concept of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean found embodiment in embryonic form in the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The idea was developed and given further shape through certain principles adopted by the littoral and hinterland States in July 1979.

(Mr. Chohan, Pakistan)

Pakistan has on many previous occasions elaborated its views on the principles and issues relating to the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region. However, I would like once again to elaborate upon one issue that we believe to be central to the concept, namely, the security of the littoral and hinterland States. It has two aspects: first, threats emanating from within the region, which are rooted in the hegemonic ambitions of powerful regional States; and secondly, extra-regional threats arising from foreign military presence in the Indian Ocean region, including the territories of the littoral and hinterland States. Large-scale military activity, deployment or build-up within or in the vicinity of the region also constitute threats to the security of the region's littoral and hinterland States. Substantive work on relevant principles must address all those aspects and define appropriate commitments and obligations on the part of both regional States and extra-regional Powers.

In addition to security, there is a need to elaborate principles in respect of geographical limits, foreign military presence, nuclear weapons, peaceful settlement of disputes and the use of the Indian Ocean by foreign vessels and aircraft. Those topics, together with security, have been the subject of a useful debate in the open-ended Working Group over the past three years. While the debate has focused on the need to elaborate substantive issues and principles relating to the establishment of the zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region that could serve as a sound basis for substantive agreements to be worked out at the Colombo Conference, the deliberations have not produced the desired results. Instead, the sessions of the Ad Hoc Committee have become embroiled in repetitive discussions on fixing the dates for the proposed Conference, the harmonization of views and the substantive preparations that must be completed prior to the Conference.

(Mr. Chohan, Pakistan)

Pakistan's support for the early convening of that Conference is without prejudice to its keen interest in ensuring a successful Conference when it takes place. For that purpose we emphasize prior accomplishment of the necessary substantive work and hope that the Ad Hoc Committee will be able to complete all the preparatory work to ensure that the Colombo Conference is held at the earliest possible time. We also believe that, for the success of the Conference, the active participation of all members of the Committee is indispensable. A partially attended Conference is likely to lapse into a propaganda exercise, which would hurt the pursuit of the objective of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): Once again we are dealing with a draft resolution, contained in document A/43/29, on the "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". I am happy to express my gratitude and that of my country to the Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka, Mr. Daya Perera, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, for his tireless efforts to achieve success in the Ad Hoc Committee's work. I should also like to thank Ambassador Jayasinghe, Deputy Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka, who expresses the views of the non-aligned countries in the Ad Hoc Committee, for his sustained efforts to achieve success of the work of the Working Group.

We have before us a draft resolution that some may view as repetitive. However, we believe it to contain new and important dimensions and to entail important new responsibilities. It deals with the work of the Ad Hoc Committee in 1989 - a task which is all the more important since the General Assembly has requested that the Conference on the Indian Ocean take place at Colombo by the year 1990. The Ad Hoc Committee is thus required to conclude its organizational work in time for the Conference to be held as scheduled.

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

Positive developments have recently taken place in the Indian Ocean region, and there can be no justification for attempts on the part of some to delay the convening of the Conference. Indeed, there has been a general improvement in the international climate, which has enabled us to achieve steady progress towards the noble objectives set forth in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI), the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. As in the past, we are convinced that, given the necessary political will, the members of the Ad Hoc Committee will be able to overcome all the obstacles in its path and to make the necessary progress, notwithstanding differences of opinion.

Unfortunately, there is a small group of States members of the Ad Hoc Committee whose sole concern is to set obstacles in the path of the Ad Hoc Committee to prevent it from completing the task entrusted to it by the General Assembly, namely, to prepare for the Conference on the Indian Ocean scheduled to be held at Colombo. One State alone has succeeded in impeding the implementation of General Assembly resolution 42/43, which requested the Ad Hoc Committee to convene three preparatory sessions in 1988. It is clear that that country's position derives from its narrow interests and is designed to preserve its military presence in the region.

In that connection we regret that that General Assembly resolution has not been implemented. We should not like to see the principle of consensus serve as a pretext for the use of the veto to prevent the Ad Hoc Committee from taking decisions. That would set a dangerous precedent that could only lead to chaos, not only within the Ad Hoc Committee, but in other forums and organs of the United Nations as well.

