

UNITED NATIONS  
**General Assembly**

FORTY-FOURTH SESSION

*Official Records*

FIRST COMMITTEE  
38th meeting  
held on  
Thursday, 16 November 1989  
at 10 a.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 38th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MASHHADI (Islamic Republic of Iran)

CONTENTS

- Tribute to Ambassador Garcia Robles
- Consideration of and action on draft resolutions on disarmament items [49] to [69] and [151] (continued)

---

This record is subject to correction.  
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned  
*within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750,  
2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/44/PV.38  
12 December 1989  
ENGLISH

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Mashhadi (Islamic Republic of Iran), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR GARCIA ROBLES

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Fellow representatives, before we continue with the work of the First Committee this morning, I should like, on behalf of the Chairman of the Committee, Adolfo Taylhardat, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, and myself, to extend a special welcome to Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles, who has recently rejoined the work of the Committee as representative of Mexico.

(The Chairman)

As you are all aware, Ambassador Garcia Robles has played a vital role in the efforts of the international community with a view to disarmament, in the negotiation and drafting of important international agreements such as the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and the permanent agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, and in the establishment of the World Disarmament Campaign.

Ambassador Garcia Robles, who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1982, has devoted his vast experience and knowledge to the cause of disarmament and is held in high esteem by our Committee. Allow me, in the name of the Committee, to wish him every success as he continues his noble work.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to associate itself with the words of the Chairman in saying how pleased we are at seeing Alfonso Garcia Robles, Ambassador of Mexico, with us once again.

We certainly missed Ambassador Garcia Robles at the beginning of our debate. In the Conference on Disarmament and in the First Committee we are accustomed to hearing him speak at the opening of the proceedings. It is certainly fair to say that the work of the First Committee would not have been the same had it not been for the presence of a man who, for several decades, has given such impetus to our work. As the dean and several times President of the Conference on Disarmament, the single disarmament negotiating forum, where he has represented Mexico since 1977, Ambassador Garcia Robles has worked tirelessly at the task of negotiation with a view to enabling the international community to achieve the fundamental peace and security it desires. In addition to his work in the field of disarmament, Ambassador Garcia Robles has been the Foreign Minister of his country

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

and Permanent Representative of Mexico to the United Nations and has actively contributed to the principal decisions of this body over the last four decades.

Those of us who have been his disciples or who are his colleagues and friends can only say that we are most pleased to see Ambassador Garcia Robles back with us in the Committee.

Mr. El ARABY (Egypt): Allow me first to say how happy I am, Sir, to see you chairing this meeting.

It is a particular pleasure for my delegation and for me personally to participate in honouring the eminent and distinguished Mexican statesman, Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles.

In the course of a long and highly successful career, Ambassador Garcia Robles has undertaken many important assignments for his country and has reached the highest echelons of Mexico's Foreign Service.

We are all indebted to Ambassador Garcia Robles. He served in several prominent positions within the United Nations Secretariat - he was Director of Political Affairs at the very inception of the Organization and he made significant contributions to the work of many committees.

It gives my delegation great pleasure to honour Ambassador Garcia Robles, a man who has left his mark on diverse fields of international concern through his steadfast determination and his deep and sincere devotion to matters of international peace and security.

It is particularly auspicious that it is the First Committee that is taking the initiative in honouring Ambassador Garcia Robles. His unwavering commitment, resolute determination, unparalleled vigour and personal enthusiasm have been instrumental in the field of disarmament. If we could single out one person today and call him "Mr. Disarmament", that person would be Ambassador Garcia Robles.

(Mr. El Araby, Egypt)

He has received numerous awards in the course of his long and distinguished career, ranging from personal recognition by his Government to the Nobel Peace Prize, and there is very little that can be added here today.

In wishing him continued success and good health, I should like to convey to him the sincere and profound appreciation of the Government of Egypt for all his recognized and highly admired achievements in the field of peace and security.

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): I too am pleased to welcome Ambassador Garcia Robles and to participate in the tributes to him for his enormous contribution throughout the years in the fields of disarmament and international and multilateral co-operation.

When the Charter of the United Nations was signed at San Francisco in 1945, Ambassador Garcia Robles was there. Now, almost 45 years later, he is still striving relentlessly for the achievement of the vital goals of the Organization in the fields of disarmament and political co-operation.

A unique and eventful political and diplomatic career has in great part been dedicated to and linked with the world Organization and its ideals. We are here today to express our great respect and gratitude for the contribution which this eminent personality and champion of peace has made throughout the years.

I am honoured, in my capacity as Chairman of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, to express our gratitude to him and to say how much we appreciate his inspiration and his contribution to the activities of the non-aligned group in the First Committee.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

If we tried to enumerate his achievements in all the years during which he has been active in the United Nations, and during which he represented his country, we would produce a long list of successes, all of which would bear the indelible personal imprint of Ambassador Garcia Robles. He has indeed left a great personal imprint on the work in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

He represented his Government in the vital fields of the United Nations, particularly those related to the problem of disarmament but also, in the early days, in many other fields of a political nature. I would like to make particular mention of his central role in the negotiations on the establishment of the first nuclear-weapon-free zone in the world covering populated areas, the Treaty of Tlatelolco. With great justification, some refer to Ambassador Garcia Robles as the father of that important Treaty. In 1978, he inspired and was instrumental in the success of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The Final Document of that session has been an essential element in directing the process of disarmament in the last decade.

Full confirmation of all his successes and achievements can best be seen in the fact that in 1982 he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, which without doubt is the highest recognition the international community can give for contributions in the cause of peace. Not much can be added to that.

I would conclude by underscoring the outstanding role played by Ambassador Garcia Robles as representative of Mexico to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. He has undoubtedly contributed to progress in different areas, and I would particularly emphasize those related to the question of a nuclear-test ban and a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

I am convinced that I share the opinion of all representatives of Member States present here in expressing full recognition of, and great respect and gratitude for, the personality and work of Ambassador Garcia Robles. I wish him a long life and the best achievements in the years to come.

Mr. HYLTIENIUS (Sweden): I would like to associate myself with the warm words of welcome the Chairman has addressed to Ambassador Garcia Robles. His outstanding career and contributions to the cause of multilateral disarmament are well known and recognized.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

One token of that recognition is the Nobel Peace Prize, which he was awarded in 1982 together with my compatriot the late Alva Myrdal. In fact, the relationship between Ambassador Garcia Robles and Sweden goes back several decades, to the days, 50 years ago, when he served as a young diplomat at the Mexican legation in Stockholm. Swedish representatives have had the privilege to co-operate closely with Ambassador Garcia Robles, not only in the Conference on Disarmament and in the First Committee but also in many other contexts, for instance when he was a member of the Palme Commission and within the framework of the Six-Nation Initiative.

My delegation has always appreciated the close contacts we have had with Ambassador Garcia Robles, and it is therefore with great pleasure that we note his presence here in the Committee.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): Our delegation, too, is heartened by the return to the First Committee of the representative of Mexico and his charming wife, who is in the Chamber today.

Ambassador Garcia Robles has for years been the dominant figure in this body, and it gained stature by his presence. Ambassador Garcia Robles has been the dean of ambassadors in the Conference on Disarmament for many years. During the course of his tenure, no one has spoken and written more eloquently or had such impact as has the representative of Mexico. Our delegation has not always shared the approaches he has championed, but we have never doubted the commonality of working towards the great goal of international peace and security.

