

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly

FORTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records

53rd meeting
held on
Thursday, 30 November 1989
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 53rd MEETING

Chairman, Mr. **FAHMY (Egypt)** (Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace

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.53
15 January 1990
ENGLISH

89-63327 5571V (E)

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Fahmy (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 4.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 67

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN AS A ZONE OF PEACE

The CHAIRMAN: The **Committee** will now proceed to take a **decision** On the draft resolution **under** agenda item 67, Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian **Ocean** as a Zone of **Peace**, that is, draft resolution **A/C.1/44/L. 33/Rev.1.**

I call on the Secretary of the Committee **for** an announcement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the First **Committee**) : I would like to inform the **Committee** that Bulgaria and the **German** Democratic Republic have become co-sponsors of draft resolution **A/C.1/44/L. 33/Rev.1.**

The CHAIRMAN: Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on draft resolution **A/C.1/44/L. 33/Rev. 1**, I shall call on those delegations wishing to make **statements** other than in explanation of their vote before the voting.

Mr. PERERA (Sri Lanka) : As you are aware, Sri Lanka was the initiator Of the proposal to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region. Since the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee **in** 1973, Sri Lanka has had the honour *of* **chairing** the Committee, chairing the working group established by the Ad Hoc Committee, and also functioning as co-ordinator of the non-aligned members of the Ad Hoc Committee. This proposal is a very important disarmament measure, in which Sri Lanka has played a pivotal role.

The Movement **of Non-Aligned** Countries as a whole **has** given full support to the proposal for the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, as stated in the declarations of the various summit conferences of the Heads **of** State or **Government** of **non-aligned** countries and at ministerial meetings.

(Mr. Perera, Sri Lanka)

By resolution **34/80 B**, the General Assembly decided that a conference **should** be convened in Colombo in 1981. This has been postponed on several occasions, **with** the result that resolution **43/79** mandated the holding of the Conference in Colombo in 1990. The Government of Sri Lanka, at the request of the Ad Hoc Committee, consequently **confirmed** that the Conference could **be** held in **Colombo** from **2** to **13** July 1990.

During the meetings of **the** Preparatory **Committee**, Sri Lanka actively participated, along with all the Member States, in efforts to **arrive** at a **consensus resolution**. Unfortunately, these efforts proved futile and there **was** no draft resolution recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee to the General **Assembly**. During the period **since** then and until the **First** Committee was apprised of this fact, my delegation spared no effort in attempting to achieve consensus on various **proposals** by the **various** Member States.

As draft resolution **A/C.1/44/L.33**, submitted on behalf **of** the Non-Aligned States, did not appear to be acceptable to certain States members **of** the **Group** of Western European and other States, the non-aligned group, with much reluctance, abandoned the proposal to hold the Conference in **Colombo next year**, purely in order to **arrive** at a **consensus**. In spite of this concession, certain Western States **insisted** that the **sessions** of the Ad Hoc Committee should be reduced in number and duration. It **distresses** me to note that a diminution in the length of the **sessions** can only **minimize** the amount of work done in the Ad Hoc Committee, and that these self-same States which suggest **minimizing** the sessions maintain that they cannot attend the Conference **as** not enough preparatory work has been done.

At **this** stage, it **is** not the intention of **my** delegation to go into the details of the **various** interpretations given by the various members of the Ad Hoc Committee of the working of the Committee and of the **progress** of work on procedural and

(Mr. Perera, Sri Lanka)

substantive **aspects** of the preparatory work. **Nor is** it my intention to engage in debate **on the merits** and demerits of **establishing a zone** of peace in the Indian Ocean region. I **am** constrained, however, to comment on **the** view that **has been expressed that**, in the climate of **super-Power détente**, the Indian **Ocean zone** of peace **has become** an anachronism. **The** view of my delegation **is** that disarmament **is** a **slow**, tedious **process** requiring much patience, and in this context it **seems** **rather** strange that the **spirit** of **co-operation** between the super-Powers does not seem to have extended into the Indian **Ocean** region.

The non-aligned group considers that **the** Meeting of the Littoral **and** Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean in 1979 established two fundamental elements which are a sine qua non of the **proposal**. These are the impact of extraregional **Powers** on the countries of the region **and the region** as a whole and, secondly, intraregional considerations. These considerations have been identified and are the principal elements contained in the report of the Meeting of **the** Littoral and Hinterland States in July 1979. These two elements are equally important - I should say vitally important - in **establishing** the Indian **Ocean** as a zone of **peace**.

In an effort to reach consensus, the non-aligned group agreed to consider a Proposal which emerged at a joint meeting of the non-aligned group and the Group of Western European and other **States**. Unfortunately, it was only at that meeting that the non-aligned States **were** informed that those proposals were not acceptable to a few States members of the Group of Western European and other States.

These protracted negotiations, which unfortunately have failed, are **a** direct result of the violation of the consensus rule - certain Member States have not agreed to attend a conference, in violation of the decision of the General Assembly contained in resolution **43/79**, which **was** adopted by consensus. The proposal contained in the present draft is to conclude the preparatory work **so that a**

(Mr. Perera, Sri Lanka)

conference could be held in 1991. **No** effort has been spared to **meet the concerns** of certain States, and **even** the concessions made by the non-aligned States to that end have been summarily **re jected**. That a vote has to **be** taken is a situation created **by** the inflexibility of the positions taken **by** certain States, and **this** too in the teeth of **numerous** concessions by the non-aligned **group**.

This **is a** matter of intense regret to my delegation. I take this opportunity to thank all the member States, both within the Ad Hoc Committee and **outside it**, which **have** spared no pains to help us, although **unsuccessfully, to arrive at a** compromise text. I would **also** thank all the member States **for** their enthusiastic and unstinted support in **our** endeavour to establish a zone of peace in the Indian **Ocean**.

The **CHAIRMAN**: I call on the representative of Yugoslavia to introduce draft resolution **A/C.1/44/L. 33/Rev. 1**.

Mr. **KOTEVSKI** (Yugoslavia): My delegation **wishes to make** this statement **on** behalf of the group of non-aligned countries.

Since **the submission** of draft resolution **A/C.1/44/L. 33** under agenda item **67**, on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian **Ocean as a Zone of Peace**, **the** group of non-aligned countries has engaged in consultations with the Group of Western European and other States, the Eastern European Group and other States with a view to reaching **consensus** on a draft text. As you are aware, the thrust of the draft resolution is the proposal to convene the Conference in Colombo in **1990**, as decided **by** the General Assembly in its resolution **43/79**.