The problem within the Ad Hoc Committee does not arise from any lack of clarity in its mandate, which is very clear. Everyone knows what it is. The true

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

problem resides in the lack of political will on the part of some States that make no secret of their outright opposition to General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI), the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

We voted in favour of the draft resolution being submitted this year, in the hope that we would be able to convince and persuade certain countries to abandon their intransigent stand and enable the Ad Hoc Committee to make the preparations necessary for convening the Colombo Conference within the scheduled time-frame, namely, by 1990, without engaging in further delaying tactics.

We join in the request made by the Soviet Union at the beginning of the Committee's work for the convening of a special meeting on the Indian Ocean next year. There is no doubt that such a meeting would, with the best of intentions, contribute to the Ad Hoc Committee's concerted efforts with a view to attaining the goal to which we all aspire: making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

In conclusion I should like to reaffirm the importance of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. That is why we hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by the First Committee by consensus, thereby enabling us to overcome the obstacles that have been placed in the path of implementation so that, in the future, we will not have to reflect positions that do not serve our common interests in the Indian Ocean region.

Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh): Our intervention, on agenda item 68, will be brief and focused. We shall join in the consensus on the draft resolution on this matter. As we stated during the general debate in this Committee, the outlet to the sea is important for Bangladesh. Our support for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace flows from that simple fact. Use of the sea must be peaceful, as must be the exploitation of its resources. If there are those who still believe that the international political climate has not improved significantly enough to facilitate implementation, it is our hope that the evidence to the contrary will enable them to change their minds. My delegation is of the opinion that sufficient progress has been achieved by the Ad Hoc Committee, under the wise stewardship of our Sri Lankan colleagues and with the co-operation of all concerned. The substantive issues involved have been elaborated. The Bangladesh delegation firmly believes that the remaining work can be completed in time for the proposed Colombo Conference to take place in 1990. It is imperative that all Member States support this endeavour. We are confident that this support will be forthcoming.

The early implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace is not just a good and powerful idea; it is an idea whose time has surely come.

Mr. SHARMA (India): My delegation fully supports the report introduced by the delegation of Sri Lanka. The importance of the principles and objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace of 1971 remains valid today. Indeed, the Ad Hoc Committee should redouble its efforts towards the successful implementation of the 1971 Declaration and work towards the convening of the Colombo Conference not later than 1990.

The idea of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace represents the hopes and aspirations of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean. It is our

(Mr. Sharma, India)

task to ensure the return of peace and tranquillity to the area. We should spare no effort in achieving this objective so eloquently put forward in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) of 1971. Needless to say, the Indian delegation will fully co-operate in bringing about this objective.

Mr. GLADKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the USSR supports the draft resolution contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean (A/43/29, para. 19). The USSR is devoting considerable attention to the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and actively and systematically supports the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The Soviet Union has put forward a series of resolutions aimed at moving off dead centre the question of the demilitarization of the area and the strengthening of peace there.

Like the majority of delegations, we note with satisfaction that this year the Committee has done considerable work in the implementation of its mandate in preparations for the Conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo. At the same time we wish to express our regret that the Ad Hoc Committee, in the absence of agreement, could not accept the invitation of the Government of Sri Lanka to hold its spring session at Colombo.

The Soviet delegation feels that conditions are now right for the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean to be able to carry out its work in the next year, especially with regard to substance. Important in this regard will be the responses of the members of the Ad Hoc Committee in the updating of document A/AC.159/L.55. We hope that we shall have an opportunity to acquaint ourselves with the resulting documents before the beginning of the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee in 1989 so as to make most effective use of the time assigned for a businesslike discussion of the substantive problems.

(Mr. Gladky, USSR)

We believe it is important for the General Assembly to express its wish that the Ad Hoc Committee mark the tenth anniversary of the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland Countries of the Indian Ocean. We also emphasize the importance we attach to the implementation of paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, concerning the need to complete the remaining preparatory work relating to the Conference on the Indian Ocean to enable it to be convened at Colombo in 1990.