Our delegation is indebted to Ambassador Garcia Robles for another reason. He has been the mentor to a generation of United States disarmament officers who began their careers in the Ad Hoc Committee on a Comprehensive Programme on Disarmament. While he saw to it that their experience was not always without stress, it was

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

always a profitable episode in their career progression, and we are convinced they could have had no better teacher.

All members of our delegation would like to wish our friend and colleague, Ambassador Garcia Robles, good health, happiness and Godspeed.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): It is very difficult to pay tribute to a person of the caliber of Ambassador Garcia Robles. It is difficult because there is so much to say and so little time in which to say it. I have had the privilege of knowing Ambassador Garcia Robles very intimately for well over 10 years, which is roughly one fifth of the time that he has spent working for the cause of disarmament. Ambassador Garcia Robles' name is synonymous with the campaign for peace and disarmament. I think the history of the struggle for disarmament in the period following the Second World War cannot be written without devoting at least one full chapter to the contribution made by Ambassador Garcia Robles.

He and I and the representatives of four other countries worked very closely together in what came to be known as the Six-Nation Initiative for Peace and Disarmament. As representatives will recall, that Initiative was launched by the leaders of India, Sweden, Mexico, Argentina, Tanzania and Greece in 1983. During the meetings of the planning group, I found Ambassador Garcia Robles extremely knowledgeable, of course, but the one thing that impressed me most was his unflinching courtesy and even temper in all circumstances.

He is a person of varied talents. He is a keen student of music, of which some representatives might not be aware. He has great knowledge and is very discriminating about good food. Representatives may not know this, but I believe that he has written a book - which he has not published - about where to eat well in and around Geneva.

Ambassador Garcia Robles is enormously appreciated in my country. We had the privilege of conferring on him the prestigious Jawaharlal Nehru Award for promoting

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

peace and international understanding. He came to India to receive that recognition and made a speech on that occasion which was one of the most important statements made in India on the subject of disarmament.

He is the author of several books, and my Spanish-speaking colleagues tell me that each one of the speeches spoken by Ambassador Garcia Robles in the Spanish language is a distinct contribution to the enrichment of that language.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

That is why I said at the beginning that it is very difficult to pay a tribute to a man of the caliber of Ambassador Garcia Robles.

I should add a word about Mrs. Garcia Robles, whom also my wife and I have had the pleasure of knowing for a period of years. The couple endeared themselves not only to us but to all those who came into contact with them. I am sure that we are not saying good-bye to Ambassador Garcia Robles and his wife - just au revoir. We may not see the Ambassador in the chamber of the First Committee, but we shall certainly see him in Geneva and elsewhere, and I am sure that, given his tenacity, his determination and his lifelong dedication to the cause of disarmament, we shall continue, in the years to come, to hear from him and to benefit from his counsel and advice.

I take this opportunity to wish Ambassador Garcia Robles and his wife happiness and continued good health.

Mr. KRASULIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Today we are honouring a man of very unusual destiny, a prominent diplomat who has devoted himself primarily to multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament. I personally have known and worked with Ambassador Garcia Robles for some years. In my country his name commands enormous respect and authority. For many years Alfonso Garcia Robles has been virtually the dean of United Nations disarmament matters. We associate with his name the considerable progress and gains that have been made in this field, both by the United Nations and by the Conference on Disarmament.

Today we should draw attention to the outstanding role that Alfonso Garcia Robles played in the drafting and ratification of the Treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons in Latin America. The significance of that Treaty lies not only in the fact that it has excluded the huge Latin American continent from

(Mr. Krasulin, USSR)

the nuclear-arms race but also in the fact that, thereby, territorial limitations were set on nuclear weapons. I agree fully with those who have called Ambassador Garcia Robles the father of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. It is not surprising that his work in this important field earned him the Nobel Peace Prize and other awards.

As we co-operated with Ambassador Garcia Robles in various international forums over the years we became aware that we were dealing with a man of remarkable qualifications, erudition and unusual thinking, a man of the highest moral standards, a man with great personal qualities.

But there is also a sad note: the Ambassador will be leaving his post as the representative of Mexico in the Conference on Disarmament. However, we hope that we shall be meeting him frequently at the various disarmament forums.

We wish him the best of health, the joyous spirit that is so common among Mexicans, great happiness and every possible success in his life.

Miss AL-MULLA (Kuwait): My delegation, on behalf of the Arab States, is honoured to take part in this modest tribute to a great man in our midst. We are pleased to see Ambassador Garcia Robles and his wife in this chamber today.

Some people know Ambassador Garcia Robles as a negotiator, initiator and mediator - a voice of wisdom and consistency in our midst. His imprint is borne on many positions, resolutions, documents and agreements. The few words that can be said of him on this occasion may not measure up to the stature of the man and to his contributions. I shall not list his contributions - others know them better than I do - but I should like to mention a few that have left a deep impression on all of us: his contribution to the finalizing of the Treaty of Tlatelolco; his contribution towards the drawing-up of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in 1978; his efforts

(Miss Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

in the field of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. His contributions are a credit not only to Mexico - his own country - but to the region and to the world.

We regret his retirement from active duty, but it is with satisfaction, appreciation and gratitude that we note the heritage that he is leaving behind. We wish him and his family health and happiness.

Mr. AZAMBUJA (Brazil): There is so much to be said about Ambassador Garcia Robles that this meeting could easily be prolonged. We would not have to repeat each other; we would all find different facets to admire, new elements to praise.

I want my tribute to be a personal one as I have known Ambassador Garcia Robles for something like 30 years. When we first met we were both very young men. At that time he was his country's ambassador to my country - and a brilliant and eminent envoy he was. He was one of the last ambassadors to be sent by Mexico to my home city of Rio de Janeiro. I recall that among young Brazilian diplomats his name already had an aura of prestige, wisdom and serene stubbornness, of commitment to what makes Latin America an important part of our world.

Then I had an even greater privilege: Ambassador Garcia Robles and I worked together for a long time in the preparation of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. He was the master architect. I was just a common labourer, but I could see how much the Treaty owed to him, and to what extent he was its inspiration. I could see how he fought for something that many people felt was unrealistic, premature and perhaps incapable of being carried to fruition. It is to a large extent due to his efforts that Latin America is free of nuclear weapons, and that is indeed an enduring monument.

(Mr. Agambuja, Brazil)

Then he and I met again in Geneva at the Conference on Disarmament. There, he expressed more than anybody else the spirit of the first special session, for which so much is owed to him.

We are delighted to see him back in our midst today, accompanied by his wife.

(Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

A man like Ambassador Garcia Robles is not a man who can retire. He has so much to say, so much to tell, so much to teach, that in all those categories he has to continue, to provide Mexico, Latin America and in particular my own country with the inspiration that has been one of his great contributions to all of us. So I wish to tell him that we have all learned from him. We all love him; we all respect him; we all wish him well.

Mr. HOU Zhitong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I should like to take this opportunity to express the deep feelings of the Chinese delegation with respect to Ambassador Garcia Robles, to whom we pay our highest tribute. Like other delegations, the Chinese delegation is delighted to see him with us once again.

We join the many representatives who have spoken of the high esteem of their delegations for the contribution made by Ambassador Garcia Robles over the years in the international arena and especially his important contributions to disarmament activities. His name is well known. It is linked to the establishment of the United Nations and its many activities, particularly its multilateral disarmament activities. He has actively participated in and made an important contribution to multilateral disarmament activities, ranging from the establishment of the First Committee to the Conference on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission and other important United Nations disarmament forums such as the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and all the documents emanating from those bodies.