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

The non-aligned countries attach great importance **to** those proposals, as **they** are **considered** to **constitute** the first stage in the implementation of the **Declaration** of the Indian Ocean **as** a Zone of Peace, adopted in **1971**. **From** the non-aligned point **of** view, the **convening** of the conference is to give further **direction** to the process of implementing the Declaration. By the terms **of** resolution **A/C.1/44/L. 33**, the conference would have been structured in **several** **stages**. **The** proposed 1990 conference at Colombo would have been the first **stage**, at which **a** final document containing the **proposed modalities**, machinery and programme of action for the furtherance of the objectives of the zone of Peace would have been adopted. The conference was also to expected to adopt modalities and a programme of action embodying practical measures for the maintenance *of* the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace in order to **finalize** an international agreement with binding **arrangements**.

However, during consultation with the Group **of** Western European and Other States, the non-aligned countries gathered that **some** **of** the members of that **Group** were not prepared to accept a **conference** with a mandate embodying **those** elements. Therefore, the non-aligned group offered to consider certain amendments to paragraph **5, 6 and 7** of draft resolution **A/C.1/44/L. 33**. Subsequently, the non-aligned group was informed that even with those amendments **some** Member States could not agree to the holding of the conference in Colombo in **1990**, and the suggestion was made that the conference be postponed. Although it was not the desire of the non-aligned countries to postpone the conference as suggested, with a view to securing the co-operation of all members the non-aligned countries were virtually forced to **agree** to a postponement of the Colombo conference.

(Mr. Kotevsk i, Yugoslavia)

Consequent upon their reluctant **agreement** to postpone the conference, the non-aligned countries submitted a further draft resolution, contained in document A/C. 1/44/L. 33/Rev. 1. That draft resolution is aimed **basically** at ensuring the Continuan~~ce~~ of the Ad Hoc Committee and determining *a time frame for the holding of* the Colombo conference. In **order** to secure consensus, the non-aligned **countries** decided that the best **course of** action would be to return to **the** consensus declaim **of** the General **Assembly** as contained in resolution **43/79** of 1988 in formulating the proposala in this regard. Accordingly, draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 33/Rev.1 **suggests** the holding of two preparatory session8 during the first half of **1990**, the first with a duration of one week and the second with a duration of two weeks. The draft text **also** proposes the convening of the conference in Colombo in 1991 in consultation with the host co **untry**.

During consultations with **the Western Group**, the group of non-aligned countries were made to understand that **some members of the Western Group** had difficulties with those two proposals, and with the eighth preambular paragraph **and** paragraph 3 of draft **resolu** tion **A/C. 1/44/L. 33/Rev. 1**. It **was** the firm understanding of the group **of** non-aligned countries that the other **States** Members **would** not have any difficulty with the proposals, **as** they were based on **consensus decisions** contained in resolution **43/79 of** 1988, **to** which all State8 Member8 were party.

The group **of** non-aligned countries attache8 great importance to the element8 contained in the eighth **preambular** paragraph and paragraph 3. **It is** the firm **understanding of** the non-aligned countries that the **continued** military **presence** of the great **Powers** in the Indian Ocean area, conceived in the context of their confrontation, gives urgency to the need to take practical steps **for the early** achievement of the objectivea **of** the Declaration. The non-aligned countries consider that element **as** the genesis of the Declaration **of** the Indian Ocean as a

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

Zone of Peace and therefore of fundamental value. Further, the convening of the conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo is also considered an important step in the implementation of the Declaration.

Drawing on the past experience of the workings of the Ad Hoc Committee, the non-aligned group was of the view that for any meaningful conduct of its work sessions of up to three weeks were necessary. Specifying the date for the holding of the conference is equally important, as the conference itself is an integral part of the implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean. The suggestion of the non-aligned countries to base the present proposals on the General Assembly's consensus resolution of 1988 was made to facilitate reaching consensus this year. It was the firm belief of the non-aligned countries that those proposals would be acceptable to all Member States, particularly those that had difficulties with convening the Colombo conference in 1990. In anticipation of consensus, and to facilitate reaching it, the non-aligned countries made a very large concession in agreeing to postpone the Colombo conference beyond 1990. Unfortunately, even that did not achieve the anticipated result.

The non-aligned countries made every possible effort to reach consensus, and offered to consider any constructive suggestions that would keep their initiative and the proposal to hold the conference alive. They exhausted all possible means to gain consensus on a draft resolution this year. The non-aligned group went to the extent of agreeing to postpone the conference, at the behest of certain States Members that were parties to a consensus decision to hold the conference in Colombo in 1990. Even at this stage it is the hope of the non-aligned countries that the States Members that had difficulties with the proposal contained in draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 33/Rev.1 will join the consensus in the greater interest of keeping the concept alive.

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

On the one hand, certain States take the position that the work of the Ad Hoc Committee should be suspended and that its Chairman should undertake consultations in order to reach agreement on substantive issues. On the other, those self-eame State8 suggest that they cannot agree to the holding of a conference as the preparatory work of the Ad Hoc Committee is incanplete. In that context , the non-aligned countries are inclined to the view that certain States do not have the political will to take the necessary steps to implement the Declaration and are hindering the process.

Some Members argue that in view of the recent developments on the international scene reference to great-Power rivalry has become redundant and therefore that any reference to great-Power confrontation, conceived in that context, is not relevant. The non-aligned group is happy at and encouraged by the developments on the international scene. However, those developments have not been reflected in the Indian Ocean region. Further, it is the firm belief of the non-aligned countries that the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and its implementation remain relevant.

While commenting on the draft resolution, let me also place on record the continued commitment of the non-aligned countries to the elements contained in document A/C. 1/44/L. 33. The position of the non-aligned countries on the substantive work of the first stage of the United Nations conference on the Indian Ocean to be held at Colombo is summarized in paragraph 6 of that document.

As mentioned earlier, the draft resolution now under consideration is seeking only the endorsement of the General Assembly for continuing the machinery that has been working on this important initiative for nearly two decades. With the new-born co-operation between the two super-&were the process of disarmament has been given momentum and strength. This new rapport should encourage rather than

(Mr. Kotevsk i, Yugoslavia)

hinder the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We are thus at a stage when any initiative aimed, at international peace and security should be jealously guarded.