In conclusion, in accordance with our proposal put forward in the First Committee on 18 October concerning the holding, in the USSR next year, of an international seminar on making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, the Soviet delegation requests the Secretariat, in particular the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs and the Department for Disarmament Affairs, to provide the necessary co-operation vis-à-vis the holding of the seminar against the Soviet Union's contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the statements on cluster 1. I now move to statements by delegations who wish to explain their position before a decision is taken on the draft resolutions in cluster 1.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.8/Rev.1, on the relationship between disarmament and development, proposed by the delegation of Zimbabwe, is very useful because it fills an important gap in the efforts of the First Committee. The implementation of the action programme adopted at the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development calls for careful consideration by the international community. Such consideration was outlined at the third special session on disarmament but was not carried out. Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.8/Rev.1 lays the foundation for the necessary examination of the implementation of the action programme adopted at the International Conference.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.63, concerning consideration of the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade, submitted by the delegation of Nigeria, provides for the necessary action by the United Nations in this respect. The Byelorussian SSR considers that the Third Disarmament Decade shall become the third decade of progress towards a nuclear-weapon-free world. The Byelorussian SSR supports this draft resolution as well as the others in cluster 1.

Mr. DOLEJS (Czechoslovakia): The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held last year proved the paramount importance of these two aspects for further international development. Taking an active part in the work of the Conference, Czechoslovakia proved its commitment to securing developments through disarmament. The Czechoslovak delegation also sees a direct interrelationship between disarmament and development and their impact on global security as the basis for the creation of a non-nuclear, non-violent and peaceful world.

(Mr. Dolejs, Czechoslovakia)

That is also why my delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.8/Rev.1, and specifically the request in operative paragraph 1 for the Secretary-General to take action through the appropriate organs, within available resources, for the implementation of the action programme adopted at the International Conference.

We expect that in the foreseeable future these concrete steps will be taken, in conformity with the provisions of that action programme adopted by the International Conference, so that the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session will be able to consider the substance of the question.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee is now ready to proceed to the next stage.

We shall take a decision first on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.3, as orally amended.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Bahamas at the First Committee's 32nd meeting, on 9 November, and has the following sponsors: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, Jordan, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo and Uruguay.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.3, as orally amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.8/Rev.1.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Zimbabwe, on behalf of the States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the First Committee's 32nd meeting, on 9 November. It has the following sponsors: the German Democratic Republic, Romania and Zimbabwe.

(The Chairman)

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.34.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the First Committee's 30th meeting, on 8 November, and has the following sponsors: Bangladesh, India, Mexico, Pakistan, Samoa, Sweden and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

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, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, 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, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.34 was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.44.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the First Committee's 30th meeting, on 8 November, and has the following sponsors: Australia, Austria, Belgium, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Samoa, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.44 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.60.

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 31st meeting, on 9 November. Its sponsor, Mexico, has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.60 was adopted.

*Subsequently, the delegations of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Trinidad and Tobago and Zambia advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: I turn now to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.63. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November 1988, and has the following sponsors: Argentina, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Nigeria, Poland, Thailand and Zaire.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.63 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I turn now to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.69/Rev.1. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Cameroon at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November 1988, and has the following sponsors: Australia, Bahamas, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Togo, Thailand, Ukrainian SSR, and Zaire.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.69/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I turn now to the draft resolution contained in paragraph 19 of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, document A/43/29. The draft resolution has programme budget implications as indicated in document A/C.1/43/L.73. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative

(The Chairman)

of Sri Lanka at the 26th meeting of the First Committee on 3 November 1988 and the sponsor has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

The draft resolution contained in document A/43/29, paragraph 19, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded our action on the draft resolutions in cluster 1 that we had to deal with today.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): We have just joined in a consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.8/Rev.1, on the relationship between disarmament and development. We have done so as a reflection of the fact that we joined consensus on the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held in 1987. But, as we made clear at the Conference, we have reservations about the Final Document. We do not believe that it adequately reflects the complex nature of the relationship between disarmament, development and security. Disarmament measures that do not take national security into account cannot contribute to international security. We are committed to both disarmament and development, each for its own sake. However, as a country with a significant programme of aid to developing countries, the United Kingdom does not believe that aid disbursement should in any way depend on progress in arms control.

We further believe that the lack of attention in the Final Document of the Conference to the need for transparency in the provision of information on military expenditure detracts from the value of the document.

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

Finally, we note that in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution just adopted the General Assembly

"Requests the Secretary-General to take action through the appropriate organs, within existing resources, for the implementation of the action programme adopted at the International Conference, and to submit a report to the General Assembly ...".