Ambassador Garcia Robles' rich experience in international affairs, his wisdom, his published works and his other contributions are the common heritage of us all. We pay a tribute to him for all his achievements over the years and wish him and his wife good health and happiness and success in all their future activities.

Mr. DIEZEL (German Democratic Republic): My delegation shares the sentiments expressed this morning in honour of the achievements of Ambassador Garcia Robles, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize. His life work for arms limitation and disarmament - often persuasive, often combative - is unsurpassed. His contribution to this Committee's work and in the Conference on Disarmament and countless other forums - above all, in the special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament - is not just a heritage that we shall preserve, but continues to be a programme of action. With special feeling, I remember his visit to my country in 1983.

Ambassador Garcia Robles has done a great service to the cause of disarmament and the disarmament community. We thank him for it.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the Twelve countries of the European Community, I wish to pay our collective tribute to Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico on this occasion in the First Committee on which we honour him. It is a tribute to the public man, but also in a way to the private man. The public man has been known for decades all over the world as the very incarnation of tireless activity for the cause of disarmament. As many delegations have already mentioned, that work received the highest acknowledgement in 1982 with the award of the Nobel Peace Prize, which was above all recognition of the remarkable work that led to the signing of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, a treaty of universal dimension. We pay a tribute to it as not only a regional action, but a global action for disarmament. In it and in the important posts Mr. Garcia Robles has held we have been able to see how much his authority has been recognized by all and how everyone has listened to him with the greatest attention and respect.

I wish also to pay a tribute to the role Ambassador Garcia Robles has played, and still plays, as a member of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters, a

(Mr. Morel, France)

relatively new body to which he has given personality, authority and weight, through his participation and highly valued advice, advice which has also benefited the Secretary-General. I wish also to refer to his role as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament on the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Since the beginning of the First Committee's work generations of diplomats - especially young diplomats - have gained from his special way of working, informal and warm, which, on the authority of the Committee's Chairman, has given them the opportunity of discussing and considering questions and advancing and finding compromise solutions. Young diplomats have been strongly influenced by this valuable experience.

I wish also to pay a tribute to the private man, who has always shown exceptional courtesy in the many debates in which he has taken part. We cannot fail to mention these personal elements, since the public man could not have had such influence without the greatly appreciated qualities of the private man.

I do not want to go on at length, for we know how modest and discreet Ambassador Garcia Robles is. We know that he is a man of great culture, and to sum up we may say that nothing that touches upon disarmament is foreign to him, and we may also use the Latin expression, Homo sum et nihil humanum a me alienum puto - "I am a man, and nothing human is foreign to me." That sense of universality is what is brought to us by the experience of Ambassador Garcia Robles and his presence with us today.

Mr. DOLEJS (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): I too wish to speak of Ambassador Garcia Robles's remarkable activities, and of his important role in formulating and achieving the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Those activities will never be forgotten. Nor will his role as Head of the delegation of Mexico to the Conference on Disarmament and to the First Committee of the General Assembly. His work was duly recognized in the award of the Nobel Peace Prize.

The delegation of Mexico has a particular position on the principle of consensus. I think that today we may, by consensus, thank Ambassador Garcia Robles for his remarkable work. We wish him all the best, and much energy for his future work in the field of disarmament.

(spoke in Spanish)

We wish him all the best and thank him warmly for all he has done.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): It has been a great honour for me to listen to the thanks expressed by previous speakers for my work. I wish in particular to thank the Chairman of the First Committee, Ambassador Taylhardat, and Ambassador Mashhadi, who is in the Chair today, for setting aside some of the Committee's valuable time to enable me to take leave of all the colleagues with whom I have had the pleasure of sharing our common efforts to achieve a world in which international peace and security will prevail.

Over the years, during successive regular and special sessions of the General Assembly, it has been my privilege to know and work with people from all latitudes and from every compass point. It is a source of great satisfaction to be able to say that, notwithstanding the differences in approach and perspective that sometimes seem to separate us, the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter have always been a common touchstone in our common efforts.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

During all these years I have been very proud to represent the Government of Mexico, whose unswerving support for the principles of international law and whose tireless quest for a world free of confrontation have always sustained us in our endeavours.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 69 AND 151 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following States have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/44/L.10; Ireland; A/C.1/44/L.63/Rev.1; New Zealand; A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev.1; Bahamas; and A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1; Antigua and Barbuda.

The CHAIRMAN: In conformity with yesterday's announcement and in the light of further consultations, it is my intention this morning to take up as many of the following draft resolutions as time permits: in cluster 3, A/C.1/44/L.63/Rev.1; in cluster 8, A/C.1/44/L.11 and L.50/Rev.1; in cluster 10, A/C.1/44/L.20/Rev.1 and L.56/Rev.1; in cluster 11, A/C.1/44/L.37 and L.60; and in cluster 16, A/C.1/44/L.2/Rev.1, L.36 and L.44/Rev.1.

Towards the end of this morning's meeting I shall announce the draft resolutions to be taken up this afternoon.

Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions before it, I call on representatives wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. KOLANE (Lesotho): On behalf of the member countries of the African Group, the Group of Latin America and Caribbean States, and the Group of Asian States, my delegation wishes to speak on agenda item 64, "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly",

(Mr. Kolane, Lesotho)

and wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.63, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament in Africa and Asia and the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean".

The United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament are the creation of the General Assembly, and their mandate is, inter alia, to provide substantive support for the initiatives and other activities agreed upon by Member States in a region for the implementation of measures for peace and disarmament through appropriate utilization of available resources, and to co-ordinate the implementation of regional activities under the World Disarmament Campaign.

The regional centres were constituted as a result of General Assembly resolution 39/63 J of 12 December 1984, which was adopted without a vote. In that resolution the Secretary-General was requested, inter alia, to provide assistance to Member States upon request with a view to establishing regional institutional arrangements for the implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign on the basis of existing resources and voluntary contributions.

The three centres were officially inaugurated in 1986, 1987 and 1989 respectively, in Togo for Africa, in Peru for Latin America and the Caribbean, and in Nepal for Asia. The centres thereupon embarked on aggressive programmes towards realizing measure of peace, arms limitation and disarmament, and towards co-ordinating the implementation of regional activities in their respective regions, under the World Disarmament Campaign.

(Mr. Kolane, Lesotho)

The regional centres are viable and effective institutions in the dissemination of information on activities of the United Nations in the field of arms limitation, confidence-building and disarmament, and they need to be further strengthened. In this regard we wish to express our deep gratitude to those countries that have provided and continue to provide voluntary contributions to enable the centres to realize their mission in the service of their respective regions.

The ongoing and proposed activities of the centres can be found in the Secretary-General's reports contained in documents A/44/582 and A/44/584. The need to strengthen the three centres is best summed up in the statement by the Under-Secretary General for Disarmament to this Committee on 18 October 1989, when he said:

"It is against this backdrop and in the context of the mandates given by the General Assembly that the three regional centres for peace and disarmament, in Africa, Latin America and Asia, have been utilized to the extent that their resources permit. Intensive dialogues are being organized at these centres. ... The potential contribution the centres can make towards the relaxation of tension, confidence-building and disarmament is now widely recognized. However, if they are to realize their potential to the full they need adequate resources, both human and financial, particularly for the effective and efficient organization and expansion of regional and subregional dialogues." (A/C.1/44/PV.6, p.4)

It is on the basis of the foregoing, mindful of the financial crisis facing the United Nations and in appreciation of the Secretary-General's continued administrative support to the centres, that we feel that, in strengthening the role of the centres, the urgent need for the establishment of the post of Director for each centre should be considered in its true perspective.