All of us are aware that disarmament is a very complex subject. It is time-onsuming and needs patience. Until the international community is able to create an atmosphere conducive to the realization of the objectives and various initiatives aimed at establishing peace and tranquillity we have to work patiently on them. But for no reason should we work towards the abandonment or destruction of such proposals.

It is in that spirit that on behalf of the non-aligned countries my delegation appeals to every Member State to vote in favour of draft resolution

A/C.1/44/L.33/Rev.1.

Mr. KRASULIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish at the outset to say that the Soviet delegation fully and completely supports draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.33/Rev.1. In that connection, my delegation would like to express its gratitude to the sponsors for the flexibility they have shown and for their desire to take account of the interests of all parties.

However, we note with regret that because of the unconstructive position of just a few States our Committee, for the first time in recent years, is forced to vote in taking a decision on the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Krasulin, USSR)

My delegation considers the proposal of the non-aligned countries contained in draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 33/Rev.1 to be an invitation to an all-encompassing constructive discussion of the problems of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. Like the majority of the States that are members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, we note with satisfaction that, this year, a significant amount of work was accomplished, including discussion of substantive questions related to the implementation of its mandate for preparing for the Colombo Conference.

Today, however, we have once again, unfortunately, to postpone the convening of this important meeting. But this decision can also be seen as an attempt to find a compromise and as a desire to take into account the interests of all countries.

It is our hope that the new deadline for convening the Conference will make it possible for the Ad Hoc Committee to solve the specific and multifaceted aspects of the substantive questions and to succeed in finding a way to balance the interests of all groups of member States represented in the Committee. The solution of the Problem of the Indian Ocean - as experience has shown in the solution of complicated international situations - can be achieved only through political means.

The USSR in devoting much attention to the problem of establishing the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, and actively and consistently advocates the early achievement of the goals of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, which was adopted by the General Assembly in 1971.

The policy of the Soviet Union with a view to ensuring security in that region depends on specific measures to reduce tension and increase confidence. As is known, the restructuring of the Soviet Union's military policy towards sufficiency defence has, in practical terms, already, received a good response in the East and West and especially in the Asian region, including the Indian Ocean. While

(Mr. Krasul in, USSR)

advocating equal **security** for all without **exception**, we are none the less also definitely opposed to having **the Indian Ocean region become** the battleground for anybody's hegemony. These considerations will guide the Soviet Union in **considering** this question, **both** in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and in **other international bodies.**

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting. I should like to remind delegations that sponsors of draft resolutions may not explain their vote, either before or after the voting.

Mr. SNOOK (United States of America): We have found it necessary to vote against this draft resolution for a number of reasons.

First, it continues to be based on the obsolete notion of great-power confrontation in this age of increased great-power co-operation in helping diffuse conflicts.

Secondly, it calls for continuation of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee without any common conception of what the Committee is to accomplish. At the Committee's summer session, the non-aligned members expressed the view that the work of the Ad Hoc Committee was substantially completed.

A number of Western delegations, including my own, noted that we would not attend a conference where there was no prior agreement on an agenda. Our delegations also suggested that a more productive way of overcoming differences would be to continue deliberations through consultation under the Chairman's authority. That proposal was presented as an honest effort to find some new means to end the long deadlock over this issue. When it was rejected, Western delegations presented three separate proposals designed to find a compromise in which the interests of all sides would be protected. I regret that each of those compromises was rejected.

(Mr. Snook, United States)

Moreover, the United States believes that there is no point in continually calling for, and setting a date for, a conference that no one expects to be held and that everyone anticipates will be put off yet another year when the issue is next discussed.

It is time for those who have been pressing the issue of the Indian Ocean zone of peace to address the real problems of their region and not to invoke an obsolete concept that conveniently casts the blame for those problems on outsiders. The military presence of the United States in the Indian Ocean is not the cause of those problems. The United States has a cooperative relationship with the overwhelming majority of the States in the region and desires to continue and expand those relationships in the future. The United States will not, however, associate itself with the type of conference provided for in the draft resolution or with the preparatory work for it. We believe that the considerable monies to be expended for the Conference could be much better spent in meeting the human needs of the peoples of the region. It also goes without saying that the United States will not consider itself bound by any declarations or decisions coming from such a conference.

Finally, we note that much has been said in the Committee about changes taking place in the world. There has been a noticeable trend away from confrontation towards co-operative approaches to the solution of problems. This draft resolution, regrettably, does not reflect that spirit of co-operation. Instead, it is frozen in time. It makes no allowance for the efforts of many States, including my own, to make this a more peaceful world for ourselves and for our children.

Mr. HUM (United Kingdom) : My delegation will vote against the draft resolution contained in document h/C. 1/44/t. 33/Rev. 1.

A **considerable** history **lies** behind this decision. My Government **decided** to join the **Ad Hoc** Committee **on the** Indian Ocean in 1980 in line with **its** support **for** **zones** of peace whenever they **meet the** interests of all **parties** concerned and **relevant** international **agreements**. We **are** painfully aware **of the numerous** tensions **and** conflicts to which various parts of the Indian **Ocean** region **are subject**. An examination of **these problems** reveals a variety of **sources**. **Since joining** the **Committee** we **have** consistently **sought** to **establish an agreed basis** from which, with appropriate assistance **from others**, the countries of the Indian **Ocean** might work to promote **peace and** stability in the region. From the **outset** we **have made it clear** that we do not believe that the 1971 **Declaration** on the Indian **Ocean as a** Zone Of **Peace provides** such a basis **since**, in our view, **some** of the **steps** that it recommends would tend **to increase**, rather than **reduce**, **instability** in the region*

A case in point is **the** question of the military **presence** of the **great Powers** in the region, referred **to** in the eighth **preambular** paragraph *of* the **draft resolution** before **us**. We cannot subscribe to the view that this **is at the root of** the **region's** problems. Further, in the light **of** the dramatic developments in **international** relations witnessed in recent **years**, the **very** language **of** this paragraph appears **outmoded**.

(Mr. Hum, United Kingdom)

We believe that **to focus on this aspect is to shirk the rigorous analysis of the region's real problems that will be necessary if they are to be addressed.**

For the past five months, we have engaged in extensive negotiations with a view to reconciling the differences that exist between members of the Ad Hoc Committee. We have done all we can to help establish a basis on which we might continue useful work in the Committee. We are grateful to all concerned in this process. We must regret, however, that it has not been possible to accommodate our views. In the light of this, my delegation has to announce that we do not consider that our continued participation in the process set out in the draft resolution would be justified.