As we understand it, that request applies only to that aspect of the action programme where action by the Secretary-General is specifically indicated, namely, paragraph 35 (c) (ix) b.

Mr. MASHHADI-GHAHVEHCHI (Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran is of the firm view that the Indian Ocean should be a zone of peace and free from military rivalry. Because of the political importance of the region, the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, as the natural extension of that ocean, must be free from foreign military interventions and military rivalries between the super-Powers. We believe that the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace constitutes a very positive step towards that goal and that the decision by consensus on A/43/29 reflects the vital importance of the subject.

Mr. GRUNDMANN (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic should like first to thank Ambassador Perera of Sri Lanka, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, for presenting document A/43/29 at the twenty-sixth meeting on 3 November. The document contains the Ad Hoc Committee's report as well as the draft resolution that was adopted by consensus some minutes ago.

In 1971, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace in its resolution 2832 (XXVI). Later, an Ad Hoc Committee was set up to prepare an international conference to define the Zone's status in terms of international law. The 49 States of the Committee, among them the permanent members of the Security Council, have largely completed preparations for convening an international conference on the Indian Ocean. Notwithstanding the efforts of the Non-Aligned States and other member States of the Committee, including the German Democratic Republic, the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo was inordinately delayed because of the unhelpful attitude adopted by some States.

The general debate in plenary meeting of the General Assembly and in the First Committee has shown that the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, a large portion of our globe, is becoming ever more urgent. The German Democratic

(Mr. Grundmann, German Democratic Republic)

Republic has on many occasions expressly supported the international demand for the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region. It welcomes all activities undertaken by the countries of the region and by other States with a view to scaling down tensions and creating a climate of stability and security.

In that context, the German Democratic Republic supports the relevant statements contained in the main document of the non-aligned countries. We also associate ourselves with the various initiatives to strengthen peace and security in the entire Asian-Pacific region as well as in the Indian Ocean. We consider the concept submitted by General Secretary Gorbachev in various statements since 1986 and more recently in his speech at Krasnoyarsk to be of fundamental importance. The proposal contained in that concept - to build confidence, strengthen security and reduce military confrontations in the Indian Ocean region - opens up additional opportunities for the work of the Ad Hoc Committee.

My delegation would like to offer some general observations on the outcome of our proceedings this year.

First, the work of the Ad Hoc Committee should not be considered in isolation, since it is part and parcel of world-wide effort to safeguard peace and security and strengthen stability and confidence in international relations and in the Indian Ocean region in particular.

Secondly, we also share the view expressed by various delegations that the positive results reached at the Moscow summit meeting in May and June of this year, the successful conclusion of the Geneva Accords, the normalization of the situation concerning Afghanistan and the positive impulses that emanated from the fifteenth special session of the General Assembly mark the beginning of what could be a turn for the better in international relations.

(Mr. Grundmann, German Democratic Republic)

Thirdly, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean did achieve tangible results in 1988. Though we faced a number of difficulties, the general atmosphere of our proceedings was marked by a spirit of accommodation and constructiveness. The record shows that this has not always been the case. We had interesting debates that laid manifestly greater emphasis on the substantive issues. In light of the international meeting on nuclear-weapon-free zones held in Berlin a few months ago and of other international events, my delegation noted with great satisfaction that there is growing interest in transforming the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace.

Fourthly, we appreciate the fact that the endeavours to convene the Conference on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace to be held in Colombo in 1990 have been reaffirmed not only within the Ad Hoc Committee but also in the general debate of the forty-third session of the General Assembly.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic welcomes the adoption of the draft resolution. I should like to remind the First Committee that it was for the fourth time in succession that the Committee was able to adopt its report, including the recommendation, during its regular session. That fact shows that there is growing acceptance by nearly all groups within our Committee of the need to keep abreast of the mainstream of international affairs. We are happy to note that the spirit of goodwill, accommodation and compromise that has prevailed in the Committee has borne fruit.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic welcomes the decision to observe the tenth anniversary of the meeting of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean held in New York in early July 1979. Moreover, my delegation fully supports the general agreement reached on the up-dating of document A/AC.159/L.55 and addenda reflecting the views of Member States on the seven topics agreed to in 1980.