(Mr. Kolane, Lesotho)

The establishment of the post of Director would go a long way to ensure that the centres have direction and proper guidance from qualified and fully mandated personnel who would co-ordinate the regional activities in a more structured and professional fashion to ensure the effective operational activities of the centres.

We stand ready and open to further consultations on the matter, and we hope that in the interim the draft resolution thus introduced will be adopted by the Committee and the General Assembly by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than in explanation of their positions on draft resolution L.63/Rev.1.

Mr. RANA (Nepal): Though a little out of turn, I wish to join other colleagues in paying a tribute to Ambassador Garcia Robles. I do not at this stage wish to add to what has already been said with such eloquence about his many contributions except to add that we all feel very much honoured by his gracious presence with us this morning. This is not only an expression of his continuing commitment to the work of this Committee but also a source of inspiration to us all. While recalling with gratitude his valuable service and contribution to the cause of peace and disarmament, we wish him and Mrs. Robles the very best in the years to come.

The representative of Lesotho, the current Chairman of the African Group of States, has introduced on behalf of the sponsors from Africa, Asia and Latin America draft resolution A/C.1/44/63/Rev.1 on the United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean. The important role that these three regional centres can play in promoting mutual confidence and security among members of the respective regions cannot be overemphasized.

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

The centres can also greatly facilitate the implementation and co-ordination of the regional activities under the whole disarmament campaign. The General Assembly has, over the last several years, confirmed the importance and potential effectiveness of the regional disarmament measures taken at the initiative of the region and with the participation of all the States in the region. Each region has specific characteristics, and it is for the countries of the region to take appropriate common initiatives. The regional centres can act as the focal point in harmonizing and co-ordinating such regional initiatives, thereby contributing to the measures of confidence-building, arms limitation and disarmament in those regions.

It goes without saying that the centres need to be provided with financial stability if they are to carry out effectively the mandate assigned to them. Draft resolution L.63/Rev.1 accordingly appeals to Member States, as well as to intergovernmental organizations, to make voluntary contributions to strengthen the operational activities of the centres. The experiences of the last few years have established that the centres also need a minimum of administrative identity not only to ensure their effective functioning but also to be able to attract voluntary contributions to finance their activities. It is with those considerations in mind that draft resolution L.63/Rev.1 calls for the establishment of the post of Director, from the regular United Nations budget, at each of the three centres. The sponsors of the draft resolution are well aware of the financial constraints of the Organization and have accordingly asked for the absolute minimum to facilitate the effective functioning of the centres. We have taken into account the justifiable concerns of the Member States in matters relating to the additional appropriations and have agreed to leave the matter to the decisions of the Secretary-General.

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

The programme budget implications of draft resolution L.63/Rev.1 make clear the course of action should the draft resolution be adopted by the General Assembly. I should also like to refer to the provision of draft resolution L.63/Rev.1 whereby the General Assembly would change the name of the Asian Centre located in Katmandu, Nepal to "The Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific". This change was proposed in consultation with other Asian States that consider the participation of Pacific countries could help and strengthen the Centre. As a matter of fact, the countries of the Pacific were invited to take part in the meeting that took place early this year, and made positive contributions to the work of the Centre.

At this point I would like to emphasize the importance of political support for the centres. In the past, draft resolutions relating to the three centres have been adopted by consensus. In view of the importance of the role that the three centres can play, we once again express the hope that draft resolution A/44/L.63/Rev.1 can be adopted by this Committee without a vote.

Mr. BELLINA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would also like to associate itself with the tributes to Ambassador Garcia Robles, an eminent Latin American who is responsible for having that region declared the world's first nuclear-free zone. We wish to do so also because of the close bonds that exist between our countries. We thank Ambassador Garcia Robles for all he has done for Latin America.

My country has the honour to be the headquarters of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean. We have also had the honour of representing the Latin American and Caribbean Group in the consultations with regard to the submission, on behalf of the three Centres, of a draft resolution calling for the establishment of the post of Director at each of the regional centres. The name of Peru therefore appears as one of the sponsors, on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States. We all view the establishment and existence of a centre of that level as of the highest importance, since it will make it possible for international progress in regard to peace, disarmament and development to be fully recognized by public opinion in our countries.

Although the Centres are in operation, they can only function within the limits of their capacities and the financial support they receive. We are deeply grateful to the Governments and governmental institutions that have enabled the Centres to function and hold important meetings and conferences over the years. However, the Centres require more dynamic support in order to be able to perform the tasks entrusted to them. That is why the members of the three regional groups feel that draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.63/Rev.1 is of great importance, since in it the Assembly would request the Secretary-General to establish the post of Director at each of the Centres.

(Mr. Bellina, Peru)

We must do our utmost to achieve the goal of a world of peace, disarmament and development. We therefore urge the members of the Committee to view the draft resolution in its proper perspective and to adopt it by consensus. Delegations that have spoken earlier have been clear and emphatic with regard to the need for the regional centres. We would again urge all States to help us promote peace, disarmament and development in our region.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those delegations that wish to make statements in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.63/Rev.1 before the voting.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom fully supports the work of the three Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament, and in previous years we have been very happy to associate ourselves with the adoption of various draft resolutions on that subject without a vote. It is therefore with great regret that this year we find ourselves obliged to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.63/Rev.1.

My delegation notes that the purpose of the request addressed to the Secretary-General in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution is to ensure the effective functioning of the three Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament. My delegation fully supports that objective. In principle, we have no objection either to the appointment of a director for each Centre. However, it is apparent from the statement of programme budget implications in document A/C.1/44/L.64/Rev.1 that the Secretariat is proposing, within a relatively short time frame, a net addition of three posts to the over-all staffing table to be funded in future from the regular budget. We recognize that an effort has been made to reduce the budgetary impact of the draft resolution, but, nevertheless, it is still not a measure that my delegation could support.

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

We would recall that the Organization is still engaged in a process of reform and renewal launched by General Assembly resolution 41/213. In adopting that resolution by consensus Member States set a target of reducing the staff establishment of the Secretariat by 15 per cent within three years. Thanks in large measure to the leadership of the Secretary-General and the co-operation of the staff, a 12 per cent post reduction has been achieved, but there is still a substantial way to go in order to meet the target.

The reform is primarily intended to promote the broadest possible agreement among Member States on administrative and budgetary matters and, by doing so, to restore confidence in the Organization and, with it, financial stability. Regrettably, financial stability is another objective that has still not been achieved. The situation remains as serious as ever. The Secretary-General, in introducing his proposed programme budget last month in the Fifth Committee, pointed out that accumulated arrears to the regular budget amounted at that time to some 77 per cent of the appropriation for the current year. My delegation's understanding of the present position is that it is doubtful whether there is sufficient cash in the general fund for the Organization to meet its expected commitments to the end of the year. Without additional collections during the remainder of 1989, it seems the United Nations will once more face the very real prospect of insolvency.

In those circumstances it appears essential to my delegation not to damage confidence in the Organization by eroding such progress as has been made so far with the reform. The creation of additional posts is particularly sensitive, and we would question the necessity for it in this case. In document A/44/6/Rev.1, which contains the Secretary-General's budget proposals for 1990 to 1991, paragraph 10 of the introduction states that all mandated outputs have been included. We would interpret that to mean that the proposed appropriation in

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

respect to programme element 5.2, Supports to Regional Centres, under section 2B, Disarmament Affairs Activities, should already be sufficient to ensure the Centres' effective functioning. We are therefore not convinced of the need for the additional appropriation of \$242,600 now proposed. If, in apparent contradiction to the judgement of the Secretary-General, supplementary resources are required, we believe they should be provided through redeployment. That would be consistent with the terms of the resolutions establishing the Centres, which refer to funding through extra-budgetary or existing resources.