Mr. STEFANINI (France) (interpretation from French) : The French delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.33/Rev.1 for the following reasons.

France has on many occasions had the opportunity of presenting its position, both within the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and in informal consultations with the sponsor of the draft resolution. France could not accept that a conference should be held in Colombo under the auspices of the United Nations to implement a Declaration to which many States have not subscribed and under conditions which do not enjoy the consensus of the members of the Ad Hoc Committee. Moreover, unlike the sponsor of this draft, France holds the view that it would be inappropriate to place the emphasis, among the alleged external causes of the instability in the region, solely on foreign military presences from outside the region, while the causes of the instability proper to the region itself seem to have been concealed.

(Mr. Stefanini, France)

France regrets that its position, one it shares with other Western countries, was not taken into consideration by the authors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.33/Rev.1 and that the sustained efforts by a number of delegations did not result in a satisfactory compromise.

Under these conditions, France will not take part in a conference held at Colombo in the absence of a consensus on convening it or on its terms of reference, and will not consider itself bound by any declaration to which it has not expressly subscribed. France therefore no longer sees any benefit to be derived from taking part in the preparatory work for the Conference within the Ad Hoc Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.33/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". The draft resolution was introduced this afternoon by the representative of Yugoslavia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations which are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries; in addition, it is co-sponsored by Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic. A statement by the Secretary of the Committee concerning the programme budget implications of this draft resolution has now been prepared, and I call on him to read it to you.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.33/Rev.1, I would like to make the following statement on behalf of the Secretariat. The draft resolution is entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

Should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, the Secretary-General would undertake the necessary preparations for the servicing of two sessions of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in 1990 in New York for completion of the

(Mr. Kheradi)

remaining preparatory work relating to the Conference on the Indian Ocean to enable the convening of the Conference at Colombo in 1991 in consultation with the host country. As indicated in paragraph 5 of document A/C.1/44/L. 66, section 2A of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1990-1991 includes provision for the work of the Ad Hoc Committee and, consequently, no modification would be required in the proposed programme of work for 1990-1991 were the General Assembly to adopt the draft resolution, and no additional appropriation would be required under section 2A of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1990-1991.

Sufficient time has not been allowed to estimate the full conference servicing costs of the two sessions of the Ad Hoc Committee referred to in paragraph 7 of document A/C.1/44/L. 33/Rev. 1. As indicated in paragraph 29.5 of the proposed programme budget, however, the level of resources for temporary assistance for meetings in 1990-1991 was estimated on the basis of previous experience to accommodate not only meetings which are programmed, but also additional meetings. In other words, provision was made in the proposed programme budget not only for meetings known at the time of budget preparation, but also for meetings that would be authorized subsequently, provided that the number and distribution of meetings and conferences in the biennium 1990-1991 is consistent with the pattern of meetings in past years. On that basis, it is estimated that no additional resources would be required under section 29 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1990-1991 as a result of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 33/Rev. 1.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 33/Rev. 1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, **Au**etr ia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Caehoelovak ia, Democra tic Yemen, Ecuador , Egypt , Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, 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, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Luaia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, 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 , Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, **United States of America**

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of , Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 33/Rev.1 was adopted by 112 votes to 4, with 14 abstentions.

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

Mr. KAWAKAMI (Japan) : I should like to explain my delegation's vote on the resolution on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace contained in document A/C.1/44/L.33/Rev.1.

Japan joined the Sincep Committee when it was established in 1973. then, it has been contributing to the work of the Committee, searching for a consensus on the issue of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. While the Government of Japan supports in principle the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean, it is firmly of the view that there should be a prior harmonization of views among the countries concerned, particularly on the basic substantive issues. Thus, it is deeply disturbed by the move to convene the Conference next year without having gained a harmonization of views.

(Mr. Kawakami, Japan)

Japan is concerned **also about** the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. We very **much** regret that **a** proposal put forward by some of the Western **members of the Ad Hoc Committee** was rejected without **serious** consideration of **its constructive aims**.

We appreciate the vigorous efforts made by **various** delegations to reach a **consensus** on **this** year's draft resolution. Regrettably, however, **those efforts** have not borne fruit and the draft resolution cannot be considered as an attempt to bridge the differences in **views** or to resolve **problems**. Japan therefore had no choice but to vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. ALPMAN (Turkey) : My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 33/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", which the Committee **has just** adopted=

We regret that we **were** unable to vote in favour of **the** draft resolution although we agree with **its** broader **objectives** and **have** traditionally joined **the consensus** which had established itself around the **corresponding** resolution in previous years.

We abstained this year because the members **of** the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean - which are the **parties** directly concerned - *were* unable to reach **an** agreement that would **allow** the adoption of the draft resolution by **consensus**. We hope that the existing differences will be overcome in the future **so** that we **will** be able to return to the practice **of** adopting this draft resolution **by** consensus.

Mr. VIQUEIRA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish) : My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 33/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of **Peace**", which **has** just been adopted by the Committee.

(Mr. Viqueira, Spain)

Al though my country is not a member of the Ad Hoc Commi t tee on the Indian Ocean we **have** traditionally supported the consensus on resolutions of this kind. We do of course continue to support the general objectives of the Declaration of the Indian **Ocean as a Zone of Peace**.

Nevertheless, this year it was not possible even **for** the members of the Ad Hoc Committee to achieve a broad enough **degree** of agreement to support the **adoption** of draft resolution **A/C.1/44/L. 33/Rev.1** without **a vote**. Given **the fact that my** country is not a **member** of the Ad Hoc Committee, it preferred to abstain, hoping that a consensus would be restored on this **important question** at the next session **of** the General Assembly .

Ms. COURTNEY (Australia) : Australia voted in favour **of** draft resolution **A/C. 1/L. 33/Rev.1**, which deals with the question of the establishment of **a zone of peace** in the Indian **Ocean**.

As a littoral **State** of the region, Australia is **f i** rmly **committed** to the achievement of the objectives of the proposal concerning **the** Indian Ocean as a **zone** of peace. It is for this reason that Australia has consistently **supported the** convening of the Conference in Colombo, which would in our view **assist the process** of attaining such a goal. Australia expresses its **regret that our** position on this issue was not shared by all members of the Ad Hoc Committee **on** the Indian **Ocean**. We are particularly concerned that the absence of **consensus on** this issue has resulted in some States deciding that they may no longer see value in participating in the preparatory process.

It **is** quite clear that if negotiations on this issue are to be meaningful they will require the participation of all relevant States on the basis of **consensus**.