(Mr. Grundmann, German Democratic Republic)

Another important development, in our view, is the submission of document A/AC.159/L.85, including a paper of 20 points, for the elaboration of elements that might be taken under consideration towards the preparation of the draft final document of the United Nations Commission on the Indian Ocean. We are of the view that in the course of its session in 1989, the Ad Hoc Committee should continue its efforts to define substantive issues on the basis of the above-mentioned document. Mention should also be made of the need to address, during our proceedings next year, the proposal put forward in document A/AC.159/L.74 concerning the stages of the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean, and of A/AC.159/L.75 dealing with confidence-building measures in the Indian Ocean, neither of which has been exhaustively discussed so far.

We are prepared to receive with an open mind any proposals or ideas designed to intensify our work and we will study them closely. In that connection, my delegation welcomes the USSR's generous offer to organize, within the framework of the World Disarmament Campaign, an international seminar on making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

The resolution adopted a few minutes ago provides clear guidance to the Ad Hoc Committee in its future work. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic also intends to play a constructive role in the proceedings of the Ad Hoc Committee in 1989.

Before concluding, I wish to express my delegation's appreciation to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Ambassador Perera of Sri Lanka, for his untiring efforts to ensure that the Committee moves forward towards the fulfilment of its mandate.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has just concluded action on cluster 1. We shall now turn to cluster 2. In cluster 2, we shall take up only draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.39. Concerning the other draft resolutions in this cluster, I am under the impression that further consultations are required.

I call on Mr. Kheradi, Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to make the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.39, entitled "Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof".

By that draft resolution the General Assembly would note that

"following appropriate consultations, a Preparatory Committee ... of the Parties to the Treaty ... is to be established prior to holding a further review conference in 1989". (para. 1)

In addition, the Secretary-General would be requested

"to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the Review Conference and its preparation". (para. 2)

It should be noted that the Review Conference is a conference of States parties to the Treaty. The first and second Review Conferences, held in 1977 and 1983 respectively, like other review conferences of multilateral disarmament Treaties - for example, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Biological Weapons Convention - included in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the Review Conferences, including the session of the Preparatory Committee. Under those arrangements no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the Organization. The wording

(Mr. Kheradi, Secretary of the
Committee)

of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.39 is identical to the wording of resolution 37/99 H, which preceded the convening of the second Review Conference.

Consequently, the Secretary-General assumes that his mandate, under the draft resolution, to provide the necessary assistance and services for the preparation and holding of the Review Conference has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that, as in the case of the two previous Conferences, the associated costs will be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the third Review Conference.

The CHAIRMAN: As it appears that no representative wishes to make a statement prior to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.39, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision.

The Secretary of the Committee has just read out the programme budget implications of the draft resolution. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Norway at the 26th meeting of the First Committee on 3 November; it has the following sponsors: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

(The Chairman)

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.39 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those members who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation would like to make a statement in connection with the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.39.

As one of the 80 parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof, and as one of the 46 sponsors of the draft resolution dealing with the question of convening a third Review Conference, the Ukrainian SSR welcomes the Committee's adoption of this draft resolution without a vote. In our view that unanimous approval will promote the success of the work of the session of the Preparatory Committee, which is scheduled to meet from 24 to 28 April next year, and also that of the Conference as a whole.

The success of the work of the Conference will depend, inter alia, on its being given all the necessary information.

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

In this regard, the Ukrainian delegation would like to recall that the General Assembly at its fortieth session, adopted also without a vote, resolution 40/94 J, entitled "Further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed, the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof". The resolution contains a request that the Conference on Disarmament, in consultation with the States parties to the Treaty on the sea-bed, taking into account existing proposals and any relevant technological developments, continue its consideration of further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed, the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof.

The Ukrainian delegation believes it is necessary that the information to be made available to the Preparatory Committee and subsequently to the Conference itself should reflect the progress made in the implementation of resolution 40/94 J. We believe that this wish of ours is entirely in harmony with operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. de LA BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation did not participate in the consensus decision on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/43/L.39. It merely wishes to have its statement of non-participation reflected in the record.

The CHAIRMAN: I would now draw the attention of representatives to Cluster 3, containing two draft resolutions, A/C.1/43/L.18 and L.21. Does any delegation wish to explain its position in regard to Cluster 3? As that is not the case, we shall begin action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.18. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Brazil, India, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.18 was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now turn to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.21. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November, and has the following sponsors: Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia and the USSR. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Chile, China, Fiji, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Malta, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Sweden, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.21 was adopted by 99 votes to 17, with 16 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: Since that concludes the voting on Cluster 3, I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes after the vote has been taken.