For our part, we would not necessarily insist on redeployment within section 2B, although in that connection we would comment that only the Fifth Committee is in a position to judge relative priorities for the allocation of resources between the sections of the budget as a whole. We hope that, in considering this issue and making recommendations on it to the Fifth Committee, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions may be able to propose a solution that my delegation could after all support, but, for the moment, we have no alternative but to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.63/Rev.1.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.63/Rev.1 - as is only logical inasmuch as we are one of its sponsors. However, we do consider it necessary to emphasize that, while we fully support efforts to ensure that the Regional Centres will be fitting instruments for the promotion of the objectives set forth in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Regional Centres are still part of the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs and that, therefore, the administrative organization of the Centres - the appointment of directors and other matters - as well as political initiatives, must be harmonized with the over-all system of consultations and modus operandi of the Department.

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

We feel that this is important for the success of the regional centres and their future efficiency.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution L.63/Rev.1. The draft resolution has programme budget implications that are set forth in document A/C.1/44/L.64/Rev.1. The draft resolution is entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament in Africa and Asia and the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean". It was introduced by the representative of Lesotho on 16 November on behalf of the Group of African States and the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, as well as Bangladesh, China, Democratic Yemen, Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, New Zealand, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Singapore, at the 38th meeting of the First Committee.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, 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, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian

Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.63/Rev.1 was adopted by 130 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on delegations wishing to explain their vote.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): While the United States supports the concept of regional disarmament centres, we are obliged to consider the financial implications of initiatives we might otherwise welcome.

The three regional disarmament centres to which the resolution refers were established on the understanding that they would be financed on the basis of voluntary contributions. Yet the draft resolution will unfortunately create new financial burdens for the United Nations, for which the 1990-1991 budget does not provide.

The creation of additional positions in the United Nations Secretariat at a time of severe budgetary constraints would be inconsistent with the ongoing efforts to keep the size of the Secretariat within those limitations. The United States fully supports those efforts and therefore was compelled to vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. NORHEIM (Norway): I wish to explain the votes of the five Nordic countries - Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and Norway - on the draft resolution contained in document L.63/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament in Africa and Asia and the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean".

(Mr. Norheim, Norway)

The Nordic countries have supported the establishment of the three regional centres and their role in the disarmament process, and we continue to do so.

Nordic countries are major contributors to the World Disarmament Campaign, through which the activities of the centres have to date been largely financed.

We have therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution, though we have reservations on the way paragraph 3 is formulated. As a matter of principle, the Nordic countries strongly support the integrity and independence of the Secretary-General, who should have the freedom to dispose of his resources as he finds appropriate. We would have liked to see this principle better reflected in the text.

Mr. MARTINEZ (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Cuba wishes to point out that, while we support draft resolution L.63/Rev.1 and the ideas it expresses, we proceed from the premise that in order for the centres to be efficient it is essential to equip them with an appropriate official to co-ordinate the centres' initiatives taking into account the nature of each region.

The centres have been given the task of disseminating information on disarmament in their respective regions and thus promoting better public understanding on disarmament matters. Their activities must accord with the priorities of the international community, which has established the highest priority for information on disarmament matters pertaining to the prevention of the outbreak of nuclear war.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): The delegation of France voted in favour of draft resolution L.63/Rev.1 and thus joined the numerous delegations which supported the draft. We are pleased to recall that France decided in 1989 to make a voluntary contribution of 20,000 francs for the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa and today we wish to

(Mr. Morel, France)

state that it will give 50,000 francs in 1990. The additional sum will serve the same purpose: to allow disarmament studies in Africa, for example on military expenditures, in close co-operation with United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR).

An African researcher should be invited to join the Institute and help it in its work.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 8, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.11. I now call on the representative of Brazil, who wishes to explain the position of his delegation before the voting.

Mr. LAMAZIERE (Brazil): Brazil will again support both draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.11 and draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25, entitled respectively "Cessation of all nuclear-test explosions" and "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water".

It is the considered view of my delegation that any progress on that subject should be compatible with article 18 of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and with the wording of the second preambular paragraph of the partial test-ban Treaty, which states that the parties seek:

"to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time".

At the same time, Brazil holds that the Conference on Disarmament should establish an ad hoc committee on a nuclear-test ban with a negotiating mandate appropriate to the Conference, which is the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of the international community.

At this time in history, when concerns about environmental problems are growing, Brazil considers it to be high time for the nuclear-weapon States to engage in negotiations at the multilateral level for the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests for all time, which, even in the form of underground tests, not only have well-known, direct negative effects for the environment, but also fuel the quantitative and qualitative arms race.

It is a fact that the existence of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, stocks, and the risk of their use are the most formidable threats to

(Mr. Lamaziere, Brazil)

the future of mankind and to life on our planet, as was recognized by the Brundtland report.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolutions in cluster 8, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.11, entitled "Cessation of all nuclear-test explosions". The draft resolution has 12 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1989.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the names of the sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.11 are Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Myanmar, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Somalia, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, China, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.11 was adopted by 117 votes to 3, with 13 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev.1, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty: report of the Conference on Disarmament". The draft resolution has 30 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of New Zealand at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1989.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the names of the sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/50/Rev.1 are Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway,

(Mr. Kheradi)

Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sweden, Thailand, Vanuatu and Zaire.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev.1 was adopted by 124 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.\*

---

\* Subsequently the delegation of Egypt advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): The United States has asked to speak to explain its negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev.1.

The United States was unable to support that draft resolution because, unfortunately, it is fundamentally inconsistent with the United States position on the issue of a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests. A comprehensive test ban would not necessarily prevent proliferation, reduce armaments, stop production of any weapon, or ensure any lessening of an arms race. Improved stability is the most direct means of improving security, and that is what we are seeking through reductions of strategic and conventional forces and the implementation of confidence-building measures.

The United States carries out nuclear tests to ensure the reliability of our nuclear deterrent, and a comprehensive ban on those tests must be viewed in the context of a time when we do not need to depend on nuclear deterrents to ensure international security and stability.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev 1, concerning the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

Our support for the draft resolution is, however, somewhat qualified. We continue to support the goal of a comprehensive test ban as laid down in the commitments engaged upon in the partial test-ban Treaty and in the non-proliferation Treaty. What draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev.1 should have brought out more clearly is that a comprehensive test ban should also be seen in the perspective of the broader process of disarmament, and nuclear disarmament in particular. Now that real disarmament is taking place in the Treaty on the

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - and that further disarmament is in the offing - I refer to the talks on the reduction of conventional forces in Europe and their implications for strategic nuclear forces and the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks - we should try to look beyond the traditional call for a comprehensive test ban as a reflection of the indirect approach to nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

The tangible results of the efforts towards a substantial reduction of nuclear weapons prompt my delegation to take these developments into account.

Other related developments too need a proper reflection. I have in mind the step-by-step process on nuclear-testing issues, to which the United States and the Soviet Union have devoted themselves since September 1987. Steps are likely to be taken swiftly. The verification protocols to the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes and the threshold test-ban Treaty will probably be concluded soon, and ratification of these two Treaties is on the agenda for 1990. The Netherlands expects the United States and the Soviet Union to seek, as a matter of urgency, further limits on the yield and number of tests, in conjunction with the process of direct reduction of nuclear weapons, to secure further implementation of the staged approach of the 1987 declaration.

