



FIRST COMMITTEE  
42th meeting  
held on  
Thursday, 12 November 1987  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 42th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued)

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be submitted to the Secretary-General's Office, Division for Public Information, concerned within one week of the date of publication as the Chief of the Official Record Editing Section, room DC2/502, United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

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

AGENDA ITEMS 48 to 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON **DRAFT** RESOLUTIONS

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

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

I call on representatives who **wish to explain their vote** before **the voting on** draft **resolutions in cluster 1.4**.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

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

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

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

(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

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

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

(The Chairman)

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Yuqoalavia at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November. The sponsors are: Algeria, Sangladeeh, Bulgaria, Burma, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Qhana, India, Indonesia, the Iolamia Republic of Iran, Madagaoaar, Mongolia, Nigeria, Pakietan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afqhrnirtan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Sarhadoe, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Srasil, Brunei Daruesalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Contral Afriaan Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Corta Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuha, Cyprue, Cseohoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominiaan Republic, Eauador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Qhana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Rondurae, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraa, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Ruwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriys, Madagasosr, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Moeambiaue, Nepal, New Zealand, Niaaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippinrr, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swasiland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad end Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republicar, united Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Japan, Norway, Spain

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

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

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

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

A recorded vote was taken.

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

**Against:** None

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

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

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I shall now call upon those delegation8 wishing to explain their vote8 following the voting.

Mr. CHOHAN (Pakistan) : I wish to explain my delegation@ 8 vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.76/Rev.2.

We highly appreciate the concerns that motivated the efforts of the sponsors of this draft resolution to facilitate the procedure8, organization and work of the First Committee, We are in broad agreement with most of the elements outlined in it. We share the desire of Member States to improve the functioning and efficacy of the United Nations bodies dealing with disarmament work. But we are also concerned at the precipitous haste with which this important subject ha8 been addreseed.



(Mr. Chohan, Pakistan)

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

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

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

(Mrs. Gonzalez y **Reynero**, Mexico)

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

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

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

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

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

We note at the **same time that the text has been** amended and a revision was circulated only yesterday . We have **some** reservations about that. We recall that late amendments were **made** in the **same** way to **the** predecessors of this draft resolution. **We** hope that it might **be** possible in **future** for **the sponsor of draft** resolution **A/C. 1/42/L.6** and the sponsors of the current draft resolution to **agree** on a **common** text before **the** introduction of texts **in the** First Committee. **We** believe, never **theless**, as noted, **that this text** overall is an improvement, which we welcome.

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

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Dj Iena, Cameroon)

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

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

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

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

(The Chairman)

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

Mr. RANA (Nepal) : My delegation has hat! extensive informal aoneultationa with other members on draft reeolution A/C.1/42/L.30 with a view to ensuring its adoption by consensus. During the process, alight modifications were agreed upon in operative paragraph 2 of the draft reeolution. The suggested changes are: in line 2, after "the initiative8 and other activities" delete "of" and add "mutually agreed upon by" so the line would read "support for the initiatives and other activities mutually agreed upon by the Member States of the Asian region", and, on line 4, after "appropriate", ahang "reutilization" to "utilization". MY delegation hopes that with those minor ohanqee it will be possible for the Committee to adopt the draft resolution without a vote, as was done in the case of similar resolutions eatabliehing regional centres in Africa and Latin America.

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

(The Chairman)

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

**(The Chairman)**

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

**A recorded vote was taken.**

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

**Against:** **United States of America**

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Granger, United States)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

However, I have to state that another desire which should aid the work of 011 of us has not been met by the merger: the desire for consensus. Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.50/Rev.1 continues the practice of questioning the principle that contributions to the World Disarmament Campaign should be voluntary. Therefore, as on similar draft resolutions in previous years, my delegation has once again had to abstain. We consider it unfortunate that a draft resolution on a cause as worthy as the World Disarmament Campaign should be burdened with non-consensus language that makes it impossible to adopt it unanimously.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

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

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

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

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

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

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



(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(The Chairman)

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

#### **PROGRAMME OF WORK**

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

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

It was so decided.

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

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

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.