(Ms. Courtney, Australia)

As a country which, along with many others, participated actively in the extensive efforts to continue to maintain consensus on this issue, Australia has to express its dissatisfaction with this final outcome. Australia considers that the negotiating process is marked by a certain inability of States to focus on their common concerns - rather it highlighted their differences.

We do not understand the argument of those who say, for example, that the Conference in Colombo is not timely because the preparations have not been completed, and then call for a re-examination of the viability of the Ad Hoc Committee preparatory process.

Equally, we do not understand why States should insist on the inclusion of the references in a preambular paragraph which, by consensus, were omitted only two years ago and which, in the light of international developments, are even less relevant today. We ask: Should the Ad Hoc Committee process be lost for the sake of a preambular paragraph? For us this throws question on the possibilities of meaningful progress on this issue.

In spite of the disappointing outcome on this draft resolution this year, Australia remains committed to pursuing avenues to reach agreement on the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We would hope that those countries with serious differences on these issues would look again at ways to bridge those differences in order to achieve the goal which we all do seem to share - that is, the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

Mr. STEPHANOU (Greece): I should like to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.33/Rev.1.

Greece abstained because we saw with regret that negotiations on producing a consensus text had failed. We also believe that the work of the Ad Hoc Committee could and should continue next year and that participation in the process of implementation of the Declaration should not be impeded. Our abstention should therefore not be viewed as withdrawal from the Ad Hoc Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to conference room paper A/C.1/44/CRP.1, dated 28 November 1989, which provides a summary of programme budget implications for the biennium 1990-1991 resulting from draft resolutions or draft decisions adopted by the First Committee during the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly. This paper has been submitted in accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. As indicated in the footnote on page 1, additional information will be issued in an addendum to it, as necessary.

Mr. ENCO (Cameroon), I wish first of all to express **sincere condolences** at the untimely death of the **President** of our **sister** country, **Comoros**. Our young **countries** need all our **citizens** of such **expertise** and **experience**. We can only hope that our **fraternal** peoples will find **peace**, security and development in the **difficult** times ahead.

We wish also to seize this opportunity to pay tribute to the **contribution** of a noble Latin American, **Ambassador** and **agent** for international **concord**, Alfonso **Garcia Robles**. He has reminded us of the reality that we must exploit the presence of **great** men while we can. We speak as **individuals** who have gained a great deal from his **wisdom**, and even profited from debate on issues on which our schools of thought **have** been dissimilar at **times**. Disagreeing with him has **proved** to give a greater reward in knowledge - **sometimes more** than merely taking **lessons** from his **inspiring** statements. The virtue of this great man **lies** in the **serenity** with which he addresses **issues** as well as responds to views that conflict with **his**. It is amazing how **highly** he has always rated the **common good**.

His life has been given in public service, not **only** to his country but also to the international community. Like many of us from the developing **countries** he had his professional education in the institutions of higher **learning** away from his country, Mexico. In the process we are schooled in the history and the thinking of others, especially those who **have** so far played an active role in dictating the **course** of history. This is a **befitting** background to enable so-called third world countries to understand the world in which they live. It gives us a special advantage because we know the totality of the world - the rich, the **poor**, the small, the big, the **great** and the not-so-great. Others are too **patronizing** at times to care about the ideas we have.

Ambassador Garcia Robles symbolizes the **truth** that peoples of the less-developed **countries** of the world are **capable** of making an **equal** contribution

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

to global dialogue on any aspect of domestic and international life. He is outstanding, but there are many in his club whose lives have given living proof of this.

We thank him for his dedication and his statesmanship, which provide light and inspiration to our younger generations, to which some of us still belong. While life continues in the human body, we want him to know that he remains a human reference library. We wish him continued health and contentment in his retirement from active service.

We wish to thank the Committee for providing this opportunity for us to express some thoughts about aspects of our work here.

The international community is at a critical phase in the life of an Organization it established in a decisive step to encourage collectivity in the management of various facets of the global crisis. This period in the life of the United Nations calls for profound reflection and a level of stock-taking that focuses on the adjustment of our individual visions of the future to the norms and principles of its Charter.

If we are truly to save our generation and future generations from the scourge of war, we must endeavour to remove from our national policies and international relations those ambitions and situations which in the past created conditions of conflict. History does repeat itself, but only when we feed into its process the same conditions that lead inevitably to an undesirable result.

We are too enlightened a generation to permit disastrous repetition. The fact that the two super-Powers are undertaking, in the weekend ahead, to promote mutual understanding and to seek new avenues for peaceful coexistence in a troubled world is in itself evidence of our growing maturity. The success of that effort must undoubtedly constitute the prayers and highest aspirations of the rest of mankind.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

The endeavours of this Committee are an important preliminary step to identifying the views of States large and small on the path we must tread. It is our considered view, however, that these evaluations and the conclusions we reach must engage the universal search for a new international order - an order of peace, security and development in the political, economic and social fields.

The central theme in that search remains the most effective response that this generation must give to the discord and conflict which ceaselessly tease the human intellect and mock our collective incapacities, especially in meeting the challenge of building durable fortresses of peace.

The times call for a demonstrative revival of faith in ourselves, faith in the lofty aspirations which we share in declaring adherence to the United Nations Charter, and faith in the institutions we have established as powerful machinery for their fulfilment.

We cannot expect to achieve our goals if we permit an undesirable gap to deepen and widen between a virtual theological declaration of faith and acts of States taken either in purported pursuit of, or in contradiction of, the precepts of that faith. It is equally important that we do not undertake actions which are inconsistent with the drive for confidence-building among States or which provide an excuse for others mischievously to grab at inconsistencies.

An occasion like this tends to bait instincts for condemnation and the apportionment of blame for the misgivings and failures that continue to haunt our efforts. My delegation strongly believes that such temptation must be resisted at a time when the value of negotiated solutions far outweighs the dubious gratifications of confrontation and unilateral actions.

Through a fruitful exchange of views, it would be possible to exploit the going international atmosphere of détente, however qualified or illusory it may

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

seem. It is more constructive to find new and productive ways of meeting the complex challenge of our time.

We live in troubled times, as the current report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization reminds us. That thought has been expressed almost routinely, to such an extent that it is now assuming the character of a cliché. The problem with clichés is that they have a tendency to submerge the verities expressed, most of which relate to serious matters.

We all seem to approach the twenty-first century convinced that we are at the threshold of a new era in history, as if the year 2,000 represents a cut-off date for change.