My delegation would also like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.11. In that draft the more balanced and realistic approach along the lines I have just indicated is scarcely apparent. The draft hinges on the one-sided assumption that prevention of nuclear war takes precedence over the prevention of all war, including nuclear war. The Netherlands delegation cannot subscribe to the thesis of the exclusive centrality of nuclear weapons in the arms-control process. The issue of nuclear weapons must be seen in the broader context of their interrelationship with conventional arms. My Government cannot support the appeal to all States members of the Conference on Disarmament to promote in 1990 the establishment of an ad hoc committee with a mandate to negotiate a treaty on the complete cessation of nuclear-test explosions. In our view, the Conference on Disarmament should, instead, take up its work on such concrete matters as the verification provisions of the multilateral test-ban

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

treaty, taking into account the commitments undertaken by the nuclear Powers in the limited test-ban Treaty of 1963 and in the non-proliferation Treaty of 1968.

Mr. SOOD (India): I want to speak about the cluster of draft resolutions on the subject of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty - in particular, those contained in documents A/C.1/44/L.11 and A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev.1.

The question of a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons has been a priority issue on the multilateral-disarmament agenda for almost 35 years. The objective is clearly reiterated in the preamble to the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, which says:

"Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time...".

My delegation regrets that, despite the repeated calls of the international community, negotiations on this issue have not commenced in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. In our view, the Conference on Disarmament remains the most appropriate forum for the commencement of negotiations on this subject of vital concern, given the presence of all five nuclear-weapon States around that conference table.

My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/44/L.11. However, my delegation notes that the scope of the Treaty, as envisaged in the draft resolution, is at variance with the generally accepted scope of such a Treaty. In our view, the scope of our work is clearly determined by the preambular declaration of the 1963 partial test ban Treaty. Our vote in favour of this draft resolution is therefore without prejudice to our position on the scope of a comprehensive test-ban treaty to be negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament, as envisaged in the preamble to the partial test-ban Treaty.

(Mr. Sood, India)

My delegation was not able to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev.1. We believe that the Conference on Disarmament is a negotiating body and that anything less than a negotiating mandate would reduce its role and downgrade the importance attached to this issue by the world community. We are aware of the bilateral talks between the United States and the Soviet Union, but these are on the subject of nuclear testing. However, as was stated by the leaders of Argentina, Greece, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden and India in connection with the Six-Nation Initiative in the Stockholm Declaration, any agreement that left room for continued testing would not be acceptable.

My delegation also urges that, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, all nuclear-weapon States suspend testing so as to facilitate negotiations.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain the negative votes cast by my delegation in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.11 and draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev.1 pertaining to nuclear-weapon tests. In our view, the texts of these draft resolutions do not deal appropriately with the question of nuclear tests. A nuclear-test ban must occur within an effective process of disarmament, in accordance with the findings of the General Assembly at its tenth special session, in 1978, as expressed in the Final Document. It can be achieved only when progress towards disarmament has made it possible without calling into question the underpinning of international security. Therefore it cannot be preliminary, nor can it be given priority over reduction of the very substantial nuclear arsenals of the two most highly armed States.

If France is to maintain its position it has no choice but to retain a credible deterrent force. This requires the incorporation of all technological progress dictated by the developments of the other strategic forces. France must

(Mr. Morel, France)

therefore be able to continue its nuclear-weapon tests at a pace and in conditions determined by technological requirements. It is in the light of those requirements that France has decided to reduce the number of tests from eight a year to six a year. France has decided to make this decision public and to report to the Secretary-General annually on any tests that it might have conducted in the preceding year.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): There is no need to reiterate the importance of a nuclear-test ban, but we feel that the urgency of this matter must always be emphasized. The process of negotiations between the two major nuclear-power States is now at an advanced stage. It is difficult to understand why negotiations on a treaty prohibiting, once and for all, the testing of nuclear weapons cannot start promptly in the Conference on Disarmament, in which all five nuclear-weapon States are represented. It is in the light of these considerations that my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev.1. On the other hand, we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.11 because we feel that it establishes a proper balance on the questions involved.

Ms. MASON (Canada): Before explaining our vote, I should like to take this opportunity to associate Canada with the words of praise and admiration said here today about a most distinguished man, Don Alfonso Garcia Robles. As a newcomer to the First Committee this year, I arrived here, as so many have, in the echo of the footsteps of this man, whose presence has enriched the multilateral process for so long.

I wish briefly to explain Canada's vote for draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.50 Rev.1 and its abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.11. Both draft resolutions seek the common objective of the cessation of all nuclear-test explosions. Moreover, it is clear from past voting patterns on similar draft resolutions that they have much in common, since while there are some States that have felt compelled to oppose both and others that have abstained on one or the other, the large majority of members of the United Nations endorse both. In a sense, the draft resolutions could be compared to alternative road map itineraries that, while seeking to end up at the same destination, a nuclear-weapon-free world, set up different routes towards that destination and suggest different methods of travel on the way.

From Canada's perspective, especially taking into account the differing national security interests and concerns of the nuclear-weapon States, without whose active participation no successful negotiations towards a comprehensive, verifiable test ban are possible, we believe that the approach set out in draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev.1 is more realistic and more likely to be effective.

The CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding to the next item I would like to remind the sponsors of draft resolutions that they are not permitted to explain their vote on their own proposals.

(The Chairman)

We shall now proceed to cluster 10. As a result of last-minute consultations, there has been a request to postpone a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.56/Rev.1.

We shall therefore take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.20/Rev.1. The sponsors of that draft resolution, which is entitled "Conventional disarmament", have requested that a decision be taken without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.20 Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of their positions.

Mr. SOOD (India): My delegation wishes to explain its participation in the decision on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.20/Rev.1.

In paragraph 2 it is recommended that the report of the Disarmament Commission should provide a basis for further deliberations on conventional disarmament by the Disarmament Commission at its next session. My delegation went along with that, on the understanding that it is not only the report of the Disarmament Commission, which did not reach any conclusions or any agreement on the subject at its previous session, but also the various conference room papers, formal and informal proposals as well as oral and any future proposals that would determine the basis of the Disarmament Commission's work on the subject. My delegation understands that the earlier work would in no way constrain the work on this item in the years to come.

Mr. HDULLEZ (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I wish to express my delegation's satisfaction at the adoption without a vote of the two draft resolutions relating to conventional disarmament, draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.13 and A/C.1/44/L.20/Rev.1. In this connection, I would recall the priority importance my country attaches to conventional disarmament, not only in Europe, where we are happy to note the progress already achieved within the Conference on

(Mr. Houlliez, Belgium)

Security and Co-operation in Europe process, but also in all parts of the world, taking into account the specific characteristics of each region. Too many financial resources are diverted from economic and social goals for the acquisition of conventional armaments. We are happy that the two draft resolutions ask the Disarmament Commission to continue, at its 1990 session, consideration of problems related to conventional disarmament.

My delegation would like to add the hope that an agreement may be reached on this matter. Considerable progress was made during the 1989 session on the essential elements of the draft report. We are convinced that the will to succeed, which should motivate all delegations, together with the praiseworthy efforts of the Commission's Chairman, Ambassador Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, to improve its work, will make it possible to adopt a report by consensus.