Mr. GEVERS (Netherlands): The Netherlands believes that agreement on a common formula which tries to combine the various unilateral declarations by nuclear-weapon States would be the right approach. We have stated this position on occasion during the sessions of the Conference on Disarmament. Such an agreement could eventually be embodied, for example, in a mandatory resolution of the Security Council or in an international agreement. Therefore we welcome the neutrally-worded draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.18, which was introduced by Pakistan. It seems to us that this draft resolution shows the kind of realistic approach that we should continue in the course of our work in the Conference on Disarmament.

(Mr. Gevers, Netherlands)

We also noted that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.21, introduced by Bulgaria on the same subject, has taken into account some of the reservations made by Western countries on previous occasions. The text, however, still contains paragraphs which we do not support, such as the last preambular paragraph, which tries to prejudice the outcome of the discussions. The Netherlands was therefore not in a position to support the Bulgarian draft resolution.

Having said this, I should like to emphasize that in the Netherlands' view there seems to be enough room for further improvement to be able to look forward to the introduction next year of just one draft resolution, which could then obtain wider support.

Mr. SHARMA (India): My delegation would like to provide clarification of its vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.21. We remain convinced that the only real and credible guarantee for non-nuclear-weapon States against the threat or use of nuclear weapons lies in the negotiation of meaningful nuclear disarmament measures looking towards the objective of complete elimination of nuclear weapons. As long as nuclear weapons remain in the arsenals of nuclear-weapon States, security doctrines are predicated on the possible use of such weapons. As long as security continues to be based on doctrines of nuclear deterrence, the development of security assurances cannot be considered an objective in itself but only an interim step in the overall plan to usher in a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world. In such a world, assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States will become redundant and total security will prevail.

Mr. FYFE (New Zealand): New Zealand abstained on draft resolution A.C.1/43/L.21 concerning the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the threat or use of nuclear weapons. Most delegations will be aware that this year there has been some imaginative thinking brought to bear on

(Mr. Fyfe, New Zealand)

the issue of negative security assurances, both in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and in the drafting of the draft resolution before us in this Committee.

It had been hoped that a new approach could be adopted towards this item seeking to transcend traditional approaches, if not to the underlying security considerations behind the draft resolution, then to its general presentation. The main sponsor of the draft resolution, Bulgaria, is to be commended both for its initiative in fostering a new approach to the item and for its flexibility in seeking to achieve a new text.

As it now stands, draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.21 represents, in New Zealand's view, a distinct improvement over last year's draft resolution, and accordingly New Zealand does not wish to express opposition through a negative vote. There are, however, some shortcomings in the text which prevent a positive vote from us.

The first preambular paragraph appears to disregard the path-breaking Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles concluded since the Committee last met. The second preambular paragraph implies that nuclear weapons are the sole cause of war of any kind, which is demonstrably incorrect, and to which the various conflicts around the world in recent years can testify. In the final preambular paragraph insufficient effort has been made to bridge the different strategic perceptions of the military alliances which, in my delegation's view, should be the common goal of such a draft resolution henceforth. Therefore, an abstention is, we think, an appropriate vote on the draft resolution before us this year.

That said, New Zealand expresses the hope that discussion and dialogue on the subject will continue after the current session of the General Assembly, that a constructive spirit will be shown in the Conference on Disarmament next year on this important subject, and that delegations will have before them a single consensus text at the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: It appears that we have now concluded our action on cluster 3.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: We have made very good progress this morning. As members are aware, there are intensive consultations going on concerning certain draft resolutions. It is my desire to encourage those consultations in order - as I have said several times to the Committee - to effect mergers where possible, and we have built into the programme that we have already adopted time for consultation. Hence, it is my intention to cancel the meeting of the First Committee for this afternoon in order to allow all delegations a little breathing time in preparation for the continued voting.

Tomorrow, Friday, at 10 a.m., we will resume voting and there will also be a meeting tomorrow afternoon, when we will take up clusters 4 and 5 and the remaining draft resolutions contained in the clusters that we dealt with today, if that is possible. I would ask the sponsors of the draft resolutions concerned to keep in touch with the Chair or the Secretariat so that we will know if they are ready.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.