History is a continuous process. The present was yesterday's future and we constitute the past of tomorrow. It is out of events that landmark in history are made) events that bring significant change, for good or for bad.

We who have witnessed the twentieth century shall be judged by the contribution we make towards changing the unhappy pattern of things that are; change induced by our pursuit of the ideals and norms universally held, by the scope of our unwillingness or willingness and determination courageously to subscribe to an edict of prohibition against all manifestations of conflict and belatedness.

From that perspective, there could be no new era unless we decided to create it. The two super-Powers, for instance, are inducing an epoch-making era in their mutual relations and, hopefully, for mankind as a whole.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

With the current events around **the globe**, a new age may well be with **us**. It need not **be marked** with **the** festivities **and** other traditional **commemorations** of a new millennium. The **year** 2000 will probably **see the dénouement** of the **dram** of **man's** growing-pains, with his recognition of **his** limitations. **The constraint** of bewildering **conditions** and **facts, some** unknown to **previous history**, the perplexity of new forms of relationships **between** man and nature in the **universe**, between people of diverse cultures, **each** seeking dignity, **each** with a variety of **tastes**, hopes, attitudes and **frustrations**; **those things, among** others, **will** become clearer, **impelling serious** reflection, **because** they will **be the factors that** determine the friendly **or** unfriendly nature of relations **among States** in the future. They will **also** condition all **approaches** to the maintenance of **international** peace, **security** and development.

The ultimate **test** may well lie in the extent to **which the** universal **ideals** **enshrined** in the **Charter** of the United Nations are matched by political will on **all sides** to realize **those** ideals. **Our fortunes** are linked by a **chemistry** that **should** inspire **co-operation** among people and among **States**, given the grave **imbalances and** shared threats to our survival.

Is it not regrettable **that**, for **us**, unity of thought and action **must** await the **horrors** of warfare - horrors to which the **pestilence of natural disasters** contribute? Will not historians mock **our blindness** to the better **alternatives** to war **and** conflict, **matters** adequately addressed by the United Nations Charter?

Man **has** always **recognized** the need for a social environment or a **community** with reasonable guarantees of **safety**, peace and progress. The collective **security** incorporated into the defence **mechanisms** of **such an** environment **was much stronger** and more **effective** against dangers than anything individual enterprise could

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

muster. The truth remains the same today. Yet it would appear that at the foundation of man's greatest dilemma has been a deep-rooted sense of resistance to the adjustments called for by the organisation of such human communities.

It would seem that at critical moments some of the rich and powerful nations of modern times embrace the same false sense of security and isolationist thinking that prehistoric man adopted in resisting the evolution of societies. The need for confidence-building continues to be strong, and so also is the imperative of actively seeking measures to enhance friendly relations. The common craving for a viable and stable international community must have as a central aim to unite the strengths of all States and encourage their participation in the development of consensus.

Times have changed, and so must our perception of the nature of the task of building a new world, a world in which conditions of peace and security decisively banish conflict in all its manifestations. We must deliberately lubricate the machinery of dialogue, concertation and action to enhance the prospects of constructive approaches to international relations, to understand the nature of our interdependence, to comprehend the realities of our common exposure to the threats attendant upon our times.

We must also recondition the machinery for realizing our declared wishes and decisions. That calls for inspirational leadership, not fortuitous manoeuvring.

For the generation that have come through this dying century, the dominant malaise has been their encounter with the devastation of wasteful conflicts: conflict in terms of armed aggression, economic injustice and social deprivation. There is some evidence of a crisis of intellectual organization revealing an incapacity to work out a collective strategy and priorities to meet the exigencies of the time.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Written history has named very few leaders in its records. Powerful men and States there have been, but most could not be categorized as leaders because they were persuaded by ambition to engage in geopolitics, testing various strategies to expand jurisdiction. That process involved the subjugation of others and the brutal imposition of the conquerors' culture and aspirations.

History has abundant evidence of successes and failures following a steady pattern: the process of the rise and fall of nations that did not employ their acquired power to enhance the common good of man on this planet. That unnecessary process will endure so long as attitudes remain unchanged towards neighbours, and thanks to technology, all States are now neighbours.

Mediaeval Europeans employed religion and culture, normally facets of inspired cultivation and human refinement, to engage in geopolitics. They undertook crusades and military adventurism, seeking expansion and the consequent guaranteed access to assets and wealth beyond their borders.

The adversary relationship inherited from the conflicts and chaotic political environment of Europe's middle ages must today give up its arrogance and gaudy banner. One would have thought that time and experience had tamed the appetite of modern man for that relationship. Somehow, succeeding generations have developed with increasing sophistication various strategies to redefine and establish new forms of expansionism in the areas of power, control and economics.

In our time, the changing societal organisation has an increased resistance to expansionism. In our view that truth is essential, the construction of conditions guaranteeing international peace and security requires bricks of the true knowledge of the myths and realities of our contemporary world.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Two major power blocs in a military aristocracy have seen two frightening wars. The message was clear: the devastation of open conflict was increasingly becoming too ghastly to permit survival for the vanquished or for the victors. The difficult negotiations among the allies in the Second World War over the plight of a defeated Germany showed that interdependence and stability demanded the protection of the wounded economy of the vanquished.

It is that spirit of pragmatism that the world needs today in the pursuit of a new world order. We need the rise of all nations, not the fall of any. No nation is too big, too powerful, too small or too poor to have a critical stake in a level of development that enhances international peace and security. The role of every State is important because each must have a say in the organization of global peace is to be placed on sound foundations. Knowledge is universal, and no privilege of size, wealth or power is a precondition for its acquisition.

The peoples of the young and poor countries of today are victims of circumstance, groomed in the knowledge and experience of induced economic calamity and a menacing isolation from the mainstream of global decision-making. They know too well the world in which they barely exist, its horrors as well as its potentials. Adversity trains them for painful economic and social adjustments, enlarges the range of their understanding of real life-and-death issues and, with time, strengthens their capacity for contributing to global peace and security.

We think this may well be the most opportune moment to launch a new enterprise for peace. We have no precedent to look back to. We must engage the future in a spirit of accommodation. The past was polluted by mistrust and the preparedness for war.