Mr. MARTINEZ (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.20/Rev.1, "Conventional disarmament", sponsored by Denmark, bearing in mind that, taking into account the conclusions of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, account is also taken of the special responsibility of the nuclear Powers and other militarily significant States for progress in disarmament matters. Conventional disarmament efforts must be seen in the context of general and complete disarmament, so that regional and subregional conventional disarmament measures are considered in the light of the characteristics of each region, with the participation of all the countries concerned so far as possible, and taking their opinions into account.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to cluster 11, draft resolutions A/C.1/44/L.37 and A/C.1/44/L.60. I shall first call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than in explanation of vote.

Mr. CHACON (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): I request the Committee not to take any decision on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.60. We had thought that our oral communication would suffice, but apparently we should have put it in writing.

I wish to withdraw draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.60.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will take no action on that draft resolution. We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.37. I call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to explain his vote before the voting.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): Last year, the United States found it necessary to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution subsequently adopted as General Assembly resolution 43/75 I, on international arms transfers. At a time when many States were pressing the United Nations to prioritize its expenditures and keep its budget in line, we believe the expenditures called for in that resolution were inappropriate. We also voiced concern about some of the substantive aspects of the resolution and about its references to other documents to which the United States does not subscribe.

Our position on those matters has not changed. Underlying that resolution, however, were some serious problems involving indiscriminate arms transfers. The United States is sensitive to those problems, and, in co-operation with other concerned States, we are actively seeking solutions.

Because we share the concerns of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.37, our delegation is pleased to support that largely procedural text. We trust that the study group considering this topic will make a clear distinction between legitimate and illicit arms transfers, and will give due consideration to other concerns.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.37, entitled "International arms transfers". It is sponsored by 28 delegations and was introduced by the representative of Colombia at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, held on 7 November 1989.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.37 is sponsored by the following delegations: Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Brazil, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.37 was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 31 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on representatives wishing to explain their vote after the voting.

Mr. HOU Zhitong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.37, on international arms transfers. Our general position with respect to international arms transfers is set out in Disarmament Commission document A/CN.10/119, and that position remains unchanged.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): My delegation supports all efforts aimed at reducing arms transfers with the objective of preventing any unjustified military build-up in any part of the world. However, consideration of such arms transfers must take into account the indigenous defence production capacities of different countries, especially the militarily significant ones, as well as the legitimate security concerns of States. Since those considerations are not duly reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.37, my delegation was constrained to abstain in the voting on that draft resolution.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.37. We support all efforts towards disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. We believe that concentrating on arms transfers at the regional level only distracts the international community's attention from the priorities established in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We do not believe this should be done before effective steps are

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

taken to end the Israeli occupation of the occupied Arab territories and to put an end to Israeli nuclear armament in our region. Our priorities also include the elimination of the apartheid régime in South Africa.

Until the peoples of those two regions can be assured that their existence is not threatened by South Africa or Israel and that measures have been taken to stop the flow of weapons to those two racist régimes, we feel that concentrating on arms transfers at the regional level is premature.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall turn now to draft resolutions in cluster 16:  
A/C.1/44/L.2/Rev.1, A/C.1/44/L.36 and A/C.1/44/L.44/Rev.1.

I call on representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. HERZBRUCH (Federal Republic of Germany): Today we shall vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36, entitled "Reduction of military budgets". My delegation joined the consensus on resolutions on this subject in previous years even though we did not fully agree with them. In this year's draft resolution, A/C.1/44/L.36, substantive changes have been made and I would like to explain our position on the text. It has always been our opinion that the reduction of military budgets will not be the result of governmental negotiations on this item, but rather the result of progress in disarmament negotiations. This is correctly expressed in the second preambular paragraph. Therefore, the preambular part of this draft resolution would be acceptable. It is the operative part of the draft resolution that troubles us. Here we find an inconsistency between the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2, which suggests that there will be such negotiations. It is our firm belief that any negotiations on the reduction of military budgets that are to take place require, first, the transparency of those budgets. In the long negotiations in the Disarmament Commission on paragraph 7 of the set of principles annexed to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36 the wording with regard to the necessity of utilizing the standardized United Nations reporting system was never agreed to and in the form in which it is now contained in the annex to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36 it in no way expresses the opinion of my Government. We have always stressed that the use of the United Nations reporting system adopted by the General Assembly in 1980 was an essential first step in providing the transparency necessary for any possible future talks on this item.

As regards operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36, we cannot welcome something that is not agreed on, namely the work of the Disarmament Commission on the identification and elaboration of this set of principles. In operative paragraph 2 it is proposed that this set of principles, which has not been agreed upon, should be brought to the attention of Member States and of the

(Mr. Herzbruch, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

Conference on Disarmament as "useful guidelines for further action in the field of the freezing and reduction of military budgets". The Conference on Disarmament does not negotiate actions on the freezing and the reduction of military budgets, nor does it intend to do so in the near future. We cannot vote in favour of a draft resolution which might be used to introduce this item into the Conference on Disarmament and would thus not leave this decision to the Conference on Disarmament itself.

Nor can we accept guidelines which have not been completed and which therefore do not reflect a common opinion. Regrettably, our efforts to find consensus language were unsuccessful. We share the desire to free the Disarmament Commission of the long negotiations on the set of principles, but we feel that trying to solve problems just by accepting language that is not agreed upon is the wrong approach and that it is not a basis for trustworthy co-operation in the very sensitive field of national security. For all those reasons we shall vote against draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.2, the United States believes it is important to note that in its report to the General Assembly at its current session the Conference on Disarmament agreed by consensus that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament will resume work with a view to resolving the outstanding issues in the near future when conditions were more conducive to progress in that regard. The Conference on Disarmament has indicated that progress on the development of a comprehensive programme of disarmament was not as far advanced as draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.2/Rev.1 would suggest. We regret that the supporters of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.2/Rev.1 deem it appropriate to prejudge any decision

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

the Conference on Disarmament may take in determining when more favourable conditions for further work on a comprehensive programme may come about.

This draft resolution also prejudges the role of the comprehensive programme in the context of the Third Disarmament Decade, especially since the text of a declaration on the objectives of the Third Disarmament Decade has yet to be developed and agreed to. For those reasons the United States regrets that it cannot support this draft resolution as it has done in past years. This is particularly unfortunate as the United States has contributed diligently to the work on a comprehensive programme of disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament. In fact, we were rather surprised that the main sponsor of the draft resolution found it possible to propose a text that was inconsistent with that Committee's recommendations.

I would also like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36, entitled "Reduction of military budgets". For important reasons the United States cannot support this draft resolution. The draft resolution ignores the fact, which is reflected in the report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly, that the text attached to this draft resolution is not an agreed text. Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36 seeks to give validity to that text, which was not agreed upon, by referring it to Member States and to the Conference on Disarmament as containing "useful guidelines for further action". Moreover, according to the text, the Secretary-General is asked to report on the implementation of this draft resolution. The draft resolution represents an unacceptable attempt to circumvent the outcome of the Disarmament Commission's deliberations on the subject of the reduction of military budgets and we must therefore vote against it.

Mr. GEVERS (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36 on the reduction of military budgets.

The Netherlands regrets that this draft resolution does not properly reflect the situation that emerged after the discussions on this subject in the Disarmament Commission. The gist of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36 is that the issue would be temporarily lifted out of the context of the Disarmament Commission and sent to the Conference on Disarmament as guidelines for further action. The guidelines, however, have not yet achieved consensus. Indeed, it was explicitly stated during this year's session of the Commission that the entire text of the principles, which is now annexed to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36, should be subject to further consultations. The principles, which were discussed in the Commission, are not agreed upon as they stand. It is not through avoiding the issue that the difficulties with some of the draft guidelines will disappear.

The text of the draft resolution itself also contains elements on which we do not agree. The reduction of military budgets would not necessarily, by itself, improve international security. It does not appear to be a particularly effective measure of disarmament. What counts more are, for example, military capabilities and their balanced and verifiable reduction. Reductions in military budgets need not affect actual capabilities at all. A third point is the matter of savings. Whether or not reductions in military expenditures will indeed have favourable economic consequences is a matter which needs more careful analysis. The sovereignty of States in deciding how to handle these delicate matters should be fully respected.

Mr. HOULLEZ (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36, entitled "Reduction of military budgets." My country takes an active part in the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission on the principles that should govern further actions of States in the field of the reduction of military budgets. Like other participants, we are forced to note that differences continue to exist with regard to the use of the reporting system for military expenditures and to the freezing of military budgets. In view of the work still to be done in those two fields, my delegation feels, inter alia, that it is premature to refer in a draft resolution to documents on which no consensus yet exists. My delegation will therefore vote against draft resolution L.36.

On the other hand, my delegation is prepared to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.44/Rev.1, "Military budgets", which expresses the conviction that more transparency and comparability of military budgets could be reached with a view to their reduction.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Comprehensive programme of disarmament". The draft resolution is sponsored by the delegation of Mexico and was introduced at the Committee's 27th meeting, on 6 November 1989. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic

Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, 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, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

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

Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.2/Rev.1 was retained by 112 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.2/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, 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, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname,

Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, 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: United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.2/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36, entitled "Reduction of military budgets". The draft resolution has 18 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Romania at the Committee's 27th meeting on 6 November 1989. I call upon the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36 has the following sponsors: Angola, Benin, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Gambia, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Lesotho, Nigeria, Peru, the Philippines, Romania, Suriname and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania,

Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Brazil, Denmark, Egypt, Iceland, India, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Norway, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.36 was adopted by 94 votes to 10, with 18 abstentions.\*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.44/Rev.1, "Military budgets." The draft resolution has 13 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany at the thirty-first meeting of the First Committee on 8 November 1989. I call upon the Secretary to read the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.44/Rev.1 is sponsored by the following delegations: the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Denmark, Gabon, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Turkey and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.44/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

---

\* Subsequently the delegation of Algeria advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mongolia, Mexico, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Cuba, Egypt, India, Iraq, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.44/Rev.1 was adopted by 105 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.\*

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

---

\* Subsequently the delegation of Bahrain advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

Ms. MIEDEMA (Netherlands): I should like to give an explanation of vote on behalf of the delegations of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands on draft resolution L.2/Rev.1.

We were pleased that the Conference on Disarmament agreed this year that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament should review the outstanding issues "when circumstances are more conducive to making progress in this regard".

Indeed, we believe that finalization of the comprehensive programme of disarmament is at this juncture perhaps not the most effective way to achieve the goals we have set ourselves on arms control and disarmament. The direct way of concrete negotiations on a broad range of weapons has proved to be far more promising than the indirect approach of formulating a comprehensive programme.

We note that the draft resolution in L.2/Rev.1, introduced by the delegation of Mexico in view of its 1989 chairmanship of the Conference on Disarmament Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, has deviated from the language agreed upon in the Conference on Disarmament.

We believe that it makes the work of the Committee more complicated when agreed language on this issue, acceptable to all members of the Conference on Disarmament, is modified here for no clear reason.

Although we voted in favour of draft resolution L.2/Rev.1, we wish to place on record the considered view of our delegations that the language agreed upon in the Conference on Disarmament - document A/44/27, page 316 - will constitute the only correct point of departure when the Conference on Disarmament proceeds to review this issue. That is why we could not but abstain on paragraph 1 when it was voted upon separately.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): I wish to explain the negative vote of the United Kingdom on draft resolution L.36, on the reduction of military budgets.

We fully endorse the statement of the Netherlands on this resolution. Multilateral agreements on the freezing or reduction of military budgets are neither practical nor useful measures in the field of disarmament and arms control. Reductions in military spending are to be welcomed if they result in a genuine reduction in offensive capabilities and the elimination of imbalances which give rise to instability.

The debate in the Disarmament Commission and the inability to agree on the principles underlying such measures is evidence that such an approach is inherently flawed.

I should also like to explain our position on draft resolution L.2/Rev.1. Here again we share completely the views just expressed by the delegation of the Netherlands.

Mr. FINAUD (France) (interpretation from French): France voted in favour of draft resolution L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Comprehensive programme of disarmament", because it continues to favour the completion of a comprehensive programme by the Conference on Disarmament. France noted with interest the progress made by the Conference on Disarmament in the study of this matter at its last session, which has made it possible to achieve further clarification of the programme while not yet completing it. The negotiations in Geneva showed that in the opinion of all delegations a pause was needed and that it was possible to achieve a consensus agreeable to all members of the Conference on Disarmament at the time its report to the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly was adopted.

The report points out that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament had also agreed to resume its work with a view to resolving pending

(Mr. Finaud, France)

issues in the near future, when conditions were more conducive to progress being made in this regard.

In light of the specific conditions under which an agreement was reached in Geneva, France feels that, now that several breakthroughs are being made both bilaterally and multilaterally in the field of disarmament, it is inadvisable to rush forward with the comprehensive programme of disarmament, which would tend to set prospects for disarmament in various fields at the same time. We therefore had to abstain on the paragraph which would lead to the resumption of the work of the Ad hoc Committee in 1991.

Mr. REESE (Australia): The Australian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution L.36, entitled "Reduction of military budgets". We did so because we strongly support the principle that military budgets should be frozen and reduced. We also believe in the need for transparency and comparability of military budgets.

Furthermore, Australia can support all of the principles that should govern further actions of States in the field of the freezing and reduction of military budgets as contained in the annex to the draft resolution.

We are also pleased to see one item removed from the agenda of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Nevertheless, we would wish to emphasize our reservations about the manner in which this question has been dealt with. Dealing with unresolved problems in the Disarmament Commission by bringing them to a vote in the First Committee is not, in our view, an appropriate solution. It undermines the spirit of consensus by which the United Nations Disarmament Commission operates, and we would not wish to see this practice extended to other items on its agenda.

(Mr. Reese, Australia)

I should also like to explain our vote in favour of paragraph 1 of draft resolution L.2/Rev.1, on the comprehensive programme of disarmament. In doing so we note that we would have preferred the draft resolution to use the language that the Conference on Disarmament reached by consensus in its 1989 report to the General Assembly. We note further that paragraph 1 calls on the Conference on Disarmament to do something that it does annually in any case - that is, consider all its agenda items, which includes reaching agreement on its draft agenda.

This is an appropriate moment - when voting on the comprehensive programme of disarmament - for Australia to associate itself with those who spoke earlier today honouring the great contribution Ambassador Garcia Robles has made to arms control and disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary to read a communication addressed to the Chairman of the First Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The communication is from Ambassador Edmond Jayasinghe, Deputy Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka, on behalf of the non-aligned members of the Ad hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. It reads as follows:

"The consultations on item 67, 'Implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace', is still in progress and will not be finalized before Friday, 17 November. Therefore we request that the consideration of this item be postponed for a future date."

The CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the request conveyed to the First Committee that consideration of item 67, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", be postponed to a future date, following consultations it is my understanding that the Committee is in agreement with this request and wishes to proceed accordingly.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon we will take up the following draft resolutions: cluster 1, L.8/Rev.1; cluster 7, L.53/Rev.3; cluster 13, L.41/Rev.2 and L.46/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.