(Mr. Enqo, Cameroon)

With the easing of tensions between the East and the West, sober reflections on both sides may yet reveal that, in reality, the lines of political confrontation between these powerful military blocs may not have coincided with the ideological postulates. **Suspicion** sought some foundation after **the** break of a temporary marriage induced by **war**. To **the** non-aligned onlooker, it would appear that they thoroughly despised one another's advantage or disadvantage in **the** post-war struggle. Impartial historians in future may reach the conclusion that both sides entered the learning process of **recognizing** that the assets and wealth sought beyond their **spheres** of influence may well have been little more than **mirages**.

Let us hope that the recent joint statement of the Soviet Union and the **United States**, declaring a resolve to inaugurate a new beginning in the **United Nations**, is born of such **understanding** of the brotherhood that can lead to enlightened construction instead of barbaric destruction. We must encourage **them** in that **noble** move. We can **now** dare to look forward to a meeting of two great leaders, in whose joint hands may now lie **the** power to make or to mar **the blueprints** of a new, environmentally safer and prosperous world.

We are also encouraged to hope that the example set by Presidents Bush and **Gorbachev** will influence international relations everywhere. The instrument of the multilateral process should benefit from the simple attitude of former adversaries to bridge gaps of misunderstanding. Miscalculations arise from ignorance and mistrust .

Greatness **does** not lie in the vain exhibition of **strength**; it is found in **the** capacity to abandon pride and rhetoric in the pursuit of genuine human and international understanding.

Our President, Paul **Biya**, has often reiterated the conviction that nothing **is**

(Mr. Enqo, Cameroon)

unattainable in human progress at this period, if the two **super-Powers** undertake to co-operate in its attainment. Current events justify that thought. May we dare to hope that all Powers, great and small, will share in practice the corollary that **in** the domain of peace, security and development, including environmental **safety**, nothing is beyond the grasp of a unity of effort on the part **of** States, inspired by the **common** good.

We have spoken at such length merely to show that the human element **is** critical in our time.

For the leadership given by the Chairman and **you**, Sir, and the other **officers** of the Committee to the Committee's work during the current session, and for your generous patience, we thank you.

The CHAIRMAN; The Committee has thus completed its work on all the agenda **1** terns, including those considered today - items 67 and **72**.

It has been the tradition that at this **stage** the Chair makes a statement. However, it is clear to me, looking at their eyes, that all the members of the **Committee** are exhausted, and I shall not do that. **More** seriously, **our** Chairman yesterday made a very eloquent statement, in which he **gave** a very **good summary of** what we have done and thanked everybody here and everybody **sitting** behind the officers of the Committee. There are many behind us and behind the **scenes** who have contributed **tremendously** to our work.

I should like simply, first, to ask our **colleague** from Venezuela **to** convey **at** least my tribute to Ambassador **Taylhardat** for chairing the Committee this year. It **was** a pleasure, as usual, to work with him. I am sure that he will be prosperous in **his** new assignments.

I shall not say much more, but I want to thank the other officers of the Committee, Mr. Mashhadi and **Mr. Platis**, who have co-operated with me in these

(The Chairman)

proceedings, the members of the Secretariat, and the interpreters, who have to cope with our mumbles and the very fast pace of some of our statements, particularly my own. Finally, I want to thank all the members of the Committee for being so cooperative and making this experience such an enjoyable one. If I have any regret, it is only that the session has been short; I am just beginning to enjoy it. But everything has to end.

I have a short list of speakers. If I may use the prerogative of the Chair one last time, I request them all to be brief.

Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): On behalf of Mr. Hassan Mashhadi, the other Vice-Chairman, who, because of circumstances beyond his control, left New York last week, I should like to read the following statement:

"It was a pleasure and an honour for me to be Vice-Chairman of the First Committee. The atmosphere in our Political and Security Committee, engaged in dialogue on questions dealing with disarmament, the strengthening of international security and problems concerning Antarctica, today can hardly be recognized as compared with a few years ago. This is indeed a reflection of dedicated effort on the part of members of this Committee and the improved international atmosphere. However, one should not lose sight of the fact that the international community is still facing an underlying challenge.

"Our eloquent words in favour of peace and an improved international atmosphere and co-operation expressed in the course of our deliberations can be effectively translated into practical deeds in the quest for security at lower levels of armaments.

"we are still witnessing the excesses of selective multilateralism in the main disarmament forums and repetition of the same agenda items and resolutions with only slight changes. We are of the view that it is time to

(Mr. Moradi, Islamic)
Republic of Iran

reflect seriously on the realities that are shaping international relations on the eve of our entering the last decade of the twentieth century, a century of war, peace and progress, with characteristic features of its own in every aspect.

"I could not conclude my statement as Vice-Chairman without a sincere and warm expression of thanks to those individuals who have been particularly close to me over the past few weeks. First, I should like to express my deep appreciation to the Chairman of the First Committee, Ambassador Taylhardat of Venezuela, for the creative work and efficient manner in which he guided the First Committee this year. It was also a pleasure for me to have the co-operation of Mt. Fahmy of Egypt and Mr. Platis of Greece, the Committee's Rapporteur. My thanks are also due to Mr. Akashi, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, and Mr. Vasiliy Safronchuk, Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, for the support and encouragement that they have rendered to the Committee by their presence. I am also grateful to Mr. Sohrab Kheradi, the Committee's efficient and competent Secretary, whose Particular qualifications have been a great contribution to my work, and Mr. Mohammad Sattar, the Committee's Assistant Secretary.

"In conclusion, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf I wish Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico health and success in his future activities. He was, and will continue to be remembered as, the landmark of disarmament forums and a great pioneer of peace."

Mr. KOLANE (Lesotho): In view of what you have said, Mr. Chairman, I shall be brief - and not very fast. As the Committee's deliberations come to an end, it is fitting and proper for me, speaking on behalf of the African Group, to

(Mr. Kolane, Lesotho)

congratulate the Chairman on the diligent and professional manner in which he has conducted the Committee's work. His deep appreciation of the difficult issues dealt with in the Committee and his wisdom in bringing together divergent positions held by various groups and delegations are indicative of his experience and therefore his well deserved choice as our Chairman.

(Mt. Kolane, Lesotho)

We also extend our sincere thanks for, and appreciation of, the indispensable work done by the officers who served the Committee, the interpreters and all the members of the Secretariat who, behind the scenes, facilitated its work. We understand and appreciate the fact that without their help and dedication we could not have achieved what we have achieved, and certainly could not have done so within the time allotted to us.

The African Group appreciates the Committee's unanimous endorsement of the draft resolution on the dumping of radioactive wastes, but notes that consensus on the denuclearization of Africa still eludes the Committee. However, we urge delegations to engage in follow-up on these draft resolutions so that they may be adopted by the General Assembly. They are of paramount importance to Africa, and that is why I have singled them out for special attention.

We also have to air Africa's concern about the assistance that South Africa continues to receive towards acquiring a nuclear capability. This is contrary to decisions of the United Nations and of the Organization of African Unity, which have determined that such acquisition would endanger the peace and security of Africa.

We hope that the current overall political climate will continue and that the ongoing dialogue between the super-Powers will result in the establishment of new trends in international relations. Africa continues to associate itself with, and to pledge its allegiance to, the United Nations in this Organization's noble endeavours to deal with issues affecting international peace and security.

Mr. LEHNE (Norway) : It is my privilege, on behalf of my colleagues in the Group of Western European and Other States, to express warmest appreciation to the Chairman of the First Committee for the way in which he has conducted the Committee's affairs during this session. That applies to you also, Sir. The

(Mr. Lehne, Norway)

Chairman's extensive diplomatic skills, combined with **his** efficiency, laid the foundation for the good atmosphere that we have experienced during **our del iberations** throughout the **session, which has** been very effective.

I want **also** to extend **our warmest** thanks to the other **officers** of the **bmmittee** - the other Vice-Chairman, Mr. Hansen Maehhadi **of** the Ialamia Republic of Iran, and the **Rapporteur, Mr. Dimitrioa Platis** of Greece - who, together with **the** Secretary **of** the Committee and **his colleagues**, have contributed **to** the **smoothness** of **our** work,

Mr. DOLEJS (Czechoslovak ia): An **co-ordinator** of the Eaatsrn European Group, I wish to congratulate the Chairman of the **First** Committee on the **successful conclusion** of **its** work at the forty-fourth **session** of the General **Assembly. We** **apprec ia** ta his **sk ilf ul guidance**, which helped **us** to overcome a number of difficultlea in our **work. In** general, we **are satisfied** with this **year's results. These results** prove that the process of disarmament continuea to be one of the priorities of the international community, and they **demonstrate** that **multilateral, bilateral and regional** approaches to **disarmament** complement **each other. We should** all **work to** make this a permanent reality. **Nuclear** and conventional disarmament were high on our agenda. At the **same time**, other **questions, such as** that of a convention on military budgets, **science and technology** and its impact, and confidence-building **measures** proved to be very important **aspects** of the **process.**

Our **aim** continues to be **a** nuclear-weapon-free world, increased security **based** on decreased levels of armaments, and defensive **military** concepts. We **are sure** that the next **summit** meeting between the Soviet Union and the **United** States, to be held in **a few days time**, will contribute further to the solution of **some of** these **questions. As** is evident, security **has a number** of aspects, **which must be** addressed adequately.

(Mr. Dolejs, Czechoslovakia)

Finally, I want to thank the Chairman again for his professional guidance. I want to thank also the Vice-Chairmen, who discharged their functions with skill, the Rapporteur and all the other officers of the Committee, the interpreters and all the other members of the Secretariat staff, without whose work the Committee could not have functioned properly-

Mr. SUXOI (Brunei Darussalam): As Chairman of the Asian Group for this month, I have the privilege of expressing the Group's gratitude for the excellence of the chairmanship of the First Committee. The diplomatic skill, well of experience, patience and deep understanding of the issues that the Chairman and both Vice-Chairmen brought to the Committee have enabled us to conclude our work successfully. We are gratified that, under such able chairmanship, the spirit of conciliation and accommodation that characterized our meetings at the beginning of the session continued to the end, thereby contributing to the adoption of many draft resolutions by consensus. When we came to draft resolutions that had to be voted upon we managed, owing to the ability and guidance of those who occupied the Chair, to avoid entering into a world of polemics and semantics. Instead, we concentrated on the matters at hand.

The Asian Group is gratified that the work of the First Committee was completed against the backdrop of a general improvement in the relations between the two super-Powers. The summit between the Soviet Union and the United States, to be held within the next few days, holds great promise for the future. There is hope of a further improvement in relations, not only between those two countries but also globally. This augurs well for the development of a consciousness that there is but one world and that, therefore, it is the collective responsibility of all of us to ensure its continued existence by removing the scourge of war.

(Mr. Suyoi, Brunei Darussalam)

I want, in conclusion, to express our sincere appreciation to the other officers of the Committee and to the Conference Services staff, including the translators, who have been very co-operative all along, and without whose assistance our task would have been difficult.

Mr. AL-SABAH (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): On behalf of the Arab Group, which Kuwait is privileged to chair, I wish, at the end of our work for this session, to express our great appreciation of the constant and unstinting efforts of the Chairman of the Committee to ensure the success of its work. Perhaps the decisions that have been made throughout our proceedings constitute evidence of his ability.

We are also happy to express to the Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Fahmy of Egypt and Mr. Mashhadi of the Islamic Republic of Iran, our appreciation of their meritorious efforts. We wish also to thank Mr. Akashi, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament, **Mr. Safronchuk**, the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, Mr. Sahrab Kheradi, the Secretary of the **Committee**, and the other members of the Secretariat, including the Conference Services staff, who worked studiously to facilitate the work of the Committee. It would be remiss of me not to express appreciation to the interpreters and translators, who spared no effort to provide the common denominator for understanding between us.

Once again I affirm that the Arab Group appreciates the positive role played by the Chairman in the conduct of the Committee's work, and we wish him success in the future.

Mr. ISAAC (Saint Lucia): On behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group, my delegation would like to express sincere appreciation to the Chairman and the other officers of the Committee for the outstanding manner in which the business of the Committee has been conducted and for their successful guidance of

(Mt. Issac, Se int Lucia)

its work to a prompt conclusion. The Chairman's efficiency and tact in moderating the many controversial discussions deserve special commendation. They should serve as an example to the future guardians of the Committee's work. Our best wishes go to him for his future endeavours.

Mr. SALAZAR (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish) : I want simply to express thanks for your comments, Sir, and for those of other delegations, especially the remarks that have been addressed to Ambassador Taylherdat of Venezuela, who has been Chairman of the First Committee for the session. Venezuela is proud that its representative has occupied the Chair. In addition, I should like to thank you, and the representative of Iran, who, by acting as Vice-Chairmen, played such an important part.

The CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the officers of the Committee, and on my own behalf, I should like to thank all representatives and to wish them health and prosperity. This wish is addressed in particular to Ambassador Robles, who has taught many of us what disarmament is all about.

The Committee rose at 6 p